Dear editor,

We are pleased to submit a revised version of the manuscript. First of all we want to thank for your effort in improving the work.

Looking forward to hear your kind reply,

Estela Nadal-Romero and co-authors.

1. We have changed all the small details that you have suggested.

line 119: "Digital photogrammetry" (no article)
line 128: "no-known" should be "unkown"
line 131: ""GCPs" (plural)
line 149: "different" should be "various
line 417: "especial" should be "special"
line 428: " which do not enable" should read "which does not allow"
line 439: "distances, is " ommit comma
line 441: "In the contrary, SfM technique, does not" should read "On the contrary, the SfM technique does not"
line 443: garbled sentence. Make new sentence after citation brackets: "This is one of the main advantages when compared to TLS."

2. line 225: I still do not understand this sentence - how can a camera provide something better than classical photogrammetry, i.e. how can a device be better than a method? *To avoid confusion we have deleted this statement.* 

3. Section 2.4 and your answer to my original comment "16. Page 345. Line 13": I have not quite understood your explanation here. Do you mean that you have used an arbitrary local coordinate system? I.e. you used the local coordinates measured by the TLS for these points during the first survey, and transformed the point cloud measured during the second survey into this first local coordinate system?

Yes, we have use an arbitrary local coordinate system (named Project Coordinate System in RiProfile software) to avoid any error introduced by the Global Coordinate acquisition of ground control points. In this way the local coordinate of the reference points obtained in the first TLS acquisition were used for transforming the coordinates of the other survey days, either the SfM point clouds and the TLS ones. Nevertheless, if the coordinates of the reflective targets are determined the transformation to a different coordinate system can be easily established.

4. Your answer to "23. Page 349. Line 28 and Page 350 line 1." - You are right, the numbers are indeed correct in the current manuscript, although they do not appear in track changes - in the discussion paper version they were wrong as I had indicated. I do not know why this happened - in any case, they are correct like this now!

5. Figure captions 5-10: Spell the software correctly according to its proprietary name: CloudCompare

We have changed that in all the figure captions.

6. Figure 9 and 10: I realize that three parts are more easily arranged in one row, but these really are too small... could you please use the same scale as the previous figures?

The scales of these figures has been optimized for the differences observed between both techniques, so we would like to maintain the scale presented in the revision. Nevertheless we have increased the size of the figures to improve the view of the observed differences.

Finally, we remain at the disposal of the Managing Editor in terms of making additional changes and improvements to the manuscript. Thank you for your assistance and advice on how to improve our manuscript.

Yours faithfully,

Estela Nadal-Romero and co-authors