General comments:
The authors have taken on board many of the suggestions from myself and the other reviewer and the changes they have made to address our comments have improved the manuscript. In particular, I felt that the limitations of the study were not made clear enough in the original manuscript whereas, in the revised manuscript, the authors have made an effort to highlight these limitations to a greater extent. I am still of the opinion that precise quantitative analysis of two-dimensional simulations (and experiments) has very little relevance to real-world dunes as acknowledged by the authors, which limits the impact of studies such as this. However, there has been a precedent in recent years for the publication of similar studies and so this work does merit publication and I would like to again commend the authors for their work.
Specific comments:
Line 70 - “Although our study is strictly only valid…”

- New sentences like this that make the limitations more explicit have greatly improved the manuscript.
- It is also important to note though, that the differences between 2D and 3D systems are not solely confined to properties of the flow but also to the interactions (e.g. avalanching etc.) between longitudinal cross-sections in a dune.

Line 210 - “It is important to note…”

- It’s good that you have made this more explicit.

Line 212 - “We compare…”

- Perhaps the authors could explain here why the repulsion observed in Bacik et al. (2020) was not observed in Jarvis et al. (2022). The authors have sufficiently explained why their model cannot reproduce the wake-induced repulsion but have not explained why that effect was not observed in their chosen quasi-2D experiments.

Figure 4 and lines 251-261

- I am not sure if the separation plot is the easiest figure to interpret although it was helped by the paragraph the authors included. I did not feel that this added to the work.