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We really appreciate the effort that you have put into writing this review. We feel all of your suggestions will improve the manuscript and associated repositories. We accept that greater background information could be provided for readers who are not already familiar with PMIP. We would like to thank you for identifying many of the instances where this would be beneficial – it’s very helpful.

We agree that figure 2 should be replaced with a diagram (see the flow chart in supplement) that better shows the relationship between the various repositories and elements of the workflow. The decision-making tree currently presented in figure 2 shall be obsolete after the release of version two of PaleoCalAdjust, so there is little need to include it in this manuscript.

The technical comments will be corrected in a revised manuscript and an itemised response to each individual specific comment shall be provided.

Please also note the supplement to this comment: https://gmd.copernicus.org/preprints/gmd-2021-290/gmd-2021-290-AC2-supplement.pdf