

# Interactive comment on "A model study of Abrahamsenbreen, a surging glacier in northern Spitsbergen" by J. Oerlemans and W. J. J. van Pelt

## J. Oerlemans and W. J. J. van Pelt

j.oerlemans@uu.nl

Received and published: 20 January 2015

The Final Response is provided in the attached PDF.

Please also note the supplement to this comment: http://www.the-cryosphere-discuss.net/8/C2933/2015/tcd-8-C2933-2015supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., 8, 5687, 2014.

C2933

Response to referee reports on
"A model study of Abrahamsenbreen, a surging glacier in northern
Spitsbergen", by J. Oerlemans and W.J.J. van Pelt.

or the manuscript.

Reforme #2 is very negative, and advises rejection. We feel that his/her judgement is mainly based on an intuitive disagreement with the approach we take, rather land the property of the

### MORE SPECIFIC

- Response to romments:

   (p. 5695) The reason why Kongsvegen was used to determine a value for  $\alpha_0$  indeed is that it also is a surge-type glacier in its quiescent phase, only about 40 km away from Abrahamsenbreen.

   (p. 5697) This is a mistake in the text: "northwesterly direction" should be "northeasterly direction". With respect to the balance gradients: Austre Braggerbreen, Mofter Lovienbreen and Kongsvegen are within 60 km west of gradients measured on these glacier are quite similar (Fig. 5). It is thus reasonable to take the average value and apply it to Abrahamsenbreen.

   (p. 5698) The increase in E when going in northeasterly direction is taken directly from the map of E over Subarbard provided in Hagne et al (1934), Fig. 8).

   (p. 5698) The increase in E when going in northeasterly direction is taken directly from the map of E over Subarbard provided in Hagne et al (1934), Fig. 8).

   (p. 5692) Calculation of the ice velocities: the referee is correct. In the initial calculation at time interval of 20 years was used, because the dates of the maps were not precisely known. So 219 and 290 m/yr are the appropriate values.

   (p. 5698) The increase in the subarbar provided in the propriate values.

   (p. 5699) En equal (S1)-(16) is corrected for each individual basin by the numbers in the  $^{20}$  column of Table 1.

- All the other comments refer to typo's or clarifications which can easily be