The article's format has significantly improved, which is commendable. The discussion now presents stronger arguments compared to the previous version, offering a critical analysis of both the data and results, which is highly insightful. I'm pleased to see that most of my previous comments have been taken into account, and I extend my gratitude to the authors. Despite being preliminary, this work has the potential to pave the way for further research.

- **Specific Comments:**

  - Line 27: Could you elaborate more on the conclusions?
  - Line 49: Consider using "Antiquity" instead of "antiquity."
  - Line 128: It would be helpful to include a legend explaining the zone referred to in the table.
  - Lines 140-141: The mention of "IA1/IA2" appears for the first time without explanation. It would be beneficial to standardize this throughout the text.
  - Lines 205, 201, 301: Please ensure consistent spacing with double spaces.
  - Digitization Error & GPA: I suggest rearranging the order of the paragraphs discussing digitization error and GPA. Since analyses Procrustes are already being discussed for error testing, this rearrangement would avoid repetition.
  - Lines 276-278: Bibliographic references should be reserved for the discussion section. However, it's worth noting that the percentage of error is similar to other studies.
  - Line 411: This result seems new (unless I missed it previously). If so, it should be presented earlier. The paragraph discussing variability due to topography is particularly intriguing!
  - Supplementary Data: Regarding geometric morphometrics analysis, it's crucial to address duplicate points. For instance, in the sliding procedure, landmarks 1 & 3 are duplicated. I suggest removing slidings 12 & 25 to prevent double-counting points, which could introduce bias.

    Further, it's worth noting that placing the end of one curve, the beginning of the next, and a fixed landmark in the same position results in the point being counted thrice, potentially leading to bias. Additionally, after digitization, consider removing two of these points before analysis,(given that the 3 landmarks are supposed to be in the same place, and therefore with 3 times more weight for this point than for another)