

Reply to comments of Reviewer 2

Thank you for comments with respect to our manuscript. I would like to answer each comment as follows.

Page 1, Line 25-26:

§ Unclear formulation: It would improve reader understanding if these systems would be presented as example applications of microscopic 3D-measurements, not that they require them

A. The digital holographic microscope and the light field microscope are not suitable for high-speed three-dimensional measurement since these systems require complex calculations for three-dimensional reconstruction. I added this explanation.

Page 1, Line 28:

§ Phrasing recommendation: measuring an image $\rightarrow$ acquiring an image

A. I modified this sentence according to your comment.

Page 2, Line 63:

§ Which specific optical characteristics were evaluated?

A. I specified the evaluated optical characteristics in this paper.

Page 4, Figure 2:

§ It is unclear in the figure where the measurement object is located. Perhaps it could be added to the figure.

A. I added the target object in this figure.

§ Since the arrow goes from the FPGA to the camera, the text in the figure description should be “The FPGA outputs an exposure signal [...]”

A. The exposure signal is outputted from FPGA. I’m sorry that the figure description was wrong. I corrected this description.

Page 4, Figure 3(c):

§ The text in Fig. 3(c) is too small

§ Switching the light direction so that the microscope is on the right (as in Fig. 2) would improve the readers understanding of the figure

A. I modified this figure according to your comment.

Page 4, Line 115:

§ Correction: “The FPGA outputted an exposure signal [...]” (same as the description of Fig. 2)

A. I corrected this sentence as the description of Fig.2.

Page 5, Line 138:

§ There should be some separation between the paragraph title (“Change in brightness depending on exposure time”) and the rest of the text. Without separation it is quite jarring to read because it is read as one sentence.

A. I agree your comment. I modified this sentence.

Page 5, Line 140:

§ Missing space after comma

A. I corrected this sentence.

Page 5, Line 146:

§ Should it not be 14.5 ms? Surely not seconds?

A. I’m sorry. it is not 14.5 ms but 14.5 us. I corrected this sentence.

Page 5, Line 149f.:

§ Same issue as in line 138. Missing separation between paragraph title and remaining text.

A. I modified this sentence.

Page 6, Line 157:

§ Same issue as in line 138.

A. I modified this sentence.

§ The beginning of the sentence with “In the measurement method [...]” should be revised since the grammar seems to be wrong

A. I modified this sentence. Could you confirm this sentence?

Page 6, Line 169:

§ Concerning the “slight deviation”: Could you give a concrete value and its significance? What was the uncertainty of the measurement?

A. I added the measurement values to this sentence. In the evaluation “Changing in focal position”, it is visually determined if it is in focus or not. Therefore, there is the uncertainty of the measurement. I added this effect to this sentence.

Page 7, Line 187:

§ Spelling error: “This reason for this [...] → “The reason for this [...]”

A. I modified this sentence according to your comment.

Page 7, Line 192:

§ Unclear: Why only two images? Perhaps the explanation given in line 210 could be moved here.

A. The present experimental system can acquire only two images. Therefore, the method which calculates depth information from two focal plane is used in this paper. I added this effect to this sentence.

Page 8, Figure 10:

§ The text in the image description is completely messed up and should be corrected.

A. I corrected this sentence. Please confirmed this sentence.

Page 8, second line after figure:

§ Unclear: What is Reference A? The references at the end are numbered.

A. I’m sorry that I forgot referring this reference. Reference A is [17]. I corrected this sentence.

Page 9, Line 239 ff.:

§ The conclusion appears too generalized; could you argue your conclusions with some concrete results (such as quantitative results)?

I added the experimental results according to your comment.