The authors have addressed most of my comments in a very satisfactory way. However, I think that one of them needs further consideration.

 Regarding the averaging over the directions (discussed on p. 5), simple, unweighted arithmetic average seems wrong. The elementary solid angle should be ∆Ω = cos(φ) ∆φ ∆θ, using the convention shown in figure 1. So, if the points are generated with constant increments ∆φ and ∆θ, the solid angles they form are not equal (contrary to what is mentioned on p. 5), but instead depend on the angle φ. So the actual solid angle is smaller for points close to the z axis (φ → π/2) than for points in the (x,y) plane. Not taking this into account means that the average can be skewed by rotating the crystal so that the z axis corresponds to a direction with a particularly large (or small) TDE. It also means that comparison across crystal structures, which can have high or low TDE directions along the axes, is difficult.

The way of addressing this would be to account for these differences in solid angles when calculating the (weighted) averages, and remove the sentence about the equality of the solid angles.

I also have a minor issue with the axes in figure 1: the left-handedness of the frame of reference is confusing.

We thank the reviewer for illustrating our error in solid angle calculation. This has been remedied within the manuscript. A section in the computational details has been included outlining our methodology for calculating the solid angle and weighted average. The displacement energies have been recalculated via the weighted average scheme, and all numbers within the manuscript have been updated. The affected figures have been regenerated with the updated data as well. The text has been modified accordingly.

It should be noted that only very minor changes were observed when including solid angle weighting, and thus none of the conclusions of the paper have been altered.

The axes have been modified in Fig. 1 to represent the right-hand rule convention.