In this file, there are responses to the Associate Editor.

We thank the Associate Editor for a quick reply.

To better observe communicating our response, we divided our responses into three categories: Agree/Clarification/Disagree.

Suggestion, Question, or Comment from the Associate Editor	Author's Response	Change in the Manuscript
Thanks so much for the reply - and for taking the time to explore how best to accurately represent the data in Figure 6.	Agree	We have updated Fig. 6 and the graphical abstract, accordingly.
Based on the figures you've sent, I think the 1.2 to -1.2 with the grey background shows the subtle changes in the elevation, and as a result it is more suitable (and accurate) then the original version. The reasons for this are that:		
your elevation changes are small, so there is no need to overstate the changes (actually, it is better for the results of the paper to highlight that the changes are only slight). The original image overstated the changes in the data.		
2. The data range is fully captured with the 1.2 to -1.2. As a result, there is no toppingout of the data, which is the most accurate way to show the information.		
3. The figures can now be easily and accurately compared as they are now on the same colourmap and scale. By having two different colourmaps the original work (unintentionally) distorted the data to show more changes than there actually are. The data change in Figure 6 is subtle and that's ok - let's present the data without		

the slight changes. I think this is achieved with the 1.2 and - 1.2 figure here with the grey background.

My recommendation for revision is to update the Figure 6 to 1.2 to -1.2 scale for both (and to not forget to add the pink polygon) - I believe the main figure after the abstract should be updated also.

Thanks for your work on this, and the push for clear representation of the data.

The updated figure:



