

Editor

Congratulations to the authors on the production of a very nice paper and thanks for the high quality, major revision they undertook along the way. Both reviewers 2 and 3 have suggested some final edits. The technical ones should be implemented - the optional ones I leave to the authors' discretion. I also note an error in the manuscript, which does not use the correct units for accumulation rate (depth/year or mass/area/year) - the authors have omitted the time unit. Please either change the unit, or ensure that the surrounding text refers to "annual accumulation of ". Also please ensure that depth units are clearly expressed in water- or ice-equivalent.

Thank you for your comments. In the discussion section "Insights from the SI:RAID age scale", we have changed the text to refer to annual accumulation rates. This is the section where absolute rates of accumulation are discussed and compared.

Reviewer 2

I find that the authors' substantial changes to the introduction and discussion have greatly improved the paper, particularly in making the paper have a stronger sense of purpose and impact. The RAID system and its pros/cons are clearly outlined now, and the discussion highlights the more unique aspects that RAID and this study bring to the broader Antarctic research field. I only have a few very minor possible technical changes for the authors to consider, but these are easily addressed in editing before final proofing.

Thank you for your assessment and for reviewing the paper a second time. We are happy that you find the changes to be sufficient.

36: Comma not needed after "stability"

Fixed

34-57: This is a long paragraph that could be split, probably at line 46 with the introduction of RAID.

Paragraph split into two as you suggest

46: RAID acronym should be defined here again in parentheses?

RAID defined again at this point

193: This sentence is very similar to 167. The context is slightly different, but it probably isn't necessary to list the volcanic events in the first instance if they are going to be repeated in the second instance here.

Sentence in line 167 which lists the events has been removed.

209: Is this a less than or equal sign? There's an actual symbol for this rather than a <=. Also at 329. Ignore if I am mistaken.

Yes you are correct, now fixed in both locations.

Reviewer 3

The authors have fully addressed my suggestions, and I support publication more-or-less as is.

Thank you very much for reviewing the paper again and for your support.

One minor suggestion which the authors may ignore if they wish!
In the following sentence:

Furthermore, a LIG record from this site, in addition to those from Skytrain Ice Rise and the upcoming Hercules Dome icecore further south (Fudge et al., 2022) and LIG data from the more westerly Mount Moulton (Korotkikh et al., 2011), would result in a more complete picture of the WAIS from this time.

It would be appropriate to cite Duestch et al. 2023 along with Fudge, and Steig et al. 2015 along with Korotkikh. Those two papers make the case that those specific sites (Duestch - SkyTrain, and Steig - Moulton) provide constraints on WAIS. Furthermore, the full Moulton record was not published in Korotkikh, but first appears in Steig. DOIs are 10.1175/JCLI-D-22-0647.1 and 10.1002/2015GL063861

Citations added, thank you for pointing this out.