

The section of the previous response to reviewers I was referring to:

Before publication, I would appreciate, if the authors could consider the following issues.

a) The authors correctly highlight uncertainties arising from prescribing or simulating Holocene and Eemian vegetation patterns. The authors recommend using the reconstruction by Hoelzmann et al. (1998) for Holocene North Africa. Is this still the best reconstruction? What about the reconstructions mentioned in the papers cited by the authors or by Lézine et al. (2011), Larrasoana et al. (2013), : : :? Perhaps there are good reasons to still use Hoelzmann's et al data. But this should be critically reassessed.

*We agree with Reviewer #1 that there are perhaps too many sensitivity experiments proposed, with too many options. With so many sensitivity expts there is the possibility of too few modeling groups doing the same experiments. We have kept only the prescribed boreal forest and shrub savanna experiments to test the sensitivities to more idealized vegetation, consistent with reconstructions, among models and for comparing these two time periods.*