

The aim of the paper is to examine why palaeoclimate data is underutilised by UK decision makers. The authors interviewed policymakers and advisors to identify potential barriers to the uptake of this information. They acknowledge that they faced challenges in carrying out their interviews due to somewhat low response rates to their emails, possibly due to the interviewees perceptions that they could not contribute knowledge. The paper is well organised and is overall a valuable contribution to this field of study.

We thank the reviewer for these positive comments, and we are pleased that they think this manuscript is a valuable contribution to the field.

Abstract: Lines 13-14 – I don't think net zero policies are a good example of how humans are framing adaptation strategies. Net zero more often is part of the discussion around mitigation rather than adaptation.

We agree with the reviewer that the example used may not have been appropriate and will revise the abstract to remove the reference to Net Zero policies and will replace it with a more appropriate focus on adaptation, resilience, and risk management policies.

Introduction: I agree with community comment CC1 that the introduction could benefit from shortening or at least breaking up into sections.

Thanks, we will remove the suggested sections reported by CC1.

Findings: Whilst the authors discuss how response rate were low; I couldn't see in the methods or the findings exactly how many people responded to their interview requests. Perhaps I missed something obvious, but it would be nice to see it mentioned in the outset of the findings.

We thank the reviewer for bringing this to our attention that it is not clear on how many people responded to our interview requests. We will add an additional sentence towards the end of the methods to mention that all the email responses led to an interview taking place. We will add a reminder of the number of interviews in the opening of the findings.

Discussions: Figure 2 is an incredibly useful figure. I was somewhat surprised that scientific journal articles ranked lower than government websites. I wonder if the arrows could be reduced to just one that says "Relevance and Reliability" given that they are both pointing in the same direction.

We agree with the reviewer that our results were surprising as coming from an academic background we had assumed that journal articles would have been much higher. We thank the reviewer for the suggestion about having only one arrow – we think this makes a lot of sense and will make the suggested change.

Line 441 – the authors refer to there being "several barriers that limit the effective transfer of knowledge..." It would be nice if they could summarise them or give examples of the kind of barriers that exist.

We will add to that sentence to provide an example and reiterate that we are talking about the barriers already identified during the discussion in the article.

Conclusions: Under study reflections the authors discuss potential further work. I would add to this that it would be interesting to hear from decision makers in other

countries. I'd be especially keen to see if these views are held by European decision makers given that UK decision makers often obtain their funding from European sources.

We think this is an excellent idea and will add this into the conclusion.

Page 6, line 140: delete "this" from "To our knowledge this there..."

Will change in the revised version