

Dr. Dietze:

Thanks very much for your attention to this paper and the online discussion. This accompanies a second revised manuscript that includes minor changes in response to the second round of review comments.

As noted in your revision instructions, the second reviews only included one important comment, which is a request to amend Figures 18 and 22 such that readers can discern the relative amplitude of variations in both ice core ^{10}Be fallout records and our reconstructed ^{10}Be fallout fluxes from NAVC sediments. In the initial and revised version, these figures only showed centered records that were scaled by their respective standard deviations, or in other words 'z-scores,' thus obscuring information about the magnitude of variation relative to the mean of each record.

We take the reviewer's point and agree with this suggestion. As discussed in our email correspondence, we think the easiest way to correct the problem is to add additional y-axes to the relevant plots in Figs. 18 and 22, such that each y-axis is labeled both with 'z-score' units of standard deviations and also with units of variation relative to the mean. Although this adds to the information density in these already dense figures, it gives readers the ability to clearly appreciate the reviewer's concern that the relative amplitude of our reconstructed fallout flux variations is not the same as the relative amplitude of ^{10}Be flux variations in ice cores.

Thus, this revision of the paper includes only additions to Figs. 18 and 22 and their captions. Because there are no other changes, we have not included a separate latexdiff markup of the second and third versions of the paper. We hope these changes are sufficient for acceptance and publication.

Regards,

– Greg Balco (on behalf of all co-authors).
