Reviewer 1

Comments and Suggestions for Authors

- The authors mix the terms total station and laser scanner with Trimble S7, Trimble SX12 and Trimble X7 models

* We have used Total stations Trimble S7 1” for check survey traverse for check points
* Terrestrial laser scanners such as Trimble X7 and Trimble SX12 for collect point clouds

- SX12 is not a laser scanner

* <https://geospatial.trimble.com/en/products/hardware/trimble-sx12> please check with this site and Trimble SX12 is a mixed total stations and laser scanners. It has included 26.6kHz laser scanner

- The values in the abstract and conclusion do not match

* Sure, we have edited

- Incorrect terminology – polygonometric network, identification point...

* Sure, polygonometric network is a traverse, identification point is a ground control marks (also edited)

- Table 1 – useless table shows the measured values

* Sure, replaced

- Page 4 – Was the SX12 used for scanning? – 1,606,305,600 points. Why, if you use TX7 scanner?

* We used both scanners, because our project tunnel has so much area.

- Figure 3: this is not a TLS profile measurement, it is simply a TLS measurement

* Edited

- I consider pictures 4-6 useless and I don't know what they are supposed to document

* Replaced

- Page 7 – why should the overlap not exceed 30%? The greater the overlap, the higher the accuracy can be reached

* Sorry it has translating error. Edited

- Chapter 3.1 – Is the 3D model projected or regressed from measurement to project? it is not clear

* Edited, there is a no projection, used ground plane.

- Figure 9 is not very informative

* Replaced

- Table 2 is incomprehensible

* Edited

- Page 9 – what is meant by relative accuracy? It is not often used term in geodesy

* Relative accuracy is shown on report of traverse network, pls see it page4

- The values in the conclusion do not match those in the abstract

* Edited

The main reminders:

- The overall observation plan is missing

* Inserted

- Geodetic network parameters are missing

* Inserted

- Missing network alignment result

* Inserted

- Missing laser scanning alignment result (registration + georeferencing)

* Inserted

- There is a lack of justified scientific contribution

Overall, the paper is rather chaotic and, despite its simplicity, not easy to understand. It's a pitty, because the topic is certainly interesting.

Reviewer 2

The paper cannot be accepted in its current form due to several issues requiring attention. Firstly, the manuscript exhibits substantial grammatical problems that significantly impair readability and comprehension. Secondly, although the study details the use of terrestrial laser scanning (TLS) technology in monitoring excavation lengths and volumes against designed parameters, the paper essentially presents a straightforward application of existing tools and software such as the Trimble S7 tacheometer and Trimble Business Center. In conclusion, while the employment of TLS in ensuring adherence to design specifications in underground mining operations is indeed noteworthy, the manuscript's current content fails to demonstrate a compelling research contribution or originality.

* We have edited our manuscript such as table, figure and some wrong translate, it has been checked by professional English Editing service.

Reviewer 3

General remarks:
- additional presentation of the results of high precision control survey carried out in the underground mining project using terrestrial laser scanning technology;
- research relevant for the Mongolia;
- minor faults are attached directly to the submitted article;
- references cited shall follow the rule of the Geomatics (see Guide for Authors)!!!!!

* Edited and replaced some figure, tables. Inserted some text