

Dear Prof Irina Rogozhina,

We hope that this message finds you well. During the proof-reading phase of our manuscript, we discovered a few minor issues involving a change in some numbers in the text. We have been asked to explain why the numbers in the text should be changed, hence this justification. There are three types of issues. One relates to misquoted size fractions of the sieves that have been used. The second relates to a dot that is missing. The third issue relates to (what we believe is) a number rounding issue. Please find all types of issues identified below (referring to typeset version three of the manuscript), followed a brief justification for the envisaged change.

Minor number error	In line 51 on page 3 should say “150-250 and 250-450 μm ” (not 250-355 and 250-355 μm). Could you please change this?
--------------------	--

This is a misquote of the mesh widths used in our study. The size fractions have been correctly stipulated in Table 1. The above outlined change would bring the text in line with the actual data in table 1. Please note, that lines 51-53 also explain why sometimes a wider size fraction was used than is stipulated in line 51.

Missing “.”	In line 5 on page 7 it says ...(<0058ppm). A dot is missing. It should be ...(<0.0058ppm)
-------------	---

This issue relates to a dot that got missing in the typesetting process. The change would correct this error.

Minor number error	In line 39 on page 8 it should say “...range from 3.99 to ...” rather than “...range from 4.00 to ...”
Minor number error	In line 40 on page 8 it should say “68.73ppm (see Table 3)” rather than “68.72ppm (see Table 3)”
Minor number error	In line 42 on page 8 it should say “), and 3.16 to 4.18...” rather than “), and 3.17 to 4.18...”
Minor number error	In line 45 on page 8 it should say “from 0.98 to 1.09 mmol mol ⁻¹ ...” rather than “from 0.98 to 1.10mmol mol ⁻¹ ...”
Minor number error	In line 51 on page 8 it should say “from 0.23 to 2.66 mmol mol ⁻¹ ...” rather than “from 0.24 to 2.66 mmol mol ⁻¹”
Minor number error	In line 52 on page 8 it should say “from 0.21 to 0.35 mmol mol ⁻¹ ...” rather than “from 0.21 to 0.36 mmol mol ⁻¹”
Minor number error	In line 53 on page 8 it should say “..from 0.25 to 0.36 mmol mol ⁻¹ ...” rather than “..from 0.25 to 0.37 mmol mol ⁻¹ ...”
Minor number error	In line 56 on page 8 it should say “..from 0.12 to 0.19 mmol mol ⁻¹ ...” rather than “..from 0.13 to 0.19 mmol mol ⁻¹ ...”

These issues refer to errors that we – unfortunately – did not spot earlier. All of these entail differences of 1 in the last decimal place between numbers quoted in the text (paragraph 3.1) and values in the respective tables. We have tried to understand the cause for these mismatches. We are not sure how this happened, but the repeated nature suggests some

form of computer bug that we did not spot before. Our best guess as to the nature of the bug is that rounding in LibreOffice Calc (which we used) as well as MS Excel can lead to errors (well documented problem we have learned), with the rounding not always done correctly. In any case, all edits needed are very small (insignificant).

None of the issues raised affects any conclusion in the manuscript. We would therefore appreciate if you could approve the proposed changes. Correcting these errors would not only improve our manuscript further but also help maintaining the high standard of "Climate of the Past".

Kind regards,
Viktoria Larsson and Simon Jung