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We agree with Dr. Ujvari’s opinion that it is a better choice to date the chronology with a high-resolution, absolute independent dating method, if there has any select object for our research object. OSL is a good meter to determine the age of last interglacial aeolian sediment, and maybe penultimate interglacial aeolian sediment (Stevens et al., 2018). Our previous study had focused on the Holocene climate variation pattern comparison between Monsoon Asia and East Asia. The OSL data suggested the climate variation pattern of Monsoon Asia was lagging that of East Asia about 3-5 ka (Chen et al., 2016). However, in this study, we focus on the comparison of the last four interglacials due to we believe the more objects we study, the closer we get to the truth. On this scale, the OSL dating result commonly presents a wide uncertainties range. Even for last interglacial and penultimate interglacial, the OSL uncertainty range can reach to 5 ka in a professional and excellent OSL study (Stevens et al., 2018), the length of which is similar to the lagging time referred in this paper. Due to the absolute independent dating method present a unignore uncertainty range, in this study, we selected a relatively dating method to further determine the chronology. The DK section had done the OSL and Paleomagnetic dating work in previous studies (Frechen and Dodonov, 1998; Ding et al., 2002). Base on those, we further developed the SPECMAP tuning chronology. We believe the absolute independent dating method combining with the relative dating method can produce a good chronology. Therefore, both two loess sequences were developed chronologies via tuning the particle size of loess to the SPECMAP (and partly NorthGRIP-Greenland) curves in this study. That is a commonly used chronology method for mid-Pleistocene loess (e.g. Sun et al., 2006; Guo et al., 2009; Hao et al., 2012). As you mentioned, this method may lead to a uncertainty range. However, this uncertainty range systemically happened in both two chronologies, it means the uncertain age affect limited on their relative age. And that is very important for our study. The OSL paper (Li et al., 2018) discovered the climate variation between Central Asia and East Asia presented an anti-phase pattern on precession component during the last interglacial. It means the climate change in Central Asia is about 10 ka lagging to East Asia on precession component. Although the length of lagging time is different, considered the uncertainties range of chronology, the result of OSL chronology is not conflicted with our result. According to comments, we will add some published OSL dating data in central Asia to discuss the unparallel variations between these two regions during Last interglacial. Nevertheless, thanks for your comments.
