

Maarten Van Daele comments to manuscript (bold), with author CORRECTED response in italics.

Deposit J. The tail related to deposit J was initially not included to the event deposit, event though from Fig. 14 it is pretty clear that there is a tail (Bouma Te division) that is indeed not included in the deposit. This tail should, however, be included already in the results, so that it can also be taken into account for the age model. Furthermore, I am far from convinced that the silt deposit below J is part of the same event. We know from comparison with well-described events (e.g., Van Daele et al., 2017; Wils et al., 2021) that a long muddy tail means a significant time lag of at least days to weeks.

The tail of the deposit was NOT included in the age-depth model, even though Maarten seems to have inferred otherwise. It would be good to know why he made this interpretation.

Other comments: Identifying the tail as the Bouma Te division implies that it is a turbidite, the result of a turbidity current. This is not the case as explained in the manuscript: the silt and the tail are part of the same event because the XRF data shows that sediment composition does not return to background until after the tail. Because the tail is part of the deposit that formed over a short time period (likely minutes to hours, depending on how quickly the floccs settle – which is less time compared to normal fine-grained sediment), they should not be included in the age model. The age model should only include normal background sedimentation, which is why it is so very important to know when a deposit starts and ends (see discussion about XRF data above).