

Dear authors,

Thanks for submitting a revised version of your manuscript. It addresses most of the concerns of the reviewer. However, I still feel that you should include the answer you gave to reviewer 1's comment about the Borcher's global production rate within your manuscript, more specifically within section 3.2.1, or at the end of section 5.1 and include the table you provide in your answer to reviewer in the supplementary material. I think this is important to include all elements for discussion so that one can have a proper critical analysis of the importance of the outcomes of your research. In addition, including those elements will also strengthen the conclusions of this manuscript. After doing this, your manuscript will be ready for publication.

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for your remark about the information regarding ^{10}Be production rates, which should be included in the manuscript. We fully agree it will strengthen the conclusions of this manuscript. According to your suggestions we included appropriate information in the section 3.2.1 (lines 226-231) and also in the section 5.1 (lines 335-340 in the revised version of the manuscript). As a consequence, there is one additional reference (Stroeven et al., 2015) added to the reference list in the revised version of the manuscript. We also added a table with the comparison of exposure ages calculated with various ^{10}Be production rates to the Appendices (Table A5). We hope this will make the manuscript suitable for publication.