	Proposed method	PL2016
Differences	– it is compiled so it is quicker (C++) – less pre-processing – computes only cliff top and toe – process concave short profiles (i.e. incomplete cliff profiles look like a check mark) – can deal with very long and narrow promontory by adjusting the normal length automatically – transects start at a user-defined level and projected inland perpendicularly to an automatically delineated smoothed coastline	– the code is readable so profile extraction function from the DEM along transects is slower (R) – pre-processing work to set up the buffers for generating transects is necessary – computes secondary inflections on the face of the cliff and if desired identifies the top and 2 toes of a sand bar in front of the cliff (one toe on each side of the sand bar top) – reject completely concave profiles (profiles that look like a check mark) – cannot deal with long and narrow promontory, unless more involved pre-processing is done. par – transects are projected seaward and inland perpendicularly to a externally delineated coastline
Commonalities	– after the profile is extracted the 2 codes to extract top and toe are similar using the same logic – both methods output the profile elevation for further processing – rejects short profiles with N_{min} or less elevation points on land, where $N_{min} = 3$ and 5 for proposed method and PL2016 (there is nothing preventing the methods to be set up for the same N_{min})	