

Overview

This manuscript presents a detailed chronology of the June 2011 Cordon Caulle eruption, through careful analysis of near- and far-field seismicity. This particular eruption has been extensively studied in terms of the petrology (Jay et al., 2014) and deformation (Wendt. et al., 2016, Delgado et al., 2019), however, this is the first presentation of the seismic sequence. The authors make an excellent case for the motivations and integrity of the work, specifically in Section 5.2 referencing the importance of geophysical monitoring of unrest in the NASME17 Report.

The eruption is defined by a 7-stage process, defined by marked changes in the seismicity which then correspond to previous models from InSAR and GNSS observations. The focus for this chronology is March to December 2011, although the authors do acknowledge unrest outwith this time frame. The authors make use of over 30,000 manually identified earthquakes and go on to include analysis of event rates, b-values, amplitudes, reduced displacement and where possible hypocentral locations and focal mechanisms.

The discussion section is structured heavily on the ‘top down’ model presented by Roman & Cashman. This creates a flowing and well-structured narrative for the eruption sequence and ties the manuscript nicely together to conclude. Overall, I would recommend this manuscript for publication subject to a few revisions and points to consider.

Major points

My main issue that I found was in the early part of the manuscript and is to do with volcanic seismicity and terminology. This whole study hinges on the understanding and interpretation of the seismicity, and particularly where certain ‘types’ of seismicity dominate the signal. Therefore, I think the manuscript would benefit from a careful and explicit description of how these categories are defined. In line 124 the authors suggest that earthquakes can be manually labelled based on their “waveform appearance”, and then in section 3.2 the authors introduce volcano seismic event labels and classifications, such as VTs, LPs, HBs and VLPs which are used repeatedly through the study. I would suggest that this section is expanded to include a more careful description of these event types. For example, I think there is a much better definition of a HB earthquake on line 271. For LPs, it would help to describe their waveform appearance, including details like their emergent onset and long single frequency coda tails. There needs to be some care taken when using the terms low-frequency (LF) vs. long-period (LP) and their association with fluid movement. For instance, some studies have shown LPs are not strictly always associated with fluid movement (Bean, C., De Barros, L., Lokmer, I. et al. *Long-period seismicity in the shallow volcanic edifice formed from slow-rupture earthquakes. Nature Geosci* 7, 71–75 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2027>).

My second main point related to this, is to do with tremor. Particularly in the latter stages of the chronology and the discussion section, there is a lot of interpretation associated with spasmodic, emission and harmonic/quasi-harmonic tremor. I think if these are going to be referenced then they should be outlined and described in this early section 3.2 with the other seismicity event types. Line 129 suggests that tremor has to have a frequency content <5 Hz but this is not always true. Later in sections 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 the authors describe the

frequency content and amplitudes of the tremor. From figure 2, the tremor appears to be occurring during a period where there are still hundreds of individual earthquakes per day. I think the methods section would benefit from a sentence or two describing how the authors isolated the tremor from discrete events and analysed it. For example, how is the tremor classified and labelled to be included in Figure 2? Because some quite major conclusions are derived about effusion rates correlating with tremor amplitudes, so it is important to be clear about how exactly this is done.

My last main point, would be to recommend the inclusion of more figures in the main text (provided that this is not a limitation from the journal or in print). There are more figures in the supporting material than the main text. A simple diagram illustrating a “typical” LP, VT, HB and tremor would really support the added detail that I have previously recommended. The reader can then see what these earthquakes really look like. Figures S1, 3, 4 and 5 could all be adapted to make a conglomerate main text figure. The authors also describe a very detailed final model for where they believe the magma storage and seismicity is originating in this eruption. I think that a cartoon diagram would support this conceptual model. It does not need to be a mapped tomographic map, but something to visually describe the volcanic system, the magma storage, the inflation and deflation lobes, the locations of seismicity during different phases etc. would all really help bring the conclusions together.

Minor points and line comments

- Line 40: “which means, however, that almost...” insert commas
- In paragraph two, the authors refer to triggered volcanic unrest following the 1960 earthquake but then never really circle back to this idea again. It would be good to get reference and a comment on this in the conclusions or discussion.
- Line 66: “The volcanic complex is composed of three main...”
- Figure 1: Despite looking through the text, I can’t see what the acronym CLVVC stands for
- Line 106: Change unprecedented to something like ‘novel’ or ‘significant’.
- Figure 2: Panel D error bars, but what kind of error? Standard deviation? Standard error? Some other measure?
- Line 168: How did you decide the magnitude of completeness? Did you calculate it or decide on a cut off threshold yourself? Do you have a plot to justify this? It could be a supplementary figure.
- Line 224: Change to something like ‘This trend continued in April when episodes of LP and HB seismicity lasted several days...’. The word pulses has a dynamic connotation that suggests it’s coming from a source.
- Line 227: April
- Line 230: I would choose a different word from crowned. It’s used a few times in the text. Maybe “culminated”, or “reached a maximum”
- Figures 3-6 all need graphical keys as well as description in the text. I still can’t really work out what the colours of the stars and squares in the location plots relate to.
- Figure 3 caption: typo – stars/starts
- When reading the Final Unrest Phase and Eruption Onset, figure 2 becomes too hard to read details. It would be good to include a similar figure but zoomed in to only this week long period so the reader can see the details for themselves.
- Line 294: Rephrase and do not use the word coronating (same as crowning, above).

- Line 449: Are you calculating the magnitudes of LP events. If so, how? Without clear onsets or S- phases.
- Line 485: “During the second half of September, an increase of LP seismicity was recorded.” – can you elaborate on this sentence at all? Or include some quantities?
- Line 567: This is the first mention of VLPs since the section 3.2. I appreciate this is before the timeline of the study but can you either remove this comment or add another sentence to explain why it is significant to have observed VLPs at that time?
- Line 576: Another
- Line 592: This section begins a discussion about the mobilization of fluids, but with no reference to LP seismicity. In section 3.2 there is specific reference to LPs being associated with fluid movement, so I think that should be mentioned here somewhere too.
- Take care when referencing White & McCausland in section 5, particularly in parallel to Roman & Cashman. White & McCausland actually describes more of a bottom-up process in many ways, and does not completely agree with Roman & Cashman. Be explicit when you reference these as to which bits of your chronology relate to which sections of their conceptual models.