Dear Editor,

Thank you for your time and sending us your decision. We have made corrections to both reviewers as shown below. Corrections made based on suggestions are shown in red. かなり丁寧に査読コメントをくれた印象.

Reply to reviewer no.4

We highly appreciate the time spent for the review comments from the reviewer especially those minor corrections (our type errors) and pointed out many points that clarifications are needed. We are happy that the reviewer is happy and highly evaluated our manuscript. Please find our responses and corrections as shown below.

Reviewer comments	Our answers	Corrected manuscript
- It is not clear how the TUNAMI N2 and STM were coupled. The authors need to provide more detailed information such as conformity of grid size, time step, and bathymetric- topography data. Furthermore, it is not clear whether the bed level in the TUNAMI N2 were also updated after sediment transport or not.	I wrote the explaining.	Please Page 8 Line 209-211 For each time step, the STM receives the total flow fluxes from TUNAMI-N2 and calculates the change of seafloor and land surface and feeds this to the next time step of the TUNAMI-N2 model.
- The reasons to run the simulation for 6 hours is not clear. Any data show the tsunami propagation at this area lasted in 6 hours? なぜ再現時間 6 時間で計算したのか?	Added the explaining.	Please see Page 10 Line274-276 The simulations were calculated over a 0.05 second increment with a 6 hour period in which the test case with a 12 hour period showed the suspended sediment concentration in the vicinity of the shoreline decreased and stabilized.
- The manning coefficient was treated uniform. Is the coefficient sensitive to the results? No specific sensitivity analysis was done in this research.	Fixed value of coefficient were used in this study sue to land use map are not available in this area. The lack understanding of manning roughness coefficient will be mainly discussed as issue by creating city use maps through field surveys in the future.	Please see Page 10 277-285
This paper also attempts to bring recovery process of the beach, which I do not see where the recovery has taken place. Usually, beach recovery process takes years after a tsunami or storm surges. The impacts of the tsunami was performed by the models, but recovery process of the beach is not	The terrain recovery after tsunami is determined by the factors of coastal conditions which used as initial conditions for tsunami movement simulation. In this study, we aimed to clarify the types of sediment movement which was caused by tsunami and the correlated initial condition. This study highlighted that out flowing sand was relatively easy to return to shoreline.	

	Whether it has actually returned will be examined in the future using wave / wind data / wave models. And recovery process of the beach will be mainly discussed as an issue in future study.	
- Backwash created deposition at the offshore area instead of erosion in other study area. But, this study revealed the opposite. Author needs to review some more cases that could give different result.	Thank you for your advice. In the future, we plan to study other areas.	
- Diffusion coefficient in Equation 6 has different symbol in the paragraph explaining the equation	Corrected	Tsunami trace height Inundation depth Tsunami height
- Figure 10, three figures in the last row have no clear explanation: to what time these figures were meant to? Please provide sufficient information and discuss this properly.	Added	Please Page 18 Figure 12