

**Dear Editor,**

Thank you for handling our manuscript and your thoughtful comments. We provide our replies point by point below. Comments and replies are shown in *italic* and **bold**, respectively. In the revised manuscript, the added and revised parts are colored by red. Figures in the manuscript are moderate resolution. Those with high resolution will be provided when this is accepted.

*My greatest concerns are with the quality of the figures. For example, I think that Fig 1 could be improved by making it more "three-dimensional". Perhaps it would be better to make two figures out of Fig. 1: You obviously need an overview figure of the entire region -- but the blue polygon describing the runout area lacks detail. It does not show the steep slope above the deposition area. Would it be possible to add a figure with a close-up of Langtang village, including a two-dimensional profile of the avalanche track? This would give the interested reader a better overview of the terrain and the location of the deposits. And the travel distance is immense -- I think some 5km to 7km.*

**[reply] We add three 3D views such as overview including Mt. Langtang Lirung, close-up of the debris covering the village and elevation difference. All figures include extent of debris and village facility. [Fig. 1b, Fig. 12]**

**We do not add avalanche track because 1) this is out of focus of this study, 2) it should be multiple possible tracks, 3) but we have no evidence (so too speculative), 4) it is easily obtainable from freely available DEM and satellite image on GIS software so that anyone can make it if they want, and 5) Lacroix (2016) provides possible profiles in his Figure 5c.**

*For me, the most important Figures are 2 and 5. In these images it is very difficult to see where the avalanche came from. These images should also demarcate not only the location of the debris -- but also the destruction caused by the avalanche air blast. (That is, the location of the debris relative to the villages. I know the tie-points are of interest to the authors--but I, as a modeller, am primarily interested in the limits of the destruction. For me Figs. 2 and 5 are also overloaded. I think that Figure 5a should be placed in a separate figure so that the reader can imagine how large the measured deposits are! Imagine standing in front of 20 m high deposits! This is unique data and should be highlighted.*

**[reply] We add three 3D close-up views of the debris covering the village and elevation difference including extent of debris and village facility. [Fig. 12]**

*In general, I think there are two few pictures giving the reader an overview of the terrain and destruction -- Perhaps the photos in Fig. 7 should be related to a map. Where are they exactly?*

**[reply] We add locations of tree investigation and ice cliffs. [Fig. 2a]**

*Fig 8 mixes tree diameter and debris thickness. True, both are histograms, but they are completely different quantities. The debris thickness I would place nearer to Fig. 5, the elevation difference.*

**[reply] We separate the histogram figure. [Figs. 6 and 9]**

*You state that the ice "should have played a key role in initiating the entire event".*

**[reply] We add this phrase. Thanks. [L409]**

*Would it be possible to place a table in the paper with your estimated mass balance: (Mass/Volume of initial ice and snow, Mass/Volume of entrained snow and debris; mass/volume of dirt/rocky debris. I think this would be helpful for the reader to identify what kind of event it was -- ice-avalanche, snow avalanche or debris avalanche. It would also provide valuable constraints on avalanche dynamics models.*

**[reply] We reevaluate the volumes and add Table 4. Thanks. [L379-, Table 4]**

*Furthermore, it would highlight the role of entrainment -- or did the entire slope become unstable at once from the shaking?*

**[reply] It is totally unknown. We add our excuse. [L382]**

*Figure 9: It is hard to distinguish the thin, thick and blue lines in Panel d.*

**[reply] We change line style. [Fig. 10d]**