

LINE 2161: If I get it right, it's either "which we must isolate from  $g_{obs}(p)$ " or "which we must separate from  $\delta(p)$ ".

LINE 2166: not really, angular velocity  $\omega = \frac{\Delta\theta}{\Delta t}$  is independent of latitude as it is in  $\text{rad} \cdot \text{sec}^{-1}$ . The tangential velocity  $\omega \cdot r$  increases at low-latitudes, which in turn increases the centrifugal effect.

FIGURE 4.4: nothing to change. Just wanted to say I love this figure! BEAUTIFUL

FIGURE 4.5: I like this Figure even more! Just check spelling "ANOMOLOUS"  $\rightarrow$  "ANOMALOUS"

LINE 2439: YES, I agree. However the least-squares approach is also equivalent to the Bayesian approach when both the "a priori" distribution for the parameters and the conditional probability of parameters given data are Gaussian. This means that the least-squares approach can be derived from the Bayesian inversion.

LINE 2711: change "ZLS gravimeter" with a "Lacoste and Romberg gravimeter upgraded to ZLS ultrastats control system".

LINE 2769: I just realized that we never justify the choice of  $2300 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}$  for the sediment's density. It is a reasonable value, but it contributed to the uncertainty of your results. Is there any reference that you can cite?

LINE 2833: OK, I see a reference to Schön (2015) here. That is probably enough.

LINE 3168: True, but the engine of forest invasion is the Oldensief (1974) invasion method, which introduces additional filtering

LINES 3176 : Sorry, I don't understand the meaning  
3178 of the leakage of high-elevation data.

FIGURE 4.19: BEAUTIFUL !!