Reviewer #1 Comments

I wonder whether it would be good to use the data shown in Fig. 2 to plot a graph, having twelve points, showing PDC (y-axis) against Thunderstorms (x-axis), The correlation coefficient could be calculated, and the significance of the result assessed.	Additional analysis has been performed, with a scatterplot of PDC against Thunderstorm frequency produced. The correlation coefficient was calculated to be 0.76. The additional plot has been included in figure 2, with explanatory text added to the figure caption.
In Fig. 4 I wonder whether Rocket nose cone would be a better term than Rocket warhead.	Figure 4 and its caption have been edited to change the term “warhead” to “nose cone”
Line 7. …. electric circuit, and the early evidence was found to support this model. …	Sentence on line 7 changed to “… and the early evidence that was found …” to improve clarity
28. … its …	In line 28, “it’s” was corrected to “its”
Fig. 1a. It would be better to have a photograph showing a clear gap between the metal support of the point discharge instruments and the more distant tower.	Figure 1a has been updated to show the mast and instruments clearly without objects in the background
Fig. 1b. Is there a paper which describes this instrument? If so, please give a reference.	A citation to Marlton et al. 2013 has been included in the caption for figure 1, as this paper describes the point discharge instrument pictured. Figure caption has been slightly altered to compensate for this.
75. … Earth; however, in areas …	Comma replaced with semicolon in line 75
77. It was …	Typo corrected in line 77 ("In” changed to “It”)
114. … ionosphere, and restoring …	Semicolon replaced with comma in line 114
282. … instruments; however, they still have …	Comma replaced with semicolon in line 282
285. aircraft	“air” replaced with “aircraft”
288. It could be useful to state that this desert is in northern Mexico and southwestern USA.	Line 288 has been modified to clarify that the observation site was in New Mexico, USA
308. … understood, however, was …	Additional comma added to line 308
Acknowledgements. … undertaking of BM's PhD project, …	Acknowledgments modified to clarify that it was BM’s PhD project.

Editor Comments

I think the title does not reflect the historical aspect of the manuscript. Therefore the term historical may be included in the title. Something like: „The Role of Point Discharge in the historical Development…“	Title has been changed to “The Role of Point Discharge in the Historical Development of Atmospheric Electricity”
Perhaps it could be mentioned in section 2 that already in 1888 Elster and Geitel developed an instrument to measure the charge of raindrops: Ueber eine Methode, die elektrische Natur der atmosphärischen Niederschläge zu bestimmen (Oktober 1887) Meteorologische Zeitschrift, 5.Jg. März-Heft, 1888, S.95-100	Additional sentence and citations added to line 68 to mention the contributions of Elster and Geitel
Isn’t it worth to mention Reinhold Reiter’s extensive work when discussing the PG investigations? Particularly his measurements at a cable car. e.g.: Harrison and Schlegel, Hist. Geo Space. Sci., 14, 71–75, https://doi.org/10.5194/hgss-14-71-2023, 2023	Additional sentence and citations added to line 55, which refers to this work.
What means the abbreviation FFAR in the caption of Fig. 4 ?	The caption of figure 4 has been edited to explain the meaning of FFAR (i.e Folding-Fin Aerial Rocket)

Reviewer #2 Comments

the end of the discussion section or beginning of the conclusions could benefit from a paragraph discussing the future potential of point discharge measurements in addition to the measurements being undertaken now. This will add to the historical context of the material already shown.	An additional paragraph has been added to the conclusions, discussing the possible direction of future point discharge investigations

For example, It is clear McGinnes et al 2024 is using a Point Discharge sensors so a line on their research using the sensor would be useful	
L77 It instead of in	Typo corrected in line 77 ("In" changed to "It")
L127: It would be useful to define the convention of positive and negative PDC. i.e is negative PDC an outflow of electrons from the point as defined in Whipple and scrace.	A convention for the polarity of PDC has been added to line 41. Additionally, the caption for figure 4 now clarifies this meaning.
Furthermore it may be prudent to add the Potential gradient convention too.	A definition of PG has been added to line 52
L189: Consider a paragraph break here. This makes it easier to see there is a shift in discussion between the positive dipole and the lower positive dipole	Paragraph break inserted at line 189. Subsequent line reworked slightly to compensate.
L266: no r in Ksanfomality	Typo corrected in "Ksanformality" in line 266
L288: Import(ance)	"import" changed to "importance" in line 278
L297: Bi -polar logarithmic electrometer	"logarithmic electrometer" in line 297 changed to "bi-polar logarithmic electrometer"
Equations (2, 3 and 4) Are the constants a, b and c universal values which can be used interchangeably between the equations. If not I'd suggest renaming them to different values to avoid confusion.	The constants a,b,c in equations 2,3,4 have been altered (to a,b,c,d,g,k) to make it clear that these represent distinct constants