

The revised manuscript appropriately responds to reviewers concerns and suggestions. I have only a few minor requests.

1. In Section 1, paragraph 2, please change, *“The goal of this study is to investigate the ‘4.2 ka event’ in a key region...”*

to

*“The goal of this study is to investigate a time period that spans the ‘4.2 ka event’ in a key region...”*

I make this distinction to make it clear that you have no pre-conceived expectation of a “4.2ka signal” in the record, & are investigating a window of time that includes that interval, to see what occurred in Rodrigues. I think this is important, given that you find nothing particularly unusual at that time in your samples.

2. In Section 5.2 you state, *“In this regard, the 4.2 ka event does not appear to be a strong ‘single pulse-like’ signal in Rodrigues in the context of the long-term climate variance between 6 and 3 ka BP...”*.

I think the important point is that there is no obvious signal of a “4.2ka B.P. event” at all, and I think you should state that quite explicitly. It is important that areas where there is no evidence for such an anomaly be identified, so we can constrain the signal and (perhaps) figure out what the possible cause was.

Accordingly, I suggest that you re-phrase this sentence, as *“In this regard, in the context of the long-term climate variance between 6 and 3 ka BP, there is no evidence for an unusual climatic anomaly between 4.2 and 3.9ka B.P. Consistently...”* etc..

3. Also, it seems odd that, after finding no evidence for a “4.2ka BP event”, Section 5.3 begins by discussing the driving mechanisms of this “event”. I suggest that you eliminate this paragraph and begin Section 5.3 with the second paragraph, *“A close examination...”* I don’t think that the first paragraph adds very much to your paper, given that it addresses something that you did not find!

After these minor changes, I think the paper will be very acceptable for publication in *Climate of the Past*.