The authors' response has adressed my concerns with the presented analysis. In particular, the paragraphs added in relation to the solar wind tracking and conclusions sections help greatly with defusing my criticism towards the choice of test model employed here: Through the way the manuscript was formulated upon first submission, I had gotten the impression that the authors are advocating for the beam-tracking detector by itself as completely sufficient for any kind of study of the particle distribution function in the solar wind. The added text illuminates some of the limitations of the beam tracking process, and illustrates its specific place in combination with other devices while still comprehensively outlining the benefits such an instrument provides for solar wind measurements.

As a result, the choice of simulation analysis presented now makes a lot more sense to me: the restriction to maxwellian distribution functions is entirely sufficient to test the performance of an instrument that is designed to study the behaviour of compact velocity space distributions.

Mention of sparse sampling methods and references to corresponding literature have been added, and while they are fewer and smaller in scope that I had suggested, the authors convincingly argued that more extended treatment of sparse sampling would go beyond the scope of this manuscript. Thus, I consider it sufficient to educate potential readers about the subject.

I thank the authors for their thorough and enlightening response to my comments, and now recommend the paper for publication.