

Thank you for accepting our manuscript. We appreciate all the comments and good suggestions during the review process. We hope to have made a useful contribution that helps the community. We only made changes in accordance to Reviewer #1's suggestions in this version and added the acknowledgements at the end of the main text.

Thanks, and kind regards,

Matthias Beyer in the name of the authors.

Response to Reviewer#1 Y.Rothfuss:

First, sorry for not providing a point-to-point reply. We thought as this has been done as response to the first-round comments it is not required again as the changes that will be made have been indicated there already.

We agree to what the review Y. Rothfuss states in terms of terminology: 'Isotope [or isotopic] composition [or signature]' is, to the contrary of what the authors say, the accepted terminology'. This is true and our statement that this notation is rather uncommon was not correct. We changed the manuscript and use 'isotopic composition' throughout the text. For expressing a specific value, however, we do not follow the reviewers' suggestion to use 'water stable isotopic composition value' – though the explanation given by Y. Rothfuss might be correct, the term is simply an unnecessary and lengthy construct. In fact, the reviewer does not even use it in their own publications. After some more research (not to prove anything rather to learn what terminology is most commonly used) we conclude that using 'δ value' is the most commonly used phrase when referring to a specific value. (we cross-checked a couple of authors: G. Bowen: isotope values; T. Volkmann: δ value/ sample value; M. Sprenger: δ or isotope value; K. Kühnhammer: δ value; Y. Rothfuss: δ value or value of δ). We hope that this is OK now. We eliminated the term 'isotope value' from the manuscript.