Authors response

Dear Editor,

we warmly thank for your effort and time editing our manuscript! As already announced in the letters responding to the reviews, we have made all changes we consider relevant and explained in the letters.

From the file showing the mark-ups, you will recognize that a large number of major and minor changes have been made in our attempt of following the suggestions by the reviewers.

Referee #1:

1. The references listed have been inserted at relevant paragraphs of the ms.

2. General comment on upwelling. We have re-structured the introduction chapter by inserting a new paragraph on the stratigraphy and hydrography of the Florida platform. This section includes a short account on sea surface temperatures and the nature of present-day´s upwellings and multi-annual SST variability. This aspect is then discussed on the basis of our new data in the discussions chapter.

Referee #2:

1. We did not follow the comments of this review as as explained in the letter, except for a modification of figure 2.

Referee #3:

1. This review makes a sequence of rather specific comments. Our subtle changes are not needed to be repeated here. As requested, we have inserted a chapter on the stratigraphy of the bank.

2. The review stresses the problem of taxonomy (as review 2). As indicated in the letter, we will address the problem of taxonomy in the companion BG paper.

3. The review suggests to elaborate more the significance of the phase differences between coral density bands and stable isotope cycles. We have been following this advice by inserting new text in the abstract and discussion.

Please, let us know if my explanations are sufficient as to explain the changes made on the manuscript.

Yours sincerely

Thomas Brachert