

RC1: Kristian Schlegel's comments:

Abstract, line 10: „Potsdam, Seddin and Niemegek“ should be included after „3 geomagnetic observatories“

Was completely considered

page 4: line 7: footnote 1) should be added for Askania Berlin: „see Appendix in Linthe (2022)“

Was completely considered

page 4: line 8: footnote 2) should be added for Otto Toepfer & Sohn, Potsdam: see Appendix after section 2.3.2

Was completely considered

page 4 line 15: footnote 2) should be added for Schulze

Was completely considered

page 5, line 27: is Fig. 9 really necessary? The disturbances caused by the Berlin suburban railway system ist shown already in Fig. 8

Was not considered. The necessity of the Figure was explained.

page 6, line 17/18 and Figs. 11 and 12: Both figures can be omitted, since the respective portraits of Adolf Schmidt and Alfred Nippoldt are already depicted as Fig. 12 and 13 in Linthe (2022).

Was completely considered

RC2: Gregory Good's comments:

p. 2 line 3: “required” should be “acquired” perhaps.

Was completely considered

p. 2 line 23: “temoral” should be “temporary”

Was completely considered

Dear Gregory,

Thank you very much for your comprehensive check and comments on my article. I am pleased by your kind judgment. I followed your comments. Your recommendation on the discussion of sources is very valuable. The archive: <http://www.geomagnetismus.net/> contains for instance a lot of interesting details of the geomagnetism history.

With my best regards

Hans-Joachim

RC3: Anonymous Referee's #2 comments:

Page 2, line 3: 'required successfully'. change to: successfully acquired

Was completely considered

Page 2, line 30: It would be nice to add a figure with a sketch or photograph of the absolute hut.

Was completely considered

Page 3, line 6: It is mentioned that the absolute hut was moved to Niemegek. If no photograph at the original location exists (see comment above), one could add a photograph of the present hut in Niemegek as reference.

Was completely considered

Page 5, line 6: What is the meaning of 'made up leeway'? Possible change to: The hourly values of this time interval were only published later in 1959 (Fanselau, 1959).

Was completely considered

Page 5, line 30: 'was unauthorised high that the', change to: was forbiddingly high and the

Was completely considered

Dear referee,

Thank you very much for your comprehensive check of my manuscript and for your kind judgement of it. Thank you also for your valuable comments. I followed all of them.

With my best regards

Hans-Joachim

RC4: Anonymous Referee's #3 comments:

Page 5, line 30 it seems that word "unauthorized" doesn't fit the context, can be omitted or replaced with other word

Was completely considered