

Dear Editor, Dear Prof. Hagen,

Thank you very much for handling the review process of our paper.

We agree with most of the reviewer's remarks and we modified the manuscript accordingly. They contributed to improve our manuscript a lot and we thank them. We have answered to all reviews and free comments (from C. Rye and M. Peltó) and you will find the corresponding documents in the interactive discussion of TCD.

Please also find the revised version of our manuscript with the modifications in green.

The main improvements in the revised manuscript are:

- In Section 3.2 (Comparison of MAR with SMB measurements), we added a (successful) comparison of the MAR_{ERA} results with Moholdt et al. (2010)
- In Section 4 (Results of MAR over the present climate), we added a paragraph (successfully) comparing our SMB estimations with other studies and re-wrote the paragraphs about the apparent stabilisation of the SMB and the atmospheric circulation
- We modified the hatching of figures 9-10-11-13-15 to make them more clear

Referee#1 suggested to move sections 6 and 7 (comparison between ERA and MIROC5 and MAR_{ERA} and MAR_{MIROC5}) in a second paper discussing future projections whereas referee#2 agrees that sections 6 and 7 fit in this paper. In our answer to referee#1, we have given our reasons for including this comparison in this paper (which were that we believe that it makes more sense to include all the MAR evaluation in one paper and that we can get directly to the heart of the subject in the future projections paper) and we have submitted in TCD a companion manuscript about future projections. We leave to you the final decision to whether we should keep this last part in this paper or move it in the other one.

On behalf of the authors,

Sincerely,

Charlotte Lang