

The manuscript has been worked on by the authors but there are still most questions left unanswered mentioned already in my first review.

Abstract: “around 6000 cal. a BP, coinciding with the Holocene optimum....”. The Holocene optimum in the 6th millennium was cal BC not BP ((the latter is around 4000 BC)). In addition, the cultivated plants (*Triticum* species, *Hordeum*, *Secale*, pulses, etc.) in South-West Asia (Near East) are millennia older.

Fig. 1: Different colored dots are entered in the map, which seem to correspond to regions. Are the dots of one color the same age? Otherwise, it would make more sense to present the points according to the archaeological epochs. Looking at the chronology table below, archaeological cultures are already present well before 6000 BP (see also in the text rows 80-90). Do we know nothing about these cultures archaeobotanically? Is this really a Neolithic (by what proved?) or are these hunter-gatherer cultures? What characterizes and differentiates the different archaeological cultures that are compared in Figs 2 and 3?

Line 100: the archaeozoological NISP method used for counting crop fragments is not understandable here. This should be clarified.

Line 102ff.: Perhaps the different size of the grains of *Triticum*, *Panicum*, *Setaria* etc. is meant here? This should be clarified.

Fig. 2 and 3: the dashed lines are mathematically not correct (see my last review), the percentages of counts and weights show the same trend.

The archaeobotanical results cannot be understood without the following (citation from my first review already):

“The temporal-quantitative evaluation is not comprehensible if the authors do not disclose how many sites (features, samples) they have per region and per time slice or archaeological culture. Only then is it clear whether the quantitative changes are not artifacts. According to page 4, they have 487 flotation results (are these samples?) from 349 sites. That is, less than 2 samples per site on average? Maybe also a few sites (which epochs) with many samples? Therefore, the representativeness of the data is not clear. What about the earliest time slice (e.g. Fig. 5 above): is there nothing investigated, or is it investigated, but nothing found?”

The phytolith picture of millets (Fig. 6 below to the left) is not good enough to be distinguished from the one to the middle and they have to be named by the species name. The grains have to be turned (embryo has to be below) and the pictures must be larger, to see if the curves of the embryos are typical for *Panicum* and *Setaria* respectively which are different.

I apologize but it makes no sense to comment on this draft further without the lacking fundamental information. I would like to ask the authors to look at my first review and to enter their answers to the open questions into their manuscript, please. I just will be able to have a look at a further fully corrected version of the manuscript with the changes indicated in the text.

