
Dear Editor,

Thank you for accepting our manuscript following the two round of reviews. Please find below an answer to the minor comments from Reviewer #2.

With best wishes,

Julien Bodart (on behalf of all co-authors)

Reviewer #2:

Minor Comments

The authors have done an outstanding job of addressing the two sets of reviewer comments. This will be a go-to paper for me and many others for many years to come. Thank you!

We would like to thank Reviewer #2 for their very positive comments on our manuscript and for their thorough review, which has undoubtedly improved this manuscript.

A few very minor technical corrections are suggested:

L314 - Wegener typo

Agreed and amended.

L676 - Jeofry typo

Agreed and amended.

L902 - 300,000 typo

Agreed and amended.

L943 - Recovery typo

Agreed and amended.

L973 - e.g. rather than i.e.?
Agreed and amended.

Figures 8&9 - I'm not convinced by the colour schemes here. They are very similar, which makes it difficult to differentiate between the ILCI and the velocity data. I recommend more of a contrast between the two datasets (e.g. velocity as greyscale?). Sorry!

Thank you for this comment. We had initially put the velocity data as gray coloscale, however we changed this following Reviewer #1’s first review which suggested to change the colorscale to make the velocity map more evident. We have therefore followed their advice and changed this accordingly. We believe this is an improvement from the grayscale figure we had initially created in the first version of the manuscript and have decided to keep this as is.