Reviewer #1: The authors have addressed most of the issues raised by the too referees. Nevertheless, in my last report I suggested that the authors normalize their irradiation diffusion by damage energy. While it's true that I inadvertently wrote damage energy rather than dpa, or damage energy per unit volume, the point is still valid. The authors provide the diffusion coefficient per fission event, but that is not what they calculate, they calculate means square displacements for a fixed damage energy per unit volume. They make several assumptions to convert this to per fission event - concerning electronic stopping, linear dependence on energy, effect of electronic stopping power on diffusion etc. Second, this value cannot be compared, easily to ion beam mixing in other materials. While the reader is given sufficient information to back calculate essentially their - epsilon(b), that should not be necessary. In other words, epsilon(b) should be provided in the table. Moreover, measurements and MD calculations of this quantity are available for many other metals - both pure metals and alloys. It is known that it correlates roughly with cohesive energy and energy density of cascades, and so the authors should report how their value fits in with other data.

We thank the reviewer for their comment. We agree that showing epsB is more appropriate than the A coefficient, as the A coefficient has assumptions built in. In Fig. 7 and table 1, the epsB parameter is now shown. Additionally, comparisons are drawn discussing the comparative magnitude of epsB in UMo to other materials.

Finally, further technical edits have been performed to improve the grammatical accuracy and clarity of the manuscript.