

Dear Authors,

Thanks for taking into account my minor comments on the text.

I am delighted to accept your paper for publication in our journal. Thank you for choosing TC to publish your work.

My only remaining comment concerns Figure 1. The two sinusoids are very thin and hard to see (at least for me!). This is not an error so you [can] keep it “as is” (I will not check) but the figure would gain readability by using thicker lines, and it is not an important figure after all.

Best regards,

Etienne Berthier

Thanks for giving the manuscript another close look. For line widths in Figure 1 and all other figures in this paper we're following the guidelines provided by the Nature journal group (<https://www.nature.com/gim/authors-and-referees/figures-tables-and-artwork-guidelines>).

By setting line transparency we've intentionally made sure the sinusoids in Figure 1 do not dominate the figure or compete visually with the primary information (the blue true velocity time series) or the secondary information (the four image acquisition times and corresponding velocities estimates obtained by the six unique image pairs).

The sinusoids are intentionally faint as their only purpose is to help the reader imagine what it might mean to fit a sinusoid to the observed velocities, and how that would compare to a sinusoid fit to the true signal. Our first attempts at creating this figure did not exploit transparency, and the overall effect was a jumbled mess of lines that buried the main intention of the figure, which is to explain how velocities are obtained from displacements measured in image pairs.

In the interest of keeping the main message of the figure at the center of focus, we've chosen to keep the figure as is.