

Dear Andy, thank you for securing further review of our manuscript and inviting minor revisions.

Re #1 – placing our work in a quantitative context – we have now included introduction Figure 1, which highlights the specific power density of all hot point drill developed to date. We have color coded this figure to highlight the increasing prevalence of low power density hot points intended for extraterrestrial settings. This figure clearly shows that no other groups have been experimenting with $>200 \text{ W/cm}^2$ specific power since c. 1980. Our Hotrod drilling system is quite peerless in terms of the specific power systems of all other hot points in operation today.

Re: #2 – relation of manuscript to digital assets – we have now included text stating that in addition to providing technical specifications, the article supplements digital assets by providing the rationale behind design choices, outlining abandoned variants and failures, describing digital data and software solutions, and highlighting outstanding challenges. We specifically state that while hot points of similar power density were deployed in the 1950s, there are no detailed designs of these drills in the public sphere today.

Re: #3 – Nizery [1951] specific power– We have now calculated the specific power of all $n = 46$ hot points surveyed by Talalay [2019]. We assess a specific power of 397 W/cm^2 to the Nizery [1951] design. We also clarify our statement that the specific power of our hot point is twice the specific power of any other hot point in operation since c. 1980. This clarifies that there are no drills currently operating at this specific power density, not that our specific power is the highest ever designed (which is clearly Nizery [1951]).

Thank you for your editorial service in support of open science.