

Harrap – Edits Round 2 – Jessell et al 2021

56-59 sentence is broken

67 missing .

80 the sentence implies you also provide everything these tools would possibly hope for... implied anyways (just being picky).

84 yes and no. If you had just a section, fine. If you had a well constrained section and a map, then there is obviously more information there in 3d ... intro structural geology labs... 😊

144-145. Already stated. Unless you are adding particulars e.g. as you do at 157 you can probably delete.

196 reads a bit oddly. Are you saying number of servers because you cited one of many servers or am I missing something? Perhaps reword?

235-240 is this coded directly as ... code ... or do you use a rule base or rule table system for later extensibility (just curious, probably doesn't need to be added, but if you did, that's interesting).

315-324 what about growth faults (which you discuss much later in another context)

326 first , is unnecessary.

431 improper use of : use () instead

440 say or not and?

455 have not can?

470 Jessell et al 2014 is not in the reference list. Careful, you might offend the guy.

562 At several points in the paper you mentioned things that are underway as studies. It feels like these should be restated here. Some are not.

580 I would argue that it eventually provides a testbed for other kinds of studies, for example in education, looking at cost effectiveness of drilling, etc. etc. Also, if this ever worked robustly and easily for the average geologist I could imagine using it iteratively while doing mapping. Though in that case one might just build a proper 3d system rather than doing multi-tool with extraction...