

Response to Reviews:

See my responses in underlined text below.

Reviewer A:

I have read over the Douglas Schmitt's commentary to accompany the submission to Seismica entitled "A compilation of elastic anisotropy measurements from metamorphic rocks" by Nikolas Christensen.

The original version commentary had numerous typographic and grammatical errors that I have endeavoured to correct (see tracked changes in MSWord document). I have also tried standardize language. For example, the commentary frequently refers to "speeds" or "wavespeeds" whereas Christensen (2025) always employs "velocities". Another example is the use of "axial" anisotropy which I have replaced with "hexagonal" after identifying their equivalence so as to avoid reader confusion. I would encourage the author to check for other examples of duplicate terminology and replace with the terms employed in Christensen (2025). There are also errors in equations (e.g. 5, 13) and I would ask the author to carefully check all equations for other instances of mislabelling etc. I would also strongly suggest, following standard usage, that references to Christensen's manuscript be cast as "Christensen (2025)" rather than "Prof Christensen's manuscript".

I believe that after the commentary is checked for accuracy, errors etc, that it will provide useful additional context for Christensen (2025).

Recommendation: Revisions Required

I agree with all of the changes suggested. I have (hopefully) placed 'hexagonal' in for any other naming for that symmetry. I also went through and redid some awkward or unclear sentences in the manuscript that are indicated in the uncleaned version of the manuscript that is renamed 'Schmitt_combined.dox'. There are a few places, too, where I tried to make it clear that I was referring to Figures in Christensen (2025). I hope these all look fine now. The initial version was written quickly and was not checked as much as it should have been – I did not expect it to go this far!

Reviewer B: Pathikrit Bhattacharya

My main comment is with respect to the quality of the figures in Figure 1. Is there a possibility that some of these figures could be made in a bit better quality? Some of the figures are slightly out of focus - e.g. in panel (a), the foliation planes are hardly visible. The writeup is so nice, it would be great to see it complemented by a nice set of clean (color?) pictures is appropriate ones are available. Rest of my comments are mostly formatting/editorial and can be found in the annotated manuscript uploaded as "Comments+from+Reviewer+1+_+Doug+Schmitt_MB_PB.docx". This file contains both Michael's and my comments together in one annotated file. I have also attached another file "Comments+from+Reviewer+1+_+Doug+Schmitt_MB.docx" which contains Michael's original review file.

Best

Path

Unfortunately the initial figures were made some time ago (early 2000's) and so I do not have the originals and so could not fix that figure with new images. I no longer have those materials as I left them in Alberta when I moved to Purdue (it was a lot of rock). In retrospect I wish I had kept them. Other than that I agree with the formatting, etc. and again made some further edits to some of the unclear sentences.

Regards

Doug