

Whilst the manuscript has been significantly improved I note that the authors do not provide a comprehensive response to the reviewer's comments and that some of the changes made do not offer a significant improvement.

The point below has not been addressed in the response. In general the authors have made efforts to discuss specific points of correction, however, the reviewers' more general points have been largely overlooked. Whilst the more discursive comments can be trickier to discuss, I think it's important that the authors make an attempt to address them.

Non-addressed point 1: "I feel more insight could be gained as to the significance of the new reconstruction with broader comparisons with existing studies and the already widely described palaeoclimatic evolution of the region"

I am happy that the authors have increased the number of data comparisons with other regional reconstructions.

An effort has been made to improve the details given regarding the physical and statistical methodologies used.

Changes to the results section have also been added and an attempt made to improve the discussions of the wider implications of the findings presented in the results.

Grammar and clarity. Unfortunately there are still numerous examples of poor grammar and clarity of language which need addressing (e.g Abstract lines 4-5. Too many uses of 'used', Abstract line 10 – plurals not correct. Abstract line 15 – plurals not correct (temperature/temperatures)).

Improved notes on sampling strategy and the relationship between this series and the existing chronologies has been more clearly presented.

I do not feel that the request to provide clearer (identifiable, bullet points maybe) aims/objectives or testable hypotheses have been met. This omission makes it hard for the reader to see the motivation for the study and to tie concluding points to objectives.

Improved and updated detrending section – important improvements have been made here to the background.

A better attempt has been made to add depth to the conclusions.

Whilst I can appreciate that some considerable effort has gone into the corrections, unfortunately I do not feel that they adequately address the points made in the original reviews.