Specific comments

Line 45-46: It is possible to be more specific here, i.e. approximately where is the boundary? And how sensitive is LLL to positional shifts in the westerlies? – this seems important to understand given the conclusions.

Line 84: Do you think this is the case here. Salt formation is a function initial environmental salt concentration, i.e. salt concentrations of the water body prior to evaporation, volume of water evaporated (often multiple evaporative events) and temperature (which effects salt crystal growth). Given LLL is a very different environment than the lower MDB which Bowler's work refers to. Do you know what the potential for efflorescence and palletisation is in this environment?

Line 179-180: Dune system and dune field implies a series of dunes, but you have one. Why not just call it 'the dune' or 'the lunette'?

Line 189: Suggest changing to 'The berm consists of poorly ……'

Line 218-219: Do you really know the lunette is LGM aged? There are three LGM ages (including the 18.5 ka data). Assuming you have augered right through the lunette then in LL3 approximately 2/3 of the lunette is younger than 20.6 ka, while for LL2 similarly 2/3 of the lunette is younger than 18.9 ka, i.e. potentially younger than the LGM in both cases. So why could it not be the case that most of the lunette is younger than the LGM.?

The best way to examine the timing of deposition would be multiple samples from the same profile and then calculate mass accumulation rates (using bulk density).

It might be the case that majority of the lunette is LGM aged, but this has not been demonstrated yet.

Line 251: If the berm had acted as a permeable filter then as you suggest, was the fine material contained in the berm was transported through the lake? And if so would it have limited lake size, i.e. until the berm was filled? Alternatively could the barrier represent pre-lake fluvial transport? Finally, what is the origin of the basalt gravels – are they fluvial?

Line 262: Given you have sands in the barrier, the barrier is in the southeast of the lake and the rivers draining the granite are presumably in the north and northeast could not the sands also potential represent lake low stands? i.e. when sand is able to be transported through the now lake bed? Alternatively, could they be derived from wave action which would imply a high lake levels. But if they are aeolian they could be derived from the lunette or from a full lake. Overall I therefore is it worth suggesting they were deposited in lake highstands? You also need references to imply lake high stands at the times you suggest? Or are these ages the four age populations (in which case you could state this directly).

Line 271: How do you know this – did you undertake mineralogy? If so you should present it?

Line 274: There is no mention of basalt in the Woodward et al., 2011 paper as far as I can find?

Line 275: Yes but what would the sorting mechanism actually be?

Line 278: Why present these months instead of seasonal means i.e. winter = June, July, August and summer = December, January, February? Is this because of potential past shifts in seasonality? In which case wouldn't July be better to present?

Line 294: The reed beds are indeed a possibility, but would these have existed in temps 6-9 degrees cooler? Another possibility might be that drainage in the west is preventing the formation of a lunette? This would also explain why there is no lunette in northwest and southwest despite reasonably strong winds in those directions.

Line 320: and following paragraph: meaning what exactly; more sediment transported to the lake and lunette building?

Line 361: Add 'winds' after 'westerly.

371: Fore dune ridge? Why again the change in terminology – I suggest being consistent.