

Referee 3.

We thank the referee for the careful reading of the manuscript.

Like the other reviewers, discussion needs to address the issues of using two or three fields. Data at two fields are the most commonly acquired and so would this method be inappropriate or do the authors have alternate approaches/ideas.

Response: The reduction to three fields has been discussed in the response to referee 1. Further reduction to two fields would not allow any reasonable resampling.

The paper is well-written and accessible to most in the field. A good balance of theory, method and application. I agree that the tables need better notes - for example the description of the colour scheme in Figure 1 has to be repeated in Fig 2 and 3; better descriptive footnotes in Table 2,3,4 (and actually I think this could be put into a single table with residue first column and clear breaks); possibly the same for Tables 5,6,7.

Response: We have combined the tables and added information to both the tables and figures as requested.

Very few errors found. Including the detected typos line 199 "highlighted"

Response: The typographical error has been corrected.