

Second Review of “Reconstructing the dynamics of the highly-similar May 2016 and June 2019 Iliamna Volcano, Alaska ice–rock avalanches from seismoacoustic data”, Toney et al.

The authors have nicely improved their manuscript, and addressed my previous comments. I therefore recommend this paper for publication.

I have technical and very minor comments that I am stating here. All the line numbers are referring to the revised manuscript including the track changes.

- 1) Line 184: Remove one of the two “was”
- 2) Paragraph 4.2.2: Is what you describe in this paragraph what is represented by the blue scale color in Fig.6? If yes, please make reference to the figure in this paragraph.
- 3) Lines 282-283: “This constraint ensures that we only use stations for which the source-receiver distance changed by a maximum amount of 10% over the course of the event.” You can also add here that this allows you to consider the source as a point source.
- 4) Lines 351-352: “Note that this method assumes that the mass m is constant, which is clearly not the case due to entrainment and deposition along the path.” So do you assume that variations in the mass are negligible and so allow you to use this method?
- 5) In paragraph 6.5, you say “In this study, we used high-resolution satellite imagery to estimate the location and to inform the selection of a mass.” But from what I understand reading Line 377 “The trial mass starts at zero (giving an infinite length) and is increased in increments of 10 million kg until the length calculated with the trial mass drops below the target length.” is that you did not use the masses computed from satellite imagery as a-priori for your inversion. I would remove “ and to inform the selection of a mass.” or detail this statement more.