

RESPONSE TO RC2

Title: Early Holocene cold snaps and their expression in the moraine record of the Eastern European Alps

Authors: Sandra M. Braumann, Joerg M. Schaefer, Stephanie M. Neuhuber, Christopher Lüthgens, Alan J. Hidy, Markus Fiebig

Article ID: cp-2021-54

The thank Reviewer #2 (R2) for reviewing the manuscript, and for his/her/their positive feedback. All comments and suggestions of R2, which helped to improve the manuscript, are included in the revised version of the manuscript and are point by point commented in the following document. R2's comments are listed in the gray boxes followed by our responses in blue.

1 Main Comments	2
2 Minor Comments	3
References	12

1 | MAIN COMMENTS

Summary of the manuscript

This manuscript presents 27 new Be-10 dates on the timing of Holocene glacial advances in the Eastern Alps of Europe and correlates them with inferred meltwater events within the North Atlantic. Their findings corroborate previous studies from the Western Alps and peripheral regions of the North Atlantic, which is glacial advances in those regions were the result of cold atmospheric temperatures being advected eastward from the Atlantic, and that the Atlantic was cold as a result of a slowdown in AMOC, which was a result of enhanced freshwater input from the Laurentide Ice Sheet.

Summary of my assessment

This manuscript was an absolute delight to read! Scientifically, the results support the conclusions (with a few very minor exceptions, discussed below) and the discussion was beyond interesting, it was enlightening. Aesthetically, the writing was silken, the figures were beautiful, and the logical organization of the manuscript was thoroughly evident. In my opinion, this paper should be published with a few moderate and several minor revisions.

Major Points

As I said, I have no “major” issues with this paper. I do, however, have three “moderate” points for the authors to consider:

First, there is a slight age inversion between MFI 4 (dated to 10.8 ± 0.7 ka) and MFI 3 (dated to 11.2 ± 0.8 ka). While these two events are indistinguishable in timing from each other based on the Be-10 dates, we know from the geomorphology that MFI 4 must be older than MFI 3. While this apparent age inversion is noted on line 407, it isn't (as far as I noticed) mentioned again. Thus, the discussion on lines 437-441 seems strange. The authors say MFI 3 falls within the PBO (defined as 11.30-11.15 ka in Europe), but MFI 4 does not. In reality, MFI 4 must have preceded MFI 3, so if only one of them is associated with the PBO, it's more likely MFI 4. In short, I don't see how both of the following could be true: (1) MFI 3 correlates with the PBO and (2) MFI 4 postdates the PBO and correlates with a summer cooling detected in Swiss and Austrian lake sediments.

Second, I was surprised that the authors did not acknowledge the possibility that the boulders dating to c. 700-1500 years ago (JAM-18-07, JAM-18-16, and LAR-19-23) were actually deposited more recently (c. the 18th century?) and contain inherited nuclides from prior exposure. The evidence from these two valleys for glacial advances c. 500 CE and c. 1300 CE is tenuous, in my opinion. The data permit glacial advances at those times, but the evidence is not compelling. I was pretty skeptical of glacial advances at those times in these two drainages—until I read about the evidence elsewhere in the Alps for glacial advances at those times (e.g., the boulder from Ochsental dating to 1500 ± 40 years, the sediment and peat profiles from various glacial forefields in the Eastern Alps, and the documented glacial advances in the Western Alps at those times. In light of the evidence from elsewhere in the Alps for glacial advances at c. 500 CE and 1300 CE, I think the interpretation presented by the authors—that these two valleys also hosted ice advances at those times—is reasonable, but the alternative possibility, that these three samples contain inherited nuclides from prior exposure should be discussed in the text.

Third (and perhaps less importantly than the two previous points), I find it curious that both valleys have moraine ridges just outside the LIA margins that are ~8-10 m wide, rich in fine-grained sediment, and devoid of boulders. While the authors suggest these ridges (J2 and L2) might be equivalent to the c. 10 ka Grüne Kuppe moraine in the adjacent landscape of Ochsental (lines 452-465), the fine-grained nature of these ridges seems anomalous—and suggests to me that they have a different origin from the boulder-rich ridges (moraines) present in these alpine valleys. In particular, I wonder if J2 and L2 might be some sort of push-ridge associated with the LIA advance? That's speculative, of course, but no more speculative (in my opinion) than their potential association with the Grüne Kuppe moraine. In any event, the true age of the undated J2 and L2 ridges is not an essential point to this manuscript—but their fine-grained nature does seem anomalous and cry out for an explanation.

We thank R2 for the appreciation of our manuscript. We acknowledge the three main points raised by R2 and improved corresponding sections in the revised version of the manuscript.

1. The age inversion of moraines JR3/L3 and JR4/L4 – equivalent to Moraine Formation Intervals (MFI) 3 and 4 – is discussed in the updated manuscript version: We agree with both reviewers that the timing of MFI 3 and MFI 4 is statistically indistinguishable. Therefore, we followed R1's suggestion and combined boulder ages featured by corresponding landforms and calculated a combined MFI 3-4 (11.0 ± 0.7 ka). This phase of moraine stabilization is then correlated with climatic events during the Early Holocene (EH) (**sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.3**). We believe that this strategy has improved the plausibility of corresponding sections in the discussion.
2. All text passages in which we propose a potential early Little Ice Age (LIA) advance around 1300 CE are formulated more cautiously in the revised version, since evidence is limited to one single boulder age (LAR-19-23). Furthermore, we revised section 5.1 and now discuss the possibility of pre-exposure in the context of Neoglacial boulder ages (**section 5.1**).
3. We highlighted the fine-grained texture of J2 and L2 compared to the blocky EH moraines (**section 4.2.2**) and suggested different ice dynamics (advance vs. equilibrium) being responsible for this difference. In the Discussion (**section 5.2.1**), we corrected our age estimate by including the LIA period.

2 | MINOR COMMENTS

Line 16: *I think there should be a hyphen between ice and margin.*

Hyphen added.

Line 16

Lines 20–21: *I think the MFI should be listed in chronological order, so oldest first.*

The strategy to constrain Early Holocene (EH) moraine formation in the study area has been improved in the updated version. As boulder ages that are featured by EH moraines in both valleys are statistically indistinguishable, they have been merged and used to calculate a combined MFI, yielding an age of 11.0 ± 0.7 ka (see also response to **Main comments – 1.**)

Lines 20–21

Line 24: *I think “millennial scale” should be hyphenated.*

Corrected.

Lines 24–25

Line 25: *I think “contemporaneous” is possibly too strong; I’d suggest “indistinguishable in timing” instead.*

Replaced with “coincide”.

Line 25

Line 32: *I think a reference or two should be provided for the duration of the YD and (less importantly) for the beginning of the Holocene. Yes, these dates are common knowledge—but someone(s) did some groundbreaking research at some point to determine those dates and their efforts should be acknowledged, in my opinion.*

References added.

Lines 32–33

Line 35: *“Centennial scale” should always be linked by a hyphen, I believe, so: “centennial-scale.”*

Fixed throughout the manuscript.

Line 35: *I remember Bob Anderson (CU-Boulder) commenting on one of my manuscripts and saying that “to be” was the weakest of all verbs, so to avoid whenever possible. In this case, “to be” can be deleted and the sentence remains grammatically correct (and becomes more concise).*

Corrected.

Line 36

Line 36: *Stylistically, I think references should also be cited in chronological order, because that helps me learn the history of the field, but I recognize that some journals prefer/require citations to be in alphabetical order. In this case, it’s neither. Also, the “e.g.” should be followed by a comma (so, “e.g.,”) and there should be a space after the semicolons and before the next name.*

The citation style template of “Climate of the Past”, which to our knowledge arranges authors alphabetically, is used in the revised manuscript version. “e.g.” has been changed to “e.g.,” throughout the text.

Line 77: *“State of the art” should be hyphenated, I believe. So, “state-of-the-art.”*

Corrected.

Line 78

Figure 1: Is an absolutely stunning figure, it contains so much information, and is an absolute delight to look at. I hope the person (or people) who made it are proud of their efforts, it is a real accomplishment.

We are grateful for positive feedback!

Line 101: “Geographic” can be deleted. (Are their locations that are not geographic? I can’t think of any... so the word can be deleted for greater conciseness without loss of meaning.

Removed.

Line 103

Line 112: Delete the “a” before “snow cover.”

Deleted.

Line 115

Line 126: This might be the previous semester speaking—in which I taught mineralogy/petrology despite being a geomorphologist—but I think “quartz yield” would be a better phrase here than “quartz content.” The lithologies present in these valleys must truly have greater quartz “contents” than these, as some of the quartz was etched away in the cleaning process, was it not? “Quartz content,” to me, suggests some sort of modal norm, potentially applicable to some sort of classification scheme—while “quartz yield” suggests this is how much quartz we got out of the rock.

Corrected.

Line 129–130

Line 134: How do you know the boulders were carved out of the bedrock by glacial flow? Why couldn’t they have tumbled onto the glacier’s surface from the adjoining cliffs and been carried to the ice margin. In theory, the boulders were plucked out of the bedrock and never saw “the light of day” until they were deposited on the moraines—but was this really what happened? How do we know?

When possible, we aimed for (sub-)rounded boulders to maximize the probability of sub- and englacial transport. A more detailed description has been added to the paragraph.

Lines 137–140

Line 142: Is there a difference between “complemented” and “updated?” If not, I’d delete complemented and just use updated. I think “updated” is the more commonly used verb.

Deleted.

Lines 147

Line 144: I think the first “historical” should be deleted. First, I’m not sure those moraines are really historical, in the meaning of the word, and second, the sentence is somewhat circular sounding as written.

Sentence modified according to R2’s suggestions.

Lines 149-150

Lines 150-151: Is the datum for this DEM actually sea level, and not some ellipsoid height? (I know this is nitty-gritty technical, but would you please confirm which the DEM is referencing with regards to its elevation?) See the last two paragraphs of Greg Balco’s blog post here (<https://cosmognosis.wordpress.com/2017/03/28/is-a-cheap-gps-ok-for-elevation-measurements-or-do-you-need-a-fancy-one/>) for more details, but the gist is that this is a frequent and impactful error on cosmo ages.

Altitudes derived from the Digital Elevation Model (DEM) refer to sea level. More details can be found at the following link, which unfortunately is not translated into English:

https://www.bev.gv.at/portal/page?_pageid=713,1572984&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL

“Höhenbezug” specifies the elevation reference system, which in the case of the used DEM is “Adria Triest”.

Line 157: As above, I think “quartz content” should be “quartz yield.”

Corrected.

Line 163

Line 171: How can an individual boulder have an arithmetic mean age? (Other than by the counting statistics at the accelerator, which I’m assuming is not being referenced.) If the authors are referring to the counting statistics from the accelerator’s beam line (or whatever it’s called), that should be specified for clarity. My hunch, though, is that this statement (of the boulder ages being arithmetic mean ages) is a typo—and that only the landform ages are arithmetic means. But please, if I’m off the mark with my hunch, just clarify what’s being discussed/reported here.

The expression is indeed confusing. In fact, we intended to refer to the mean of replicate AMS measurements and have revised the section accordingly.

Lines 177–178

Line 186: Reviewers don’t often say this (at least I don’t think they do...), but I just want to praise how logical and organized the Results and Discussion are, the thought that the authors have put into this manuscript is clearly evident!

Thank you for acknowledging our efforts to present our results in a comprehensible and easy-to-read manner.

Line 198: As above, I think the fine-grained nature of ridges J2 and L2 is an important observation with regards to their origin(s).

See our response in the **Main comments, point 3**.

Figure 2: Is absolutely stunning... I really like how the authors have shaded the moraines by color and used the right-angle lines to connect the sample dots with the boxes with their ages and names. The 1-m hillshade background doesn’t hurt either!

Figure 3: Also very nice!

Thank you for appreciating the design of our figures!

Line 244: The abbreviation “c” shouldn’t be used to start a sentence, even in capitalized form. Instead, I’d recommend using “approximately” instead. Also, in my experience “c.” or “ca.” for “circa” are only used with regards to approximate dates, not approximate distances, or other quantities.

Corrected throughout the manuscript.

Figure 4: Awesome, just like Figure 2...

Figure 5: Beautiful, just like Figure 3.

Thank you!

Line 276: I think the word “risky” is misleading. At first I thought you were saying that it was too dangerous to sample there, as rocks might fall down as squish you while you’re trying to hammer out a sample, but then the phrase “to tackle with SED of boulders” made me realize that you’re talking about scientific risk, not personal risk. I’d encourage you to preface risky with scientific, so “scientifically risky,” unless you are concerned about being squished, in which case I’d recommend you drop the “to tackle with SED of boulders” part of the sentence.

Both, actually, but we are more concerned about producing erroneous data. Corrected accordingly.

Line 311

Line 293: I'm not seeing the gray-shaded bars... do you mean the thin black lines instead, for each individual sample? Perhaps "bars" should be singular, "bar," instead? Also, the vertical uncertainty bar in the background—which I'm guessing is what you're talking about—seems kind of greenish, but perhaps that's me.

The word "bars" has been changed to the singular form ("bar"). The gray shading indicating the 1 σ analytical uncertainty has been slightly darkened. Further explanations of the color codes in the figure and their meaning have been added to the captions.

Line 328

Figure 6: Also, while we're talking about Fig. 6, I don't really understand the differences between the three types of uncertainty you report on the mean age, and I think other readers might also struggle. I understand total uncertainty (reported in red) is the production rate and spike uncertainty added in quadrature, but I don't really understand the importance of the difference between the 1-sigma uncertainty (± 16 years) and the standard error of the mean (± 9). I guess I would have thought they were the same thing, with the "standard error of the mean" being the correct term and the "1-sigma uncertainty" being the not-really-100%-approved-by-statisticians version of the "standard error of the mean." Your paper isn't the place to teach readers about statistics—but a few sentences somewhere in the text about the differences between these things would help me (and I think others) out. (Thanks for considering this request!)

Thank you for pointing out the lack of clarity in the captions. We have added some information on the Standard Error to the **captions of Figure 6**. Standard Deviation (SD) and Standard Error (SE) are related as the SE is calculated based on the SD, but are different statistical measures.

The **Standard Deviation (SD)** describes the deviation of the data relative to their mean and is calculated using the following formula:

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum(x - \bar{x})^2}{n - 1}}$$

x ... boulder ages
 \bar{x} ... mean of boulder ages
 n ... number of boulders

The **Standard Error (SE)** quantifies the dispersion of sample means around the "true" population mean. It describes potential sampling fluctuation of a distribution and was calculated using the following formula:

$$SE = \frac{SD}{\sqrt{n}}$$

For clarification:

- Individual **boulder ages** are reported with 1 σ SD of AMS measurements.
- Uncertainties reported with **moraine ages** are: 1 σ SD of AMS measurements, a 1 % uncertainty on the carrier concentration, and the uncertainty of the production rate propagated in quadrature and are very conservative (given a 6.3 % uncertainty on the Swiss production rate).
- In the Kernel plots, we report the Standard Error of moraine ages to give the reader a sense for dispersion of sample means around the population's mean.

Lines 329–333 and 380–383

Line 300: I think "supplements" should be capitalized, and the final "s" in it dropped. So, "Supplement."

Corrected throughout the manuscript.

Table 1: Are the elevations really meters above sea level, or meters about some ellipsoid? (As above, what is really 0 m elevation in the DEM?) Also, “quartz weight” would be better reported as “quartz mass.” Also, I think the 10th column from the left (3rd from the right) is mislabeled. It says it’s a ratio of Be-10 to Be-9, but that’s what the column to the left reports and the units in this column are atoms, and a ratio shouldn’t have units. Finally, how can we possibly know the average thickness of the samples to a 10th of a millimeter? While you could just reduce the reported precision (as I suspect the true precision of these measurements is being overstated)—I’m also curious as to what method you used to calculate these numbers, as it’s not stated in the text (that I saw) and I’d potentially like to use the same method in my own research.

- Elevation: altitudes refer to sea level (please see our response to lines 150-151).
- Column header “Quartz weight” has been changed to “Quartz mass”.
- Column header “¹⁰Be/⁹Be ratio” has been changed to “¹⁰Be atoms”.
- Average sample thickness: It is correct that the specification of the second decimal place pretends “false” precision. Therefore, one decimal place was removed. The average thickness was measured with a caliper. For each sample, multiple thickness measurements were made at various points (roughly based on a 2x2 cm grid). Then, an average value was calculated.

Table 1

Line 313: “11 230” should be reported as “11,230” or, alternatively, all the other 5-digit ages should be reported in the same fashion, with a space between the 3rd and 4th digits.

Fixed.

Line 353

Lines 323-327: This advancement—of adding a late spike of Fe to help process small-volume samples—seems worth of a sentence in the abstract, in my opinion. It’s a really methodological advancement for cosmo, I think, and well worth highlighting, in my assessment.

We appreciate this, however, our manuscript is an example for the application of the Fe addition, which allows for reducing the amount of Be carrier added to the sample. Here, we focus more on the geochronological and climatic interpretation of the data, and less on methodological aspects. We feel that mentioning in the abstract as a highlight would mandate further explanation beyond the scope of this study to include the series of experiments and datasets that were the basis for adopting this technique. A methodology manuscript, in which the development and application of this advancement is described in detail is currently in preparation.

Table 2: Same 4 points as for Table 1 above.

Fixed.

Table 2

Figure 7: Same comment about the meaning of the reported statistics (i.e., what’s the difference between the 1 sigma uncertainty and the standard error of the mean) as for Figure 6. In other words (in case my point/uncertainty has been unclear), what are these two statistical calculations telling us? When would/should we refer to one and when should we refer to the other?

Please see our response to Figure 6.

Lines 344-345: I think 1-3 references would be appropriate here. Who did the work that leads us to expect LIA moraine formation between 1250 and 1850 CE?

References added.

Line 389

Line 345: As discussed above in the “moderate points” section, I think “recorded” is too strong a word for the evidence this manuscript presents, “suggested” might be a good alternative.

Reviewer suggestion adopted.

Lines 387–389

Line 361: While you interpret JAM-18-16’s 1070 yr age as a minimum age, because that dates to the beginning of the MWP and the boulder might have toppled. The boulder might, alternatively, host inherited nuclides, in which case the 1070 yr age would be a maximum age. I think this possibility should be acknowledged in the text.

R2 raises an important point as the boulder’s nuclide inventory could indeed contain an inherited component, which would lead to an age overestimation. However, as stated in the manuscript text, we revisited the boulder and argue that due to its bedding and the size of the boulder, it is much more likely that it toppled. Nevertheless, we cannot rule out pre-exposure and have added this explanation to the revised version of our manuscript.

Line 407

Line 377: “Centennial scale” should be hyphenated.

Corrected throughout the manuscript.

Figure 8: There isn’t a year 0 in the CE chronologic system, as far as I know. I believe the “CE” dating convention is the same as the “AD” dating convention, with the years matching one-to-one and the meaning ascribed to them (the two-letter abbreviation) being the only difference. Because the Roman’s didn’t have the concept of zero, the numbering goes directly from 1 BC to 1 AD. Thus, as far as I know, the CE system also goes from -1 to 1 with no zero (but feel free provide a citation correcting me if you think I’m wrong). Also, on a much less nit-picky note, Figure 8 is really well designed! I like your use of color—and how time runs from left to right, that makes it easier to read in my opinion.

R2 is correct that the CE dating convention does not include the year 0. Therefore, we have modified the x-axis following the example of one of the publications cited in this diagram (Büntgen et al., 2011).

Figure 8

Line 399: This is the same section heading as 5.1. I think you might mean “The moraine record of the early Holocene” here.

Fixed.

Line 443

Line 462: I don’t think the word “evolving” should be used with regards to species, except in the case of evolution in the Darwinian sense. I think you might be thinking of an upward migration in the treeline, is that right? Also, *pinus cembra* should be italicized, I think, and shouldn’t *pinus* be capitalized as well?

Rephrased and corrected.

Line 523

Figure 9: I’m not familiar with the word “warves.” It’s at the top of the figure, sideways, in association with PBO. Do you mean varves instead? And if so, what do varves have to do with the PBO? Also, with regards to (g) and (h), what do the uncertainty bars represent, 1-sigma uncertainties?

“Warves” is a misspelling; we meant “varves”. The snippet is a remnant of a first draft of the figure and has been removed from the revised version.

Figure 9

Line 467: I'm not familiar with the word "detrical." Do you mean "detrital" instead?

Typo. Corrected.

Line 543

Line 491: I had a stats prof who said the word "significant" should only be used in scientific writing to mean "statistically significant" (at a specified threshold). That might be a stats professor's view of the world—but I see no reason why "substantial" couldn't be used here instead.

Replaced.

Line 567

Line 491: "large scale" should be hyphenated, I believe.

Hyphen added.

Line 567

Line 493: Was the Icelandic ice mass really an ice sheet (>50,000 km²) vs. an ice cap (<50,000 km²)?

According to Geirsdottir et al. (2009, Fig. 2c), large parts of Iceland (total area 103,000 km²), were still covered by glacial ice during the Preboreal. Therefore, we think that the term ice sheet is adequate in this context.

Line 501: I believe "hemisphere" should be capitalized.

Line 502: Essentially the same point, I think "northern hemisphere" should be capitalized.

Corrected throughout the manuscript.

Line 508-509: I have two minor points about "there is evidence of more subdued glacial discharge during the EH that results in a deceleration of the thermohaline circulation." First, I think 1-3 references should be cited here, in support of that statement. Second, the term "thermohaline circulation" seems to have gone out of fashion, so I'd recommend you use "AMOC," meridional overturning circulation, or something of that nature.

As suggested by R2, we added three references to support our statement. Regarding the second point, we prefer to keep the term "thermohaline circulation", as we would like to highlight the physical process itself, not so much the specific ocean current.

Lines 586–587

Line 513: I think "glaciated" should be deleted, because it is redundant with "glaciers" two words previous.

Deleted.

Line 591

Line 517: "ice bergs" should be one word, "icebergs."

Corrected.

Line 595

Line 518: I don't know if you need to introduce the term/concept "H0" into the paper. Its fine if you want to—but, if I'm not mistaken, the term is only used in this paragraph (lines 515-531) and "H0" does not appear on Fig. 9 (YD is used there instead).

We prefer to keep the explanation of the term as a service to the reader.

Line 519: I'm not familiar with the word "detrical," do you mean "detrital" instead?

Typo – corrected.

Line 597

Line 521-522: The sentence says Jennings et al. (2015) found 6 DCPs, but Fig. 9 shows 7. Maybe someone discovered a 7th one later (I don't know that literature well enough), but it seems like possibly a typo so I thought I'd mention it.

Jennings et al. (2015) found 7 major and one minor DCP between 11.5 and 8.15 ka. In Fig. 9, we only highlight the major ones, hence 7. "DCP 1-6" was indeed a typo.

Line 600

Line 523: The reference to "Fig. 8a" should be to Fig. 9a.

Fixed.

Lines 600–601

Line 531: A figure number is missing from "Fig. g-h."

Figure number added.

Line 610

Line 534: I think "Resulting" should be preceded by "The," so "The resulting freshwater..."

Corrected.

Line 613

Line 543: "sea ice" should be hyphenated.

Hyphen added.

Line 622

Line 555: I think there's a typo here... do you mean the western margin of the North Atlantic? Or the eastern margin of the LIS? The "western" margin of the LIS would be in the Canadian prairie... at least, that's the thought that comes to my mind as I read the sentence.

We meant the eastern margin of the LIS and thank R2 for this comment.

Line 634

Line 556: I think "perturbated" should be replaced with "reduced," as "perturbed" (note the spelling difference) means changed or altered, while "reduced" specifies the direction of change.

Replaced.

Line 636

Line 573: Delete "have," it's not necessary.

Sentence rephrased.

Lines 654–655

Appendix A: I think it's great that you included so many photos of the sampled landscapes, that really helps the curious reader understand each boulder's context within the landscape.

Thank you!

Line 612: “unweatherd” should be “unweathered.”

Corrected.

Line 692

Line 617: I looked for your samples on the ICE-D Alpine database and was unable to find them. What’s the timeline for getting the samples posted?

We will have the data posted on the ICE-D database as soon as the manuscript and thus our data organization and data interpretation are accepted.

Line 632: Is “inataura” supposed to be capitalized? (I don’t know... but it seems likely to me.)

“inataura” is written in lower case according to their website (<https://www.inatura.at/en/legal-disclosure>).

The Supplement: Once again, it’s really nice that you included multiple photos of every boulder, I like your thoroughness!

Supplement, 5th line to the caption for Table A2: I think the “therefore” in “and was therefore used to quantify” should be deleted, its unnecessary (the sentence makes sense without it).

One final note: thanks so much for submitting this manuscript to *Climate of the Past*. I know reviewers don’t often tack on such comments—but your manuscript was such a delight to read, and the figures were so well made!

The adverb “therefore” was removed in the **captions of Table S2**.

We thank R2 for his/her/their nice and motivating words! We are pleased that the manuscript has been well received and that we have been able to contribute to the advancement of knowledge on glacier and climate fluctuations during the Late Glacial and during the Holocene.

REFERENCES

- Büntgen, U., Tegel, W., Nicolussi, K., McCormick, M., Frank, D., Trouet, V., Kaplan, J.O., Herzig, F., Heussner, K.U., Wanner, H., Luterbacher, J., Esper, J., 2011. 2500 Years of European Climate Variability and Human Susceptibility. *Science* 331, 578-582.
- Geirsdottir, A., Miller, G.H., Axford, Y., Olafsdottir, S., 2009. Holocene and latest Pleistocene climate and glacier fluctuations in Iceland. *Quaternary Sci Rev* 28, 2107-2118.
- Jennings, A., Andrews, J., Pearce, C., Wilson, L., Olfasdottir, S., 2015. Detrital carbonate peaks on the Labrador shelf, a 13-7 ka template for freshwater forcing from the Hudson Strait outlet of the Laurentide Ice Sheet into the subpolar gyre. *Quaternary Sci Rev* 107, 62-80.