We would like to thank the reviewer for his/her help to review our paper. The comments and suggestions are encouraging and useful in revising the manuscript. We have responded to the reviewer's comments below.

The authors have addressed my second main point, but the inclusion of Figure 2 has not done much to allay my concerns about identification of the first event, which provides the premise for the conclusion about the X-line crossing the location of BepiColombo. Whilst there is a reversal in the Bn trace, it seems to be more of a (slanted) step function rather than a bipolar signature per se, and as I suggested may be the case in my previous review, the enhancement in the total field strength precedes the reversal in Bn, rather than being centered on it - so this seems to be contrary to what one would expect for a flux rope signature? The authors state in their response that they could not completely exclude the possibility that this structure was a magnetosheath structure - I would suggest that this is a strong possibility. I therefore do suggest acknowledging this possibility in Section 3.1, and softening the conclusion accordingly.

The conclusion that the first structure is a FTE-type flux rope has been softened. We have made changes in Section 3.1. (lines 117 to 119), Conclusions (lines 249 to 252), and Abstract (line 20).

Line 155 - I presume that the vectors nmin, nint and nmax are determined from minimum variance analysis on the flux rope, but please state so explicitly.

Yes. The vectors are determined from minimum variance analysis. This has been added.

The revised paper would still benefit from careful proof-reading/copyediting - I have not listed all language issues, but there are two in particular that impact on clarity:

We have polished the English writing. Annales Geophysicae will provide English language copy-editing. We will ask for that.

Line 155 onwards - there are several instances where the authors talk about positions/scale/intensity etc "along with [vector]" (lines 155, 156, 157, 171, 172) - I think the authors mean "in the [vector] direction" or "along the [vector] direction".

Thanks! In these and other places, "along with" has been corrected according to the reviewer's suggestions.

Line 187 - by "includes the strongest flatten profile" do you mean "corresponds to the most flattened profile"?

Yes. It has been changed.