

The revised version of the manuscript looks better compared to the initially submitted one. Still, I am not convinced with the argumentation concerning mismatches between modelled and reconstructed isochrone depths in Fig. 2. It is obvious that the model fails to reproduce reconstructed isochrone depth in some regions. Of course, one can suggest possible explanations what is the reason for that. But without due proof that the mismatch was caused by e.g. insufficient climatic forcing, one can think about failures in the modelling approach. Anyway, I realise that the main goal of the paper was to demonstrate a new methodology in the model-based paleo-reconstructions, though the demonstration of the confusing results decreases the value of the approach.