I would like to thank the authors for their effort in incorporating the recommended suggestions and redoing some tests with the Bev-A-Line XX tubing, which included remeasured HDPE tubing. In addition, the inclusion of Decabon in the analysis is appreciated. Importantly, you clearly indicate that the Bev-A-Line XX tubing indeed performs as poorly as you stated previously. Please excuse my earlier scepticism on that finding.

I have few comments left on the rest of the manuscript, which I believe is near ready for publication. It will be valuable for future water isotope analysis studies to have this tubing material comparison available.

The experiments are now well explained, and the results easy to interpret. I am however left somewhat unsatisfied / hugely curious to the process driving the wall exchange in the poorly performing tubes, which currently remains an open question. I understand that you do not know the answer to that question, but some discussion specific to that topic would be interesting for the curious reader (optional).

Small comments:

L. 369; there is no table S2. Table S1? Optionally change the name of the supplement headers (S1-S6) to not match the figure and table names.

L. 390; No location time in table S1/S2.

L. 440; Try to explain how or why the Dekabon dD and d18O transitions are so different.

L. 566; While the Decabon and Bev-A-Line XX liner materials are unknown, it is worth speculating on the process causing the large smoothing/wall exchange observed. Especially the H2O panel in figure S3 begs the question of where the WVISS water physically goes (probably the liquid phase).

L. 609; amount → margin

L. 679; Try to give some indication / explanation of why such a factor of 71 can exist. What kind of process can be affecting dD so much more?

L. 795; isotopic change → the isotopic step change

Figure S4 and Figure S9 seem to have accidental double axis labels.