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I have read the responses of the authors to both reviews. Their response reads more as a defense of the manuscript “as is” than an acknowledgment that there are ways in which the manuscript could be improved so as to better serve the broader community.

In particular, the suggestion that the authors don’t wish the manuscript to be overly technical and thus that they will only consider boron isobaric interferences in the supplement is indicative of why this paper is not ready for publication. This weakness was pointed out by both reviewers as a critical omission - one that can be a major player in the blank. Yet, rather than address this weakness, head on, they have suggested it’s only important for technical readers - those just interested in results need not consider it. But, everyone interested in interpreting low ratio data needs to be fully aware that isobaric interferences are important. The similar rejection of the comments on Type 1 vs Type 2 errors - rather than clarification in the ms is another example.

The authors’s defensive rather approach in responding to constructive criticism of their work by two different reviewers confirms to me that they are insufficiently self-critical and are not responding to community concerns. The responses do not change my overall opinion of the manuscript which I continue to believe is not a good fit for Earth Surface Dynamics and which I do not believe will have a wide readership. I continue to believe that this ms is incomplete, does not represent the state of the art in blank correction, could lead readers down an erroneous path, and belongs in a more specialist journal because it does not deal directly with material of interest to those whose focus is surface processes.