

As we are constrained by the deadlines of your impending meetings, as well as our own work deadlines, we realize that we will be unable to make all of your requested corrections to our proposals. Instead, we hope to receive helpful feedback and, at the very least, begin the discussion on getting these features officially recognized.

The reason that we originally had put place names before the directional names is that we understood these features as being linked to each other in complexes, rather than as individual entities. We had considered submitting some of the complexes within the same SCUFN form (e.g. Bogoslof Basin, Bogoslof Sill, Bogoslof East, Bogoslof West, and Bogoslof Valley) but realized that this approach was impractical.

Our placement of points were not chosen as central by distance, as some of these canyons are massive and winding features. We chose to place them along the center thalweg at the steepest point to reflect where the feature was most distinct from the surrounding bathymetry. Using the central point by length might result in putting some of these canyon labels on the shelf. Perhaps we can review the steepness along our various canyon thalwegs and delete the flattest parts in the shallow and deep areas.

When we were trying to label these canyons and describe them in our manuscript, we quickly realized that the available seafloor feature name files were often wildly incorrect. We assumed that these inaccuracies were from flawed bathymetry maps, which, of course, was the purpose for our bathymetry compilation and publication. Reconciling our new bathymetry with the existing seafloor feature name files proved quite difficult, and this inspired us to try to do this reconciliation by moving existing points to the steepest parts of our canyons. We would very much like to better understand your central placement of points. We made note and proposed many corrections to feature locations, as plotting them on top of our bathymetry shows them in places that do not seem best suited to denote the feature. If that is the requirement than it would require more work to adjust than we have time.

We would suggest an order of importance for your limited reviewing time:

1. Location Revision: Navarin Canyon: we strongly believe the location of Navarin Canyon was incorrectly mistaken for East instead of West at the 180 line. (Proposal 2)
2. New Features: Ashishik Canyon, Agligadak Canyon, Vostochnie Canyon, Little Zhemchug Canyon, South Navarin Canyon (Proposals: 7, 37, 23, 16, 3)
3. Features Present in ACUF but New to GEBCO: Okmok Canyon, Inanudak Canyon, Atka Canyons, Chagak Canyon, Saint Paul Canyons, Middle Canyon, Korovin Canyon, Herbert Canyon, Chagulak Canyon, Saint Matthew Canyon, Saint George Canyon, Amlia Canyon/Sill, Seguam Canyons/Sill/Basin, Bogoslof Canyons/Sill/Basin. (Proposals: 17, 35, 41-43, 15, 20-22, 1, 36, 34, 33, 5, 19, 38-39, 24-28, 10-13 and 44)
4. Revisions: Amukta Canyon, Yunaska Canyon, Carlisle Canyon, Umnak Canyon/Valley, Bering Canyon/Valley, Bristol Canyon, Pribilof Canyon, Pervenets Canyon, Zhemchug Canyon. (Proposals: 40, 31, 32, 29-30, 8-9, 14, 18, 4, 6)