

Response to Anonymous Referee #1

Dear Anonymous Referee #1

Once again, thanks for the feedback. I have discussed it with my co-author and made some changes which I will upload in a revised manuscript that hopefully fulfils your requests.

Response to your comments:

1. We know it is a rather technical manuscript, but we considered this specific forum suited for more technical papers. So we prefer to keep the technical details for now. Apart from the too-technical part, we have emphasised the advances obtained in the discussion.
2. At the end of the discussion, we have included our guidelines for the best strategies in a bullet point format to gain a better overview.
3. We have changed quite a bit in the discussion, including more detail on the advantages/disadvantages.

Response to Anonymous Referee #2

Dear Anonymous Referee #2

Thanks a lot for the feedback; it is very valuable. I have discussed it with my co-author and made some changes which I will upload in a revised manuscript that hopefully fulfils your requests.

Response to your comments:

1. At this point, we do not have any other (aerial) baseline data to compare it with, and we can only refer to other articles as we do in the manuscript. Nonetheless, we include a lot of data that indicate the instrumentation noise in a static mode, which can help us evaluate the drone-towed solution. We know it is a method-heavy manuscript, but we considered this specific forum suited for more technical and method-heavy papers. So we prefer to keep the technical details for now.
2. Most of the introduction describes the advantages and disadvantages of the other EM system, but we have made extensive changes in the discussion to further emphasised the advantages/disadvantages.
3. At the end of the discussion, we have included our guidelines for the best strategies in a bullet point format, which can help implement possible improvements.