

1. The authors state in their response to reviews that they do not cite Ursula Ginster's 2018 PhD thesis because it is not published. However, it is acceptable to cite a thesis or dissertation in this journal. I encourage the authors to review our policies on references here: <https://www.geochronology.net/submission.html#references>. It is appropriate to cite this thesis in this manuscript in the places where the authors call for additional zircon diffusion data to be collected (e.g., lines 420-423), as this thesis presents such data and has been publicly available since late 2019. Please find the thesis here: <https://repository.arizona.edu/items/939252c4-8021-4461-ab96-ee7b0c53c459>

We have cited this dissertation where suggested.

2. The authors declined to include either a plot or statistics that compare the observed and predicted ages in the thermal history models, stating that such plots were already provided in McDannell et al. (2022). I understand that with the original ZRDAAM model, the authors' results and those of McDannell et al. (2022) are the same. However, the results in terms of predicted versus observed ages with ZRDAAM uncertainties incorporated are not shown in the McDannell et al. (2022) paper. From what the authors have described qualitatively in the text, there are differences, e.g., lines 341-343: "In this latter case, the maximum posterior model is a little simpler (fewer time-temperature points) and does not reproduce the observations (lower likelihood) quite as well as the no resampling model." This is why I suggested that providing the likelihood statistics for the different QTQt summary models (e.g., in a table) would be valuable.

We have added more information and a table of likelihood and posterior values for the different models.