



Corrigendum to **“Satellite observations of snowfall regimes** **over the Greenland Ice Sheet” published in The Cryosphere, 14,** **4379–4404, 2020**

Elin A. McIlhatten¹, Claire Pettersen², Norman B. Wood², and Tristan S. L’Ecuyer¹

¹Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, University of Wisconsin–Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA

²Space Science and Engineering Center, University of Wisconsin–Madison, Madison, Wisconsin, USA

Correspondence: Elin A. McIlhatten (mcilhatten@wisc.edu)

Published: 23 November 2022

In the abovementioned publication, incorrect regime percentages are listed in Table 2 on p. 4389. We thank Pradeep Aggarwal for bringing this issue to our attention. Please find the corrected Table 2 below, which also includes an additional decimal point. The changes to this table do not impact the analyses or the conclusions presented in the original publication.

In the original table, we mistakenly included results from a different set of calculations rather than the intended results. The IC/CLW percentages output for the original table were weighted averages from all the months making up the season/year. Since the total rates vary monthly, it is not a useful way to partition the mass totals listed in the table. Percentages calculated directly from the mass totals for each regime are more useful to the reader and are what appear in the updated table.

We chose to include an additional decimal point in the corrected table for two reasons: (1) to provide clarity for the reader and (2) because the researcher who pointed out the IC/CLW issue expressed interest in having more precision, so we thought others might be interested as well. Since we calculate the annual, summer, and winter values independently, rounding to a whole number makes some annual basin totals different than the sum of the seasons. For example, for basin 1.2, the original table values are 7 for annual mass, 2 for winter mass, and 4 for summer mass, and the revised table values are 6.6 for annual mass, 2.3 for winter mass, and 4.3 for summer mass.

We used whole numbers in the original table to be consistent with what we showed in the figures for the full GrIS values. It is well within the precision from the calculations to include the additional decimal point.

Table 2. Summary of 2CSP accumulation estimates by GrIS basin. All masses are in Gt yr^{-1} . The “summit100” basin includes every observation within 100 km of Summit Station.

Basin no.	Annual mass (IC%, CLW%)	Winter mass (IC%, CLW%)	Summer mass (IC%, CLW%)	Area km^2
1.1	12.3 (70, 30)	4.0 (88, 12)	8.3 (62, 38)	131 115
1.2	6.6 (73, 27)	2.3 (87, 13)	4.3 (66, 34)	63 773
1.3	5.0 (79, 21)	1.9 (88, 12)	3.1 (73, 27)	46 152
1.4	2.1 (76, 24)	1.0 (87, 13)	1.1 (66, 34)	17 536
2.1	28.8 (78, 22)	11.4 (91, 9)	17.4 (69, 31)	274 220
2.2	6.1 (83, 17)	2.5 (89, 11)	3.6 (78, 22)	51 196
3.1	23.3 (85, 15)	9.2 (94, 6)	14.1 (79, 21)	148 090
3.2	13.9 (84, 16)	8.1 (90, 10)	5.7 (77, 23)	35 619
3.3	31.3 (87, 13)	18.2 (92, 8)	13.0 (80, 20)	73 232
4.1	29.8 (85, 15)	17.6 (89, 11)	12.2 (79, 21)	64 669
4.2	30.0 (79, 21)	20.2 (85, 15)	9.8 (68, 32)	46 802
4.3	23.6 (78, 22)	17.5 (82, 18)	6.1 (65, 35)	33 326
5.0	30.2 (78, 22)	18.2 (87, 13)	12.0 (64, 36)	49 738
6.1	18.9 (79, 21)	9.2 (90, 10)	9.7 (69, 31)	49 909
6.2	36.3 (77, 23)	18.0 (86, 14)	18.3 (69, 31)	136 902
7.1	24.3 (81, 19)	11.2 (91, 9)	13.1 (73, 27)	95 213
7.2	29.6 (80, 20)	11.8 (91, 9)	17.8 (73, 27)	130 027
8.1	42.1 (77, 23)	14.3 (89, 11)	27.8 (70, 30)	241 556
8.2	5.6 (67, 33)	2.0 (84, 16)	3.6 (58, 42)	33 497
summit100	3.3 (76, 24)	1.0 (93, 7)	2.3 (69, 31)	31 416

Summary of snow accumulation by basin.