To the reviewer:

The changes made with regard to your comments are summarized in the following list, with the same numbering. Page, paragraph, and line numbers reference the "diff" document (which shows both deleted and added content). The listed paragraph number does not necessarily correspond to the actual paragraph number but rather the number of the textual "blocks"; for example, displayed equations separate a paragraph into multiple "blocks". Displayed equations and figures list an equation/figure number in parentheses instead of a paragraph number and line number. Negative line numbers denote counting from the bottom of the text block up.

Item	Page	Par.	Line	Change
1	2	3	4	mentioned Monte Carlo techniques
2	1	1	6	mentioned upfront that Cartesian geometries are assumed
	2	4	3	mentioned the lack of decoupling for curvilinear geometries
3	2	5	1	made requested change
4	3	2	12	added Hamilton citation
5	4	5	3	mentioned the assumption made on the source term sign, as well as the possible negativity with anisotropic scattering
6	7	4	1	fixed mis-worded first sentence. Made second sentence more precise and supported it with reference.
7	8	(20)	-	fixed notation in equation
	9	(21a)	-	fixed notation in equation
8	10	1	2	added $j \neq i$ to each line of equation
9	-	-	-	The changes made in addressing comment 5 included that the source sign assumption was made in this work, which should address this comment as well.
10	11	7	1	fixed typo
11	18	3	2	fixed typo
12	19	3	3	mentioned that multiple passes through the limiter were not used in results
13				?
14	24	1	6	Added discussion about CFL descreasing total computational time but at the expense of FCT solution quality. Added a column showing L^2 error for each run to demonstrate decreasing FCT solution quality with increasing CFL number. Also the entries in the table have all changed because the end time for the study was changed from 1 to 1.5 (the end time was originally never mentioned). This change was made so that the steady-state should theoretically be reached; 1 second is not enough, considering the geometry, transport speed, and transport direction. The steady-state is desirable because the steady-state analytical solution is useful for evaluating solution error and drawing conclusions about FCT solution quality.
15	25	1	5	gave boundary conditions, as well as transport direction
16	25	2	7	mentioned U^- and U^+
17	28	(6)	-	added missing Galerkin sets to plot
18	29	2	9	fixed typo

The following are additional changes made, addressing grammar, typos, poor wording, missing details, etc.:

Item	Page	Par.	Line	Change
1	2	4	6	changed "Equations (3)" to "the system given by Equation (3)"
2	18	3	1	changed unusual grammar: "the Zalesak's limiter" to "the Zalesak limiter"
3	23	3	2	gave the mesh size and end time used for the study
4	24	1	16	removed "easily" from "easily mitigated"; the word was unnecessary and expressed opinion
5	27	2	8	added comment about U^- and U^+, as for comment 16
6	29	2	5	fixed typo: "at al." to "et al."
7	29	2	6	fixed typo: "extents these" to "extends these"
8	29	2	-2	improved grammar: "the low- and the high-order" to "the low- and high-order". The second "the" interrupted the hyphenation of "low-order".