Dear Editors,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript. Our responses to each of the AE and reviewer’s comments are below in red. Please let us know if you require any additional information or other changes.

Sincerely,

Christie Bahlai

The Reviewer highlights that the manuscript has improved substantially. However, it should be better organized and edited for clarity. I am issuing a decision of Minor Revision to allow the Authors to rework the text as needed.

>Thank you for your positive assessment of our work. We greatly appreciate the efforts of the AE and both reviewers that helped us to improve the clarity of the manuscript substantially. We carefully reviewed the reviewer’s comments in the most recent reviews and revised our manuscript accordingly. Please see our specific responses below.

Reviewer #1:

The manuscript has improved a lot in this revision. Especially it is now better linked to the existing methods and it is more clear that it is not about finding a tipping point.

>Thank you so much for your positive comments and feedback on our work! We appreciate the time that the reviewer took to offer constructive feedback.

I only have a few minor comments left:  
  
Line 16 "an analytical approach" I think this is confusing as an analytic approach usually means a mathematical derivation, whereas the DSD method is an algorithm.

>Agreed. We changed this phrase to “an algorithmic approach”.  
  
Methods are not always clear enough. For instance in Line 137 the authors write that they fit the model, but do not describe using which method (also not referring to appendix 2 where the functions are described).

>Thank you for the feedback on the methods. We carefully reviewed the entire methods section and edited for clarity throughout. To address the specific line comment, we now reference the fitting algorithm and cite the R package that we used for fitting. We added this information to the paragraph starting at line 165, as this is where we describe the technical implementation of the algorithm.  
  
The result section includes the methods of the case studies. I think it is better to move that part to the methods section (now called models).

>The authors discussed the placement of the case study section at length. We had originally included the methods for the case studies in with the model section in an earlier draft. During early revisions based on colleagues’ feedback, it was noted that this approach made the manuscript choppy and difficult to read, and it was suggested that the case studies be treated as their own ‘unit’ within the results. After careful consideration, we agreed. The current approach, which places the complete case studies in one unit, allows us to avoid repeating information or forcing the reader to go back and forth among sections for the next part of the connected case study ‘story’. This makes logical sense to us because the case studies are separate from development of the main algorithm- they’re an application of the algorithm, and should be able to stand on their own. However, we invite the editor to comment on the manuscript structure. We prefer to keep the manuscript organized as but are open to suggestions for re-organizing the case study section.