

Editor comment 2 on cp-2017-107

Dear Carter et al,

Thank you for your responses to the first round of reviewers and editorial comments. We believe that the manuscript has improved.

However, the second round of reviews raises the same problems with the analogue technique again, in line with the first round of reviewers' comments (see Referee #3 additional comment 1, Referee #4 full report). This suggests that you have not addressed this issue adequately in your responses to the first round of reviews. The editorial team has therefore taken the decision to ask for a final round of major revisions, to allow you to comprehensively address this issue. If this issue cannot be addressed in this round of revisions, we will not send the paper for an additional round of revision-review and will be unable to accept the paper for publication.

In order to address the analogue technique issue, we request a paragraph in the introduction and a subsection in the discussion which clearly address the potential weaknesses and problems in application of the technique. An acceptance that this suggests more uncertainty in your results and interpretation than is currently expressed is needed. You should also discuss what might make the results presented here more robust to the challenges to the modern analogue technique and its application in this study - see comments from Referee #4 on this.

Additional comments made by referees 3, 4 and 5 should also be addressed.

We look forward to your responses and final revisions of this manuscript.

Best wishes,

Heather Plumpton (Handling Editor) and Mike Evans (Co-Editor)