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Dear Sir/Madam,

REVIEW OF MANUSCRIPT 2068262122123088-R1

Thank you for providing the reviews of the above manuscript. We have taken the Reviewers’ comments into account and have provided an updated version of the manuscript. We have appreciated the insight and criticisms provided and would like to thank them for their detailed feedback. We believe all the raised issues have been addressed and as such we have outlined all of the changes below.

Comments from Reviewer: Cris Luengo

“I asked to give units for the values of the parameters used (page 10). You replied that "none of the parameters listed have associated units in the way that measurements can be related to pixels or microns." I disagree: sigma and rho are parameters to the Gaussian, and therefore have spatial units (either pixels or micron). It is very important to indicate units here, as this will determine the amount of smoothing introduced. (Tau is a time step, and therefore could be reported in seconds, although the units here are meaningless because time is exclusively a part of the minimisation algorithm. c_1 and c_2 are the same units as the Eigenvalues of the structure tensor, which has the same units as the gradient of the image (intensity/space). Reporting these units adds complexity but doesn't solve any ambiguities, so I would leave these units out.)”

We agree and have therefore included the units for both sigma and rho (in pixels and their converted values in microns).