

Review of Yan et al. revisions

Yan et al. have provided a revised manuscript “Enhanced Moisture Delivery into Victoria Land, East Antarctica During the Early Last Interglacial: Implications for West Antarctic Ice Sheet Stability”. The revisions include improved figures and fuller descriptions of the limitations of their conclusions. However, I think the issue of the ice timescale tie points requires a fuller analysis in the main text. In particular, the inference of accumulation rate is highly dependent on the tie points between 128 and 129 ka. These are based on a visual match of a noisy isotope peak in S27 to a smooth peak EDC. The S27 isotope record has 3 different peaks that could plausibly be considered the maximum after applying a smoothing 5 data points.

To illustrate the importance of these tie points, the figure below shows the change in delta-age that occurs if you remove the 3 tie points between 128 and 129 ka in the bottom panel (and use linear interpolation between the tie points). The small delta-age which gives rise to the inference of the high accumulation no longer exists. The removal of the tie points also affects the look of the isotope record, which is plotted in the top panel. Can the resulting isotope record be excluded from consideration? If so, on what basis? I want to emphasize that this is not the only plausible shift in the ice timescale that would impact the delta-age; it is just one that was relatively simple to do as a reviewer. It strikes me that the delta-age uncertainties in Figure 7 are missing an important source of uncertainty and are considerably larger than shown.

I think the paper would be much improved if there was a quantitative way of aligning (and assessing the alignment of) the S27 isotope record with the EDC isotope record. Lee et al. (2020 in *Climate of the Past*) use a matching method for the methane record of Roosevelt Island which could be applicable here. The inference of high accumulation during the Last Interglacial has the potential to be very impactful which is why I think the conclusion warrants substantial scrutiny.

