

In their revisions, Tapster and Bright have added clarifying information to their methods sections, along with changes to the text to improve the flow of the manuscript. Section 5 has been significantly improved, which now lays out the methodological workflow and leaching technique in a clearer way. Figure 3 is a really nice addition that I think will be very useful for researchers looking to utilize methods described in this paper. Authors have done a nice job of making technical improvements to the text.

In the interactive discussion for this manuscript there was some discussion about the geologic implications of the U-Pb ages for the Cligga Head greisen deposit. It is my opinion that the authors demonstrate a careful analysis of the implications of these data without over interpreting them. Specifically, their discussion in the paragraph beginning on line 606 does a nice job presenting the geologic conclusions, as well as the uncertainties preventing further conclusions.

In their response to reviewers, the authors also justify the contents of their conclusions section. I feel that the conclusions section effectively presents the findings of the paper.

It is my opinion that the revised iteration of the manuscript is suitable for final publication in Geochronology, following the few technical changes I suggest below.

Technical Comments:

Line 32: The last sentence in the abstract seems to transition abruptly from the previous sentence describing the inaccuracy of microbeam methods. I think it could help to state specifically, “the ID-TIMS methods described in this manuscript”, rather than “This method”.

Line 52: No need to start a new paragraph here

Line 121: fulfill spelled incorrectly

Line 273: “placing” should be “placed”