

Dear Authors,

*As indicated in the public response, the text reads now fine. There are, however, issues with some of the figures. This is aside from most figures being rather fuzzy, which I trust will be corrected in the production phase of the manuscript. The first issue relates to the first occurrence indication in figure 4 of *Amaurolithus primus* (Lapatza Hill section). In the text this first occurrence is reported at c. 18.5m (line 390). In the figure, however, the arrow indicates a depth of 19.5m. Could this please be looked into and other, comparable references be checked? This might involve minor text edits as well.*

The second issue affects figures 7-10, more specifically the stable O and C isotope records of the fine fraction. There is a mismatch between the smoothed version of the records and the underpinning original records. In figure 8 for example, between roughly 8 and 6 Ma, the smoothed and the original $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ records are clearly offset. This likely explains why the original (unsmoothed) records end earlier than the smoothed versions (does not really make sense). Smaller issues are indicated in the carbon isotope record between roughly 12 and 8.6 Ma. Can these issues please be looked into as well?

If there are questions, please let me know.

Best wishes,

Simon

Dear Simon,

Thank you very much for your message and for bringing these issues to our attention. They have now been rectified as detailed in the text below.

Best wishes,

Torin

All Figures – *This is aside from most figures being rather fuzzy, which I trust will be corrected in the production phase of the manuscript.*

This was due to compression during conversion of the manuscript to PDF. All figures will be submitted as high-resolution image files in the final version.

Figure 4 – *In the text, this first occurrence is reported at c. 18.5m (line 390). In the figure, however, the arrow indicates a depth of 19.5m.*

This was a typo in the text, which has now been corrected. Thank you for bringing it to our attention. This discrepancy did not affect the calculated sedimentation rates or any subsequent text.

Figures 7–10 – *The stable O and C isotope records of the fine fraction. There is a mismatch between the smoothed version of the records and the underpinning original records.*

Thank you very much for pointing this out — I should have caught it myself. The issue stemmed from the original (unsmoothed) record being plotted on an outdated age model. This has now been corrected, and all relevant figures have been updated accordingly.