You will see that you have 3 anonymous reviews and a community comment from Michael Sigl. You now need to respond to all the comments (including those of Sigl). I will give a formal guidance about producing a new version after you have posted your comments. However just to give you some context, I can see that all reviewers think this is a valuable contribution and improvement. However I note the point that since this version of the age scale is likely to persist for many years, it should be as good as possible, so please do pay attention to the detailed comments including the questions from Michael Sigl about whether you included his CFA data and the 10Be spike dates from his paper (plus the more recent 660 BCE date).

It may be helpful if I comment on two other issues.

a) Two reviewers have suggested that it might be beneficial to separate out the sections on the climate response to volcanoes and the identification of Mediterranean eruptions from the rest of the paper. While you are welcome to consider this, I am in principle happy to have them included in this paper as examples of how the new timescale can be used. In commenting on this proposals, you should justify your decision to include them, but I am not insisting on a separation.

b) I am concerned about data availability. We have far too many examples where data are promised but never appear, and for this kind of work it is mandatory that the data be available. In your response please elaborate on the papers in prep and submitted that would release the data, so that I can assess whether the timescale for their release is appropriate wrt this paper.