

Review of Biskaborn et al. revisions submitted to Biogeosciences

General comments

This is a much improved version where the authors have comprehensively addressed reviewer comments from both myself and Emilie Saulnier-Talbot. The manuscript is almost ready for publication, but the authors should take account of the minor amendments suggested below.

Specific Comments:

The final line of the abstract, now begs the question: have you taken long cores from either of these two regions as part of your overall long-term studies? This does not need to be considered here, but will need to form part of consideration for site selection in future papers.

Introduction:

Line 89: ...isotopes in diatom **silica**...

Line 144 and elsewhere: sometimes you use paleo, sometimes palaeo; best to stick with one or other

Fig 1: In the legend, should "drawned" be "drowned"

Material and Methods:

Line 273: I think if you want to use AD/BC, I'd recommend using instead CE (common era)

Lines 415-416: Does it matter than New et al. 2002 is quite old now, and the region has seen rapid warming since 1998?

Fig 2a and Fig 3a: as these are diatom and chironomid codes, need to make a link to either species names in the Supp Info, or provide species names alongside codes here in the legend.

Results:

Line 526 and elsewhere: ideally for isotopes, use en-dash instead of a hyphen to signify a negative value

Supplementary Info:

Fig II: is the y-axis label here correct? it suggests that species are plotted according to water depth; as each site will have a different water depth, I assume that each row is a different site, as indicated in the legend. But labels should be consistent between figure and legend