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I have now received comments from two referees whom are experts in topographic analysis. Based on my own reading of the manuscript and these reviews, I can see that this could make a very useful contribution to the community. While it is primarily a methods paper, the method is novel and has potentially wide applications, and is timely in the context of advances in the resolution of digital topographic datasets. The advancement relates to the quantitative interrogation of topographic data, therefore fits within the cross-cutting themes at ESurfD and so is suitable for eventual publication here. I agree with one of the referees, that a ‘Short Communication’ may be most suitable.
However, both referees raise important issues relating to the level of detail (e.g. in the method and its application), content and example, and writing style/grammar which need to be addressed. Please provide a detailed point-by-point response to each comment and indicate how they would be addressed in a revised manuscript.

Herein I highlight some additional comment based on my own reading of the manuscript which also need to be considered:

- The title could be more informative of the content in the paper. May I suggest “Extracting topographic swath profiles along curved geomorphic features” or something along those lines?

- I agree with both referees who concur that the paper would be strengthened if a comparison of a standard topographic swath profile (which may be misleading) is presented alongside the new method, so the reader can compare the results and see the benefits of your method more clearly.

- There are repetitions in the opening paragraphs (388/11 and 389/11). The list of references at 389/1 needs to be used to construct a clearer explanation of swath profile application (linked to comment by Hurst).

- Figures 1 and 2 can be combined (as part a and b).

- 389/25 – an odd sentence, crucial to what? This somewhat undermines what you are about to present so please re-think this. - 397/6 – links to comments above – how to demonstrate this?
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