

The authors wish to thank the reviewers for their stimulating comments, which we have addressed as follows:

Reviewer 1

The Conclusion did not say much about the objective statement in the Introduction that highlighted the need for 'a model for angular distribution of evaporating atoms in order to link the measured deposition rate to the evaporation rate'. Yet, from Figure 4, it is clear that the new model describes experimental data better than the 'point source' model.

The conclusion has been expanded and now notes the success of the new model.

Reviewer 2

- "Well-known models" are only well known to users of the model - Please add references of the description of the Hertz-Knudsen model.

The phrase "well-known models" occurs in the abstract where we did not wish to add references. The reference [4] where such models can be found was already included in section 2.1 (Theory – point source) but we have make this more clear.

-Your conclusion in the abstract where you summarize the results (last 2 sentences of the abstract) should be incorporated into the conclusion at the end of the article which is, in itself, inadequate.

These sentences have been incorporated into the conclusion which has been expanded.

Page 2 Eq-1: No reference to the equation is found. Please add or derive in a few steps.

We have added a closely related equation derived in Ref [4] from which the given equation is evident by inspection.

Page 5 last sentence of this section: "Although the form of the experimental curve and the theoretical curves do not match very well, the results indicate clearly that the experimental data coincides better for the evaporation model from an extended source and for high directionality (n)." This remark could be summarised or as is input into the CONCLUSIONS

It has been added to the conclusion

- Conclusion is inadequate - "may" indicates that further research is needed to capture the geometry parameter. See remark about abstract. The conclusion is lacking positive outcomes of the study and future areas to correlate the theoretical and practical. Was the Experimental evaluation of emission models from a thermal evaporation source successful or not?

We have improved the conclusion and indicated the success of the study.

Fig-4: Vertical axis: Although it is being mentioned in the text about the measurement is in 1 min period, the units in the graph should be corrected. "Rate" per se has a period attached to it. Suggestion: cm to change to cm/min ?? Are there any error bars for the practical evaluation? If not it should be mentioned in the text. If error bars are available they should be added to the graph.

There vertical axis of fig. 4 gives the ratio of two rates (that at a given separation compared to the rate when the separation was 3 cm) and is therefore unitless. The unit of cm refers to the separation distance h (and not the rate). To avoid confusion we have relabelled the axis. No formal assessment of the error bars for the experimental data was made and it is not included.