------ Reply to the Reviewers comments ----
The authors have finally decided to treat the Y and Z directions the same.
That makes the paper much better.

A: Thank you for your comments and corrections. We made changes in the text and figure, as follows.

While the triangle method may provide a good estimate for the shock normal vector in the eta direction, it provides no information in the zeta direction. In contrast, the velocity jump provides information in both directions. So the authors should scale back their harsh criticism and remain objective (for example line 193, and elsewhere).
Lines 193-195: So why are the authors talking about the error in the eta direction only? What about the error in the zeta direction? It is infinity for the triangle method.

A: We rephrased the entire paragraph and also described that comparison is only in the \eta direction. We also added the estimate of the error range in \zeta direction, which is the same in the \eta direction in 1D model.

Figure 3: it is quite hard to interpret the figures. What is "deflection change"?
How is it related to "shock angle"? There may be information about this somewhere in the text, but the caption does not really explain it.
In panel b we are looking at the zeta direction, but the horizontal axis is showing theta_eta. Why? What does this plot show then?

A: We enhanced the figure caption. We also added the explanation of "deflection angle". We also switched (c) and (d) for smooth explanation.

We also corrected following typos
Line 27: omni -> OMNI
Line 195: large -> larger
Lines 337-338: there is double negation. Fix grammar.
Line 425: the Earth -> Earth
Line 431: into between -> into
Figure 2: T_s2 label is touching the blue quadrangle below (is that a satellite?).
Took me a while to figure out that it is a letter T.