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)