Reviewer A:

This paper is not ready to publish. The topic and the results are well worth publishing in this publication. The problem is that the paper reads as though it?s been cut and pasted together without having had enough editing to make it flow. Questions come up as I read it that are answered a page later, and not where I?d expect the explanation to be. – We have introduced some changes for a better flow of our article.

In addition, the English needs to be edited to correct grammar and sentence structure. There are a lot of run-on sentences and sentences that don?t make sense. I have read other articles by these authors and I know they can write a more polished paper. – We have edited the article.

More specific comments:

DONE University CLA should be written out.

THANKS – DONE Some things that spell checkers don?t get are things like the usage of queue instead of cue.

DONE There are also acronyms that are used without definition.

DONE The 3rd and 4th paragraphs of the introduction need references for the background they are referring to.

We used provided template, and all looked correct – we can work with publisher on this. The email address on the first page is not a footnote, it?s in the midst of the text in the version reviewed.

DONE What is ?a-harmonic?? I think you mean ?nonharmonic?

DONE Should be ?Young?s modulus? not module

How fast are the exposure times? How do you ensure that you are not smearing while doing temporal phase shifting? Even if you?re talking 2 hz and you?re taking data at 60 fps, there will still be some motion during the phase shift which likely will be between 8-15 hz. – The exposure time was 16ms for a 60fps camera. And yes, there will be some fringe smearing and it will cause a phase ripple error, but this error’s characteristic is known and thus can be identified and ignored. The precision of measurement will be affected but biological measurements due to its transparent nature of sample and environment and not well known indices of refraction, can afford larger errors.

Where you explain the scan beginning above Fig 4 the explanation is confusing. Not sure if it?s the grammar or the explanation. Please clarify what you are saying. The explanation was changed and hopefully it is clearer now.

The last sentence before the conclusions makes it sound like there is another example. Is there? Or did you forget to delete this sentence? We deleted the sentence.

Overall, this paper needs significant rewriting and polishing before it is ready to publish. I do not recommend publication until it has been revised and re-reviewed.