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INTRODUCTION
We appreciate Thackeray’s (2020) comments on our recent examination of late Quaternary micromammals from the southern Cape of South Africa (Faith et al., 2019). Focusing on the well-sampled sequence from Boomplaas Cave, we argued—controversially in Thackeray’s (2020) opinion—that the micromammals indicated a transition from a relatively humid Last Glacial Maximum (LGM) to a more arid Holocene. This is at odds with earlier interpretations of the region’s climate history (e.g., Avery, 1982; Deacon et al., 1984; Deacon and Lancaster, 1988), though it is now supported by a growing body of evidence (e.g., Chase et al., 2017; Chase et al., 2018; Engelbrecht et al., 2019; Faith, 2013a, b). We welcome this opportunity to clarify a few points raised by Thackeray (2020) and to further elaborate on our original interpretations.

MOISTURE AVAILABILITY, PRECIPITATION, AND TEMPERATURE
In Faith et al. (2019), our analysis and interpretation focused specifically on moisture availability (humidity/aridity). As defined in the paper, this variable is determined by precipitation minus potential evapotranspiration. While it is common to conflate aridity with rainfall amount, as Thackeray has in his comment (2020), this leads to confusion, as rainfall amount is only one factor determining aridity. As discussed by Chevalier and Chase (2016), moisture availability is largely determined by the combination of precipitation and temperature, through its influence on evapotranspiration. Thus, our interpretation of relatively humid conditions during the LGM at Boomplaas Cave should not be equated as implying relatively higher rainfall, as Thackeray (2020) has inferred.

To be clear, a relatively humid LGM could result from greater precipitation, cooler temperatures, or a combination of both. There is no question that cooler temperatures during the LGM would have contributed to greater moisture availability by reducing evapotranspiration (as suggested by Chase et al., 2017; Chase et al., 2018), but whether this was accompanied by higher or lower precipitation cannot be ascertained from our analysis. Indeed, we are skeptical that any analysis of faunal community composition can inform directly on rainfall amountsensu stricto, when it is moisture availability that determines habitat structure and the availability of the key resources (e.g., forage, standing water) on which faunas depend (Faith and Lyman, 2019). Faith et al., 2019 focused on moisture availability precisely because most organisms (both floral and faunal) are influenced by moisture availability rather than by rainfall amount—as a given amount of precipitation can have vastly different environmental consequences depending on how much of it is lost through evapotranspiration (e.g., Chevalier and Chase, 2016).

**A SEMI-ARID CLIMATE**

Thackeray (2020) observes that in our ordination of modern and fossil micromammal samples, the LGM assemblage from member GWA at Boomplaas Cave plots adjacent to several modern assemblages characterized by a semi-arid climate. The emphasis Thackeray (2020) places on 'semi-arid' throughout his letter implies that some clarification is necessary, since the implication is that a semi-arid LGM is inconsistent with our original interpretations. It is not. Following the United Nations National Environment Programme (UNEP) classification scheme (UNEP, 1997), a "semi-arid" climate is characterized by mean annual precipitation (MAP) that is 20-50% of mean annual evapotranspiration (MAE), or, aridity index (AI; MAP/MAE) values of 0.2 to 0.5. Boomplaas Cave today is at the lower limit of semi-arid (AI = 0.24), yet the modern samples flagged by Thackeray (2020) are characterized by much greater moisture availability, with AI values of 0.43 to 0.48 (i.e., MAP is 43-48% of MAE). In other words, GWA is similar to modern micromammal assemblages from places with nearly double the moisture availability of the Boomplaas environment today, but which are also classified as "semi-arid". Thus, the proximity of GWA to these assemblages is fully consistent with our previous observation of a relatively humid – but still semi-arid - LGM.

**CUTTING THROUGH THE CONFUSION**

Resolving the paleoclimatic history of the southern Cape has proven challenging in part due to a combination of seemingly contradictory lines of evidence (e.g., Avery, 1982; Avery, 2004) together with conflicting interpretations of the evidence (e.g., Chase and
These conflicts arise because many of the key archives provide only indirect—and at times uncertain—proxies for the climate variables in question. Indeed, many characterizations of the LGM as a time of harsh and arid conditions are based on ambiguous evidence (reviewed in Chase and Meadows, 2007), and this is particularly true of the records from Boomplaas Cave (see discussion in Faith, 2013a). For example, focusing on the micromammals, Avery (1982) once argued that low taxonomic diversity during the LGM was indicative of arid conditions, though she later showed that diversity was a poor predictor of precipitation (Avery, 1999). Thackeray’s (1987) interpretation of an arid LGM was based on a micromammal-derived index that is only weakly correlation with precipitation \( r^2 = 0.35 \), implying that it is strongly influenced by other (currently unknown) environmental parameters. Likewise, elevated frequencies of the bush Karoo rat \( (Myotomys unisulcatus) \) during the LGM has also been interpreted as indicative of aridity (Avery, 1982; Deacon et al., 1984; Thackeray, 1987)—most recently by Thackeray (2020)—yet this species occurs at similar if not higher abundances in environments that are considerably more humid than Boomplaas Cave is today (Supplementary Table 1 in Faith et al., 2019).

Because the reconstruction of paleoclimatic changes from the mammalian fossil record is fraught with potential pitfalls, confidence in the interpretations is enhanced when there is consistency between multiple independent lines of evidence (Faith and Lyman, 2019). Our interpretations provide just that. In Faith et al. (2019), we emphasized the broad similarities between our record of moisture availability and that provided by isotopic analysis of the Seweweeksport hyrax middens (Chase et al., 2017; Chase et al., 2018), located in a similar environment ~70 km west of Boomplaas. Also important is that the nearby Cango Cave speleothem (~3 km east of Boomplaas) shows a hiatus from the Lateglacial to the middle Holocene, signaling a lack of drip water availability (Talma and Vogel, 1992; Vogel, 1983). Deacon et al. (1984) struggled to reconcile this with their interpretations of an arid LGM transitioning to a humid Holocene, though the timing of the hiatus closely matches what we infer to be the most arid portion of the Boomplaas Cave sequence (Faith et al., 2019). In addition, a recent climate simulation suggests that the region would have received greater rainfall during the LGM relative to the present (Engelbrecht et al., 2019). In our view, the consistency between all of these records tips the scale in favor of the emerging understanding of the southern Cape’s climate history—the transition from the LGM to the Holocene was characterized by increased aridity.
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