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 kind comments. We agree, we were able to improve the clarity of the manuscript substantially with the reviews and some careful revision.

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! We appreciate the time the reviewer spent 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- Changed 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 descirbed).

>This is a good point. We’ve now referenced the fitting algorithm and cited the R package used to do it. 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 this section at length- we had originally included the methods for the case studies in with the model in an earlier draft. In an early review, it was noted that handling made the manuscript read more choppily, and it was suggested that they be treated as their own ‘unit’ within the results, to avoid repeating information or a reader having to scan through to find the next part of the connected ‘story’. This made logical sense to us because the case studies are something apart from the 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 here- we would prefer to keep the manuscript organized as-is but are open to suggestions for re-organizing the case studies.