The manuscript clearly improved from its last version. It is, however, still not ready for publication. Some results are not clearly presented, and some essential information is still lacking. Please find below my minor comments that will hopefully improve the readability of the manuscript. Please also go through the entire text and rewrite to be more concise.

Specific comments:

Northern Hemisphere ice sheet forcing/Appendix A: In the last version of the manuscript there was too few information, now there is too much. Please rewrite to be more concise, and exact. Suggestions for some changes:
Line 465: Appendix **A**
Line 469-470 and following: what is the difference between post-LGM and Termination I? Maybe better to change all to Termination I?
Line 472: change to NH
Lines 482-483: change 'more' to 'most'
Lines 496-497: change to '… Figure A1, neglecting isostatic adjustment (i.e. using present…)
Lines 500-502: rewrite
The important part here is the remapping of post-LGM/Termination I retreat to Termination II, which is based on the d18O record of Lisiecki and Raymo (2005). How similar are these two terminations in the d18O record? And is reshuffling of the Termination I records a valid approach?

Line 121: explain MIS 5e, or change to LIG

Line 130: delete Stone reference here; they don't use the index method

Line 135: delete first 'as'

Lines 147-154: The approach of using the two different sea-level curves still does not make sense to me. I understand that the GrIS is not largely influenced by using another record, but it is confusing that the AIS is forced directly by the Grant sea level reconstruction, and at the same time indirectly by the FWF from the NH ice sheets that are reconstructed using the LR05 stack. This is especially important because of the different timing of the sea level highstand in both reconstructions. Please discuss.

Lines 159-160: change 'In that case', to 'Therefore'

Lines 161-162: Change to: 'The FWF from the dynamic GrIS and AIS replace…'

Lines 165-177: As suggested before, I still think a figure comparing your sea level contributions to the Kopp et al. (2009) data is necessary. Your companion paper deals with a fully coupled climate and ice sheet model, so likely the sea level will be different from the one prescribed here. As the sea level evolution is essential for the results of the present study, it really should be clearly shown and discussed.

Lines 208-210: rewrite

Lines 213-214: Change to: 'The increased temperature changes of these simulations is due to albedo…'

Line 230: 'FWF are *similar*'? Or small?

Line 235: Change to 'Here changes in AMIC cause a perturbation…'

Figure 6: Another possible reason for the mismatch could due to the comparison of modelled temperatures over a large region to local measured anomalies.

Line 261: 'partially suppressed'? Suppressed to PI values? Or no FWF at all?

Lines 397-399: delete sentence

Line 400: delete "climatic"