

Responses to comments from submission on metals-2665682

Reviewer 2 Round 1

Comment 1. abstract need to be improved.

Response: The abstract has been updated to better detail the scope and results of the paper, noted in Footnote 1

Comment 2. there is no conclusion.

Response: The previous discussion section was more appropriately renamed the Conclusions, Section 5 and also noted in Footnote 14 and a new discussion section was added, Section 4, this is also noted in Footnote 11. The new conclusions^x section was also updated to more directly highlight the results, Footnote 15

Comment 3. Have the authors tried other algorithms?

Response: The authors have not tried any other algorithms for the reasons detailed in the discussion section, noted with Footnote 12

Comment 4. The laser - processed sample region is not half-spherical. So the “depth” is not accurate and cannot be used.

Response: why?

Comment 5. the citation to previous works are not full.

Response: The introduction section has been updated to more fully present this work in the current state of the art and the result is a more fully referenced work.