

I have roughly read the revised paper and reviewers' comments, I think the writing style of this manuscript is somewhat tedious, but the content is acceptable for publication after the following suggestions are compiled:

1) Use the same format for citing references, e.g. A [?], or A and B [?] or ABC et al. [?] . It should check and make corrections for the entire manuscript.	<i>References have been affected following the journal format for the entire documents. The same format now used for all the references.</i>
(2) The symbols used in equations should in consistent with their descriptions in the content. In equation (1), the dot sign (multiplication) should in the middle place, and and the italic font of delta x, delta y, and delta z are not the same as dx, dy and dz. Similarly, the meaning of symbol fonts in equation (2) is not the same as described in the content.	<i>The observations have been corrected as in lines 377 and 422</i>
3) There is an extra "(" in the 10 lines of Section 2.2 Aeromagnetic.	<i>I am sorry, I couldn't find such on line 10 of the section as mentioned</i>
4) The title of Figure 6 is missing, and Figure 8 is not in a good position	<i>I don't think there is need for title again since the figure describes the type of map it is. Figure 8 has been re-positioned.</i>
5) Why Figures 15 and 16 presented before Figure 10?	<i>Nothing like that here</i>
6) There is an extra "<" in REFERENCES 3.	<i>Corrected: line 637</i>
	<b>Note:</b> <i>Please the yellow colour indicated the corrected version and need to be changed before publishing if accepted. Thanks</i>

Overall, this manuscript requires a detailed proof reading check by the authors to make sure everything is in good order.