

January 20th, 2015

Dear Editor,

We are grateful for the reviewers' comments and suggestions that we found very constructive. We have followed all major recommendations by the reviewers, which will improve the manuscript. Most importantly, we found that our interpretation of the bimodal MODIS albedo distributions from 2013 were not due to a shift from clean to dirty ice, but a shift from snow to an ice covered surface. We will update the manuscript accordingly. We will also add a new analysis of MODIS albedo distributions from 2012 that exhibit a more complex pattern than in 2013. In 2012, darker ice surfaces are exposed and are qualitatively different than other ice surfaces. Thus, we believe our revised manuscript of albedo of different ice surface types will provide a contribution to understanding Greenland ice sheet albedo in the ablation zone. We will revise the title of our manuscript to: Multi-modal albedo distributions in ablation zone in southwestern Greenland ice sheet. In addition, we would like to include three new coauthors to the manuscript who all made contributions to the revisions - Drs. L. Koenig, M. Hom, and C. Shuman.

A detailed response to each of the reviewers concerns and comments follows below.

In our response, we restate reviewers' comments and follow up with our responses in **blue text**. We use *italics* to highlight text that will be added or rewritten in the manuscript revisions. There might be minor changes to the manuscript from what is presented below to ensure the text flows well.

Sincerely,
Samiah Moustafa
PhD Candidate, Rutgers University

Response to comments by Dr. Pope

Response to comments on the Introduction section

1. **Surface albedo is defined as “is defined as the ratio of reflected to incident solar radiation upon a given surface (Schaepman-Strub et al., 2006).” However, that paper explicitly calls out the ambiguous use of the term “albedo.” Even in common usage (as bihemispherical reflectance), “albedo” can refer to either the entire spectrum of solar radiation or the visible part of the spectrum (IASC Mass Balance Glossary). I do appreciate the desire to be pithy and concise, but I think it would help comprehension if you were more explicit in the introduction and through with the types of reflectance being compared and the wavelengths implied.
 - In the revised manuscript, we follow the advice of Dr. Pope and provide a more unambiguous term for surface albedo – identifying it as the bihemispherical reflectance across the visible and near-infrared wavelengths (case 9 in Schaepman-Strub et al., 2006). Throughout the manuscript, we provided explicit terminology for different types of reflectance and associated wavelengths as requested.
2. **The first paragraph continues on to describe positive albedo feedbacks as observed in previous studies. The was confusing to me as the reader because those studies (as summarized by Stroeve) show “The downward albedo trends indicate both a reduction in the duration of snowcover over low albedo bare ice, and an expansion of the bare ice area (Box et al., 2012; Tedesco et al., 2011).” This paper, on the other hand, avoids snow altogether and instead describes change in albedo on clean/dirty ice surfaces and cryoconite. This juxtaposition was misleading to at least this reader. To me, it would have been clearer to me to immediately move on to the more relevant content of the 2nd paragraph. (Another way to say this is that many studies focus on the whole of the GrIS – to be self-consistent, this paper should be highlighting studies / processes which focus on what happens after bare ice is exposed.)
 - We will rewrite the first paragraph to include reduction in snow cover as another mechanism for albedo decline. It reads:

Over the last decade, an observed decline in albedo has been linked to less summer snow cover, expansion of bare ice area, and enhanced snow grain metamorphic rates from atmospheric warming, amplified by the melt-albedo feedback (Box et al., 2012; Stroeve et al., 2013; Tedesco et al., 2011). This positive feedback entails snow grain growth owing to melt, reducing surface albedo,...
 - We have decided to keep the first paragraph in the manuscript because it serves to draw the reader’s attention to the importance of surface albedo on the GrIS, as well as its role in modulating the mass balance of the ice sheet (via the ice-albedo feedback and snow grain metamorphic rates).

**Page 4740, Lines 13-15 affirm that negative albedo trends are “linked to a darkening of the ice surface from increased surface coverage of meltwater, cryoconite holes, and impurity-rich surface types (Bøggild et al., 2010; Chandler et al., 2014; Wientjes and Oerlemans, 2010).” It would be clearer to say that ablation facies have expanded relative to accumulation facies (i.e. Box: “the strength of albedo feedback is determined more by the surface albedo decrease

associated with a loss of seasonal snow cover than the reduction in snow albedo due to snow metamorphosis because of the large difference between snow and bare ice albedo values.”) rather than this sentence, which implies darkening ice surfaces, which is not previously substantiated in the literature as far as I am aware.

- We have corrected the text as requested. The revised text will read:

Furthermore, negative albedo trends since 2000 (Box et al., 2012) are linked to an expansion of ablation facies relative to accumulation facies.

Response to comments on the ASD Data Collection section

3. **You mention the use of a foreoptic for solar illumination collection. Was no foreoptic used at all for data collection? And if not, were data collected with the sensor oriented in different directions horizontally so as not to bias measurements on particular sensor fibers? Also, was each spectrum really only 5 samples, or was each sample actually also a repeat of ‘x’ scans (e.g. 25-50 scans), as is standard with ASD software?

- We have rewritten the methods section to clarify that the ASD was fitted with a Remote Cosine Receptor (RCR), but no additional fiber optics was attached. We also clarified that each of the five consecutive samples consists of 10 dark currents per scan and 10 white reference measurements. The new text will read:

The ASD was mounted on a tripod at 0.4 m distance, and with no foreoptic attached (i.e., bare fiber), had a 25° field-of-view, corresponding to a spot size of ~0.18 m diameter on the surface.

At each sample location, five consecutive spectra consisting of 10 dark currents per scan and 10 white reference measurements were recorded and averaged.

4. **You say that α_{ASD} is averaged over the whole spectral range (of 325-1075 nm). Instead, for better comparison with MODIS as is done later, would it make more sense to use MODIS relative spectral response functions to weight the spectra? Or does the increased MODIS range (300-3000 nm) really change the comparison enough already to make this not worthwhile?

- We have revised our methodology to compute α_{ASD} as a weighted average based on incoming solar radiation in each wavelength described in response reviewer 2 General Comment #4. This should provide a more accurate value for α_{ASD} . We will revise the manuscript text to make it very clear that the comparison between α_{ASD} and α_{MOD} are not directly comparable. We decided not to calculate α_{ASD} based on the spectral response of MODIS for two reasons. First, as Dr. Pope points out, the limited spectral range of the α_{ASD} compared to MODIS will not allow a calculation of a directly comparable variable. Second, we don’t aim to make a comprehensive validation between α_{MOD} and α_{ASD} , but rather use MODIS qualitatively to provide spatial and temporal context. While the absolute values will differ, the difference between the two products should not change spatial and temporal patterns.

5. **Your regression α_{ASD} vs α_{MET} as presented on Page 4746 / Figure 4 seems very skewed to the datapoint on the left. Afterall, α_{ASD} ranges from 0.45 to 0.6 beside that one 0.15 value, while the α_{AMET} are well spread between 0.3 and 0.65. To me, this puts

into question the regression (and use of a 40% variance statistic). While I think there is likely some truth to your statement that “The discrepancy is likely due to differences in exact sample locations and instrumentation”, I think your regression puts the ASD and MET data into question more than reinforcing their intercomparison.

- We have replotted Figure 4 and updated it with revised α_{ASD} values calculated with the broadband albedo calculation described in response to reviewer 2 General Comment #4. Furthermore, we discovered that the outlier point was identified as ‘low quality’ and included in the figure by mistake. The revised figure shows a stronger fit between the two variables. The figure is shown below:




Figure 4. Broadband α_{base} (blue dots) and α_{top} (pink dots) vs. α_{ASD} and α_{MET} (i.e., both α_{base} and α_{top}) measurements fitted to a linear regression equation ($R^2 = 0.67$). The value of α_{ASD} error is based on the standard deviation of individual α_{ASD} measurements.

Response to comments on the Melt section


6. **Small note: Page 4748, Line 16 makes an assumption about net longwave radiation being negligible for surface melt. Since you go on to later talk about relative rates anyway, you might not need to state this assumption, and just acknowledge you are addressing shortwave flux only? Either that, or back up your assumption with a reference.
 - We will revise the text to acknowledge that we are only addressing shortwave flux here in our computation of relative surface melt rates as suggested.

Response to comments on the Distribution Discussion section

7. **Page 4750, Lines 15-22: I might be misunderstanding, but these numbers don't all seem


to match up. E.g. the difference between 5.8 and 7.0 is 1.2, not 2.3. Or am I misunderstanding? Same comment for the subsequent set of numbers, too.

- Indeed, the numbers are incorrect. We corrected this error and the numbers now match up. These revised numbers will also be updated in Figure 8 and Table 4.
 - These values were originally provided in units of m d^{-1} and converted to SI units of m s^{-1} .
8. **Fig 12: The term “spatial scale” is ambiguous to me. As I understand it, you are varying the spatial extent, not the spatial resolution. Apologies if I misread that. SO – this figure is possibly two populations that are snow & ice, as opposed to “ice” and “dirty”. Could you address how you are sure that there is no influence of snow in the scenes? Also, why else would the spatial extent matter (as opposed to being able to see things at different spatial resolutions, i.e. small patches of dark things wouldn’t be resolved, etc.)
- Yes, we are varying the spatial extent and not the spatial resolution. In the revised manuscript, the term ‘spatial scale’ will be replaced throughout the text to instead reflect the less ambiguous term ‘spatial extent’.
 - After carefully analyzing the conditions in our study area in 2013, we have come to the conclusion that snow did in fact influence the MODIS scenes. As will become clear in the response to reviewers 1 and 2 below, we have made major revisions to the manuscript to address this issue.
 - Snow did influence the probability density distributions (PDDs) at the MODIS 100x100 and 150x150 spatial extents in 2013, as seen in Figure 12. The bimodality identified for the 100x100 MODIS pentad averages is likely associated with the population of snow and ice surfaces.
 - To verify the presence of snow in our study area and MODIS spatial extents, we examined hourly precipitation and air temperature measurements collected by a meteorological station installed near the ice sheet edge (at the proglacial and ice sheet margin interface). Near surface air temperature measurements from the shorter Base Met Stations time series were also examined to demonstrate roughly how much colder it was on the ice. To confirm that solid precipitation fell, we used NASA’s WorldViewer to browse daily MODIS reflectance imagery (bands 7-2-1 and 3-6-7) to identify textural or brightness changes related to precipitation events. The identification of snowfall events will be added to the Methods section.
 - Several precipitation events occurred throughout the 2013 melt season as shown in the figure below. Two snowfall events were identified on 28-29 June and after 14-15 August. The 28-29 June 2013 precipitation event has been identified as a snowfall event. NASA WorldViewer imagery reveal cloud cover on 28-29 June followed by a brightening of the surface on 30 June. The 28-29 June snowfall event corresponds to the bimodal distribution observed in the MODIS 30 Jun - 4 July pentad average (see Figure 13), corresponding to a brief ‘jump’ in the PDD (associated with higher albedo values of ~0.6 and 0.7). The bimodal distribution seen in the 2013 MODIS data is associated with a transition from ice to snow, rather than clean to dirty ice. The results of this snowfall event, and its role in creating a bimodal distribution in the MODIS 2013 data will be added to the Results section, and further fleshed out in the Discussion section.



New Figure. Summer 2013 precipitation (left y-axis; black line) and near surface air temperature (right y-axis; blue line) time series collected from a meteorological station installed at the edge of the pro-glacial tundra environment. Base Met Station near surface air temperature time series is available from 8 – 26 June 2013 (green line). The difference in tundra and ice sheet near surface air temperatures is ~ 3 °C. The zero degree line is in red.

- To verify our findings in 2013, we also included an analysis of possible snowfall events in 2012 based on precipitation and air temperature meteorological station time series data, as shown in the figure below. Snowfall events likely occurred on 6 and 13 June 2012, prior to the start of the meteorological station log (8 June 2012), and on 14-15 August 2012, based on NASA WorldViewer imagery. Calculation of 100x100 MODIS 2012 pentad averages reveal that the only exception to low albedo averages is on 6 June 2012, when snow likely fell (as verified with NASA’s WorldViewer and tundra meteorological station data; see figure below and our response to reviewer 1 Major Comment #3 below). The results of the 2012 snowfall event identification, as well as its impact on MODIS albedo and pentad averages will be added to the Results section.



New Figure. Summer 2012 precipitation (left y-axis; black line) and near surface air temperature (right y-axis; blue line) time series collected from a meteorological station installed at the edge of the pro-glacial tundra environment. The zero degree line is in red.

9. **Overall in figs & discussion: I think the term “bimodal distribution” really needs to be used with caution (as opposed to single peak with a shoulder, wide peak, etc.) as this has important implications for later interpretation.
 - After revising our work and discovering more complex albedo distributions, we agree with the reviewer, and have adopted a more cautious and nuanced approach to writing about our results and their interpretation.

Response to Anonymous Referee #1

Response to General comments

Although Moustafa et. al. touch a very interesting and important research topic (i.e. the seasonal evolution of ice surface types in the GrIS ablation zone) that is very relevant for (future) surface mass balance estimations, there are several main issues and a variety of smaller comments that need to be clarified and corrected (see major and detailed comments below).

Generally, I do think that Moustafa et. al. are overcriticizing the existent SMB models while simultaneously overinterpreting their own results. For example, the latest generation of SMB models does take the major variability in ablation zone albedo into account (i.e., snowfall events, spatial variability (e.g. Van Angelen et. al., 2012)). Therefore they should already account for the major albedo variability in this study, which I also tend to attribute to (degraded) snow and spatial

variability. In that context, I do believe they are obtaining results that are very close to the results obtained by Alexander et. al. (2014). Moreover, by comparing the differences in melt relative to melt with unrealistic high ice albedo values of 0.7 they are overestimating the impact of their study.

In the response to the reviewer's major and minor comments below, it will become clear how we have addressed the reviewer's general comments. Briefly, we have revised the manuscript to better represent the state-of-the-art surface mass balance models, recalculated in-situ ASD albedo values (now more realistic), and clarified how our study differ from Alexander et. al.'s study, thereby strengthening the weaknesses pointed out by the reviewer.

2 Response to Major comments

1. Moustafa et. al. state motivate their work based on the clear separation between the albedo schemes of ablation zones in current surface mass balance models (e.g. in RCMs) and the albedo values they observe. In their motivation they implicitly take two assumptions. Firstly, they assume that a constant and spatially uniform ice albedo is being used throughout the ablation season in the existent SMB models and, consequently, they assume there is no seasonal variation in the ablation zone albedo. Secondly, they assume that last winter's or wind redistributed snow does not play a role in their data and, consequently, they assume that they are observing only evolution of ablation zone ice surfaces.

- We will revise the manuscript and better described SMB models and acknowledge that SMB models represent seasonal variation in ablation zone albedo. For example, we have rewritten the introduction to say:

State-of-the-art SMB models consider the presence of water ponding, bare ice, and snow surfaces to characterize seasonal variations in ablation zone albedo (Alexander et al., 2014; Van Angelen et al., 2012).

- We have also added an analysis to consider the possibility of snow cover in explaining high albedo values. Indeed, several high albedo events are likely due to snowfall and expansion of snow-covered ice. Further details are provided in the response to Dr. Pope's Comment #8.

2. Although I agree 100% with the importance of understanding/assessing the seasonal evolution of ablation zone albedo, I don't agree with this separation. Firstly, because recent SMB models (e.g. in RACMO; Van Angelen et. al., 2012) take the spatial variability in ice albedo into account (e.g., spatially variable ice albedo background map that accounts for spatial differences in dark material, etc.). Secondly, because snow in these models also results in a bimodal albedo distribution (e.g. Fig. 5 of Van Angelen et. al. (2012)) as short term snowfall periods or redistribution of blowing snow on top of the underlying ice can result in variations in ablation zone albedo (i.e., here the bimodal distribution is the result of the deposition/change/removal of the snow layer on top of the ice layer). Thirdly, they assume that the observed changes in albedo are completely independent of snow (redistribution) events, whereas I think the observed fractions of white ice are very closely related to these (earlier) snow events. Therefore, I do not see this clear separation between ablation zone albedo in SMB models and evolution of ablation zone albedo in this study.


- After conducting further analysis, we agree with the reviewer, to a large extent. Indeed,

the bimodal distribution seen in MODIS albedo data in 2013 was due to differences in snow and ice covered area (see response to Dr. Pope's Comment #8). We will update the manuscript throughout to correct our error. However, we expanded our analysis to also include MODIS albedo data observed in 2012. This analysis is explained in reviewer 1 Major Comment #3 below and shows that 'dark' ice regions exist, but were not visible in 2013 due to snow cover. Thus, our claim that dust and sediment on Greenland's ice sheet surface can influence surface albedo stands.


3. Although I agree that SMB models don't have the evolution of ice surfaces (e.g. dust deposition/accumulation, cryoconite development, roughness evolution, etc.), they do have variations in ablation zone albedo (e.g. on top of a spatially variable ice background (Van Angelen et. al., 2012) or as a function of ponding water (MAR)) as a result of the deposition/redistribution of snow which also results in a bimodal distribution. I am convinced that large part of the albedo evolution in Fig.6 is closely related to this bimodal distribution (presence/absence of snow or at least the remnants in the form of white ice) which is also in the SMB models if they model it correctly. For example, if I look at Fig. 13, I have the impression that this 'bimodal distribution' is the effect of the presence of snow or degraded snow (which you call white ice), which perhaps is also in Alexander et al. (2014). Therefore, I think you should prove that this bimodal distribution is effectively not the result of the disappearing (already degraded) snow instead of the evolving ice itself (i.e., completely independent of previous snowfall events) and/or what the contribution of (degraded) snow to this bimodal distribution is?

- As explained in our response to reviewer one's Comment #1 and Dr. Pope's comment #8, we concur with the reviewer that the bimodal distribution in Figure 13 is due to snow. However, the albedo evolution in Figure 6 cannot have been caused by presence/absence of snow alone. We will revise the manuscript to clarify that Figure 6 shows albedo for the two MODIS pixels that overlap with our transect and that snow had melted from this region before mid-June 2013. We will also clarify that there were no snowfall events in this area between 9-25 June 2013. Finally, we will revise our text to acknowledge that while albedo has a slight negative trend from June to mid-August, there is variability that could be caused by occasional snowfall events.
- While the 2013 MODIS albedo bimodal distribution shown in Figure 12 and 13 actually are a result of snow and ice albedo, subsequent analysis of MODIS (MOD10) 2012 data, for the 100x100 spatial extent pentad averages, reveal a more complex distribution (see figure below). This distribution cannot be explained due to the presence/absence of snow and ice. Very low albedo values are likely due to sediment and dust-enriched ice in the so-called 'dark-band' region (see figure of spatial distribution of 100x100 MODIS albedo data in 2012 and 2013 below). In the revised manuscript, this new analysis will be included to provide evidence for the importance of low albedo surfaces caused by surface dust and sediments. In our revised discussion, we hypothesize that higher resolution satellite imagery (finer than MODIS) might capture such regions closer to the ice sheet margin. Furthermore, we postulate that the area of these regions may grow in size over the melting season as demonstrated on local scales by Chandler's in-situ observations.
- Here, 2012 MODIS pentad averages exhibit more variability and center at lower albedo values (between ~0.3 – 0.5 albedo values) as compared to 2013 pentad averages (see figure below). The higher probability of substantially low albedo values is expected since 2012 was identified as an extreme melt year (e.g., see Nghiem et al., 2012). These points will be


brought up in the Results section along with its implications in the Discussion section (e.g., this greater variability may be related to changes in meltwater ponding).




New Figure. MODIS 100x100 spatial extent pentad average albedo distributions for the 2012 melt season. Note, the 20-24 June pentad (yellow stippled line) is erroneous due to an outlier in the MODIS data for on 21-22 June 2012. This figure will be updated accordingly.




New Figure. MODIS 2012 seasonal average albedo probability density distributions at three spatial extents. The MODIS 2012 seasonal average albedo probabilities for the 100x100 and 150x150 spatial extents reveal a high probability of low albedo values (0.2 – 0.3). This is likely influenced by the expansion of the ‘dark band’ region in these spatial extents.



Updated Figure 12. MODIS 2013 seasonal average albedo probability density distributions at three spatial extents. The bimodal distribution seen at the 100x100 spatial extent is likely the result of snow and ice facies characterizing the two peaks.



New Figure. MODIS 2013 spatial average for the 100x100 spatial extent. Overall higher MODIS albedo values are observed in 2013, without a 'dark band' region surface expression.



New Figure. MODIS 2012 spatial average for the 100x100 spatial extent. A region of dark ice, known as the ‘dark band’, extends through our study area (cyan blue color).

4. You state the ‘seasonal changes in GrIS ablation zone albedo are not exclusively a function a darkening surface from ice crystal growth’ and I do completely agree. The current SMB models do not claim that either for the ablation zone, because the major variability the ablation zone albedo in these models is driven by the deposition/change/disappearance of snow. Consequently, these models also have the bimodal distribution with sudden changes (e.g. sudden disappearance of snow or the sudden albedo reduction due to localized melt within the snowpack). Again, here you will have to prove that the bimodal distribution is effectively not the result of the disappearing (already degraded) snow instead of the evolving ice itself (i.e., completely independent of previous snowfall events) and/or what the contribution of (degraded) snow to this bimodal distribution is?
 - Indeed, after careful analysis, we found that the 2013 bimodal distribution was due to the presence of snow and ice. However, in 2012, a more complex distribution emerges as the snow melt, revealing a region of lower albedo known as the ‘dark-band’. We explain how this has been addressed in the revised paper in reviewer 1 Comment #3 above. Furthermore, we will correct our manuscript text to clarify that the presence/absence of snow cover is an important driver for surface albedo.
5. Is the spatial or temporal variability of importance? I do have the impression that the spatial variability in ‘ice albedo’ is an order of magnitude more important than the temporal variability (E.g., the difference between pixel 1 and 2 is bigger than the within pixel variability, certainly if you assume that the biggest temporal variability is driven by appearance/disappearance of snowfall (e.g. 29/6 or 7/7)). If you then take into consideration that for example Van Angelen et.

al. already accounts for the spatial variability in ice albedo, the uncertainty of the existing SMB's, which is the motivation for your research, reduces significantly. I certainly think this should be discussed in your paper.

- In our revised manuscript, we will explain that the spatial distribution of snow cover and background ice albedo is very important to understand the temporal change in MODIS distributions in 2012 and 2013. For example, in 2012 when snow melt is more pronounced and reaches higher elevations, the 'dark band' is exposed and results in a mode with lower albedo.
 - We will rewrite our Introduction section to acknowledge that the SMB model RACMO2 (as implemented by van Angelen et al. (2012)) accounts for spatially distributed ice albedo, and considers the impact of black carbon contaminants on albedo. Finally, we will rewrite our Introduction to make clear that the motivation for our research is not to critique SMB models, but to understand ablation zone albedo because of its role in ice sheet surface ablation.
6. Although I agree with the Short Comment of Pope that it is good that you provide so much information on the processing of the ASD data, I think large part of this processing (e.g. section 3.4 and Fig. 2-3) can be moved to a supplementary material as I think it diverts the reader of your main message. Moreover, some of this processing should be improved (e.g., the use of different wavelengths, etc.) to avoid wrong interpretations (see detailed comments).
- We will dedicate the information related to the ASD data processing to an Appendix section. This new appendix will include section 3.4 and Figures 2-4. This appendix will describe our improved processing that address the concerns raised by the reviewers about accounting for wavelengths (see response to Dr. Pope's Comment #4) and in the Detailed Comments below.
7. The hypothetical albedo distributions based on ASD albedo (400-700nm) values for distinct surfaces and the fractional surface coverage area from Chander et. al. (2014) is prone to many assumptions that are wrong or difficult to justify. Therefore, it is very difficult to draw any conclusion from it. In my opinion, it is an interesting thinking exercise, but it stays far from the real bimodal distributions that will be much more blurred due to i) broadband values instead of overestimated albedo differences in the 400-700nm, ii) uneven standard deviations for different surface types (see detailed comments). This blurring is also what I tend to see in Fig. 10 and therefore I would remove this analysis as it will give you an overestimation of the real bimodality.
- The authors believe that incorporating the computed albedo distribution analysis is an important part of the study. To our knowledge, no other studies have attempted to theorize and characterize the albedo distributions of distinct surface types in the ablation area of the GrIS. In the revised manuscript, we will correct the issues raised by the reviewer, namely i) correct calculation of broadband albedo and ii) provide different standard deviations for each surface type.
8. By comparing melt rates relative to the early summer ice melt rates, the underestimation in the existing SMB models and the importance of this study is overestimated. For example, existing SMB models with a fixed ice albedo use values of typically 0.5-0.45, but that locally go much lower (e.g. Van Angelen et. al. 2012), whereas Moustafa et. al. compare melt relative to melt with

albedo values of 0.7. Off course, this will result in strong increases in melt rate when compared relative to unrealistic high ice albedo values with unrealistic low melt rates.

- We will clarify that the melt rate calculations were made to examine the seasonal changes in MODIS albedo. No comparison with SMB models was made. Furthermore, we will remove the last sentences in the conclusions that stated that SMB models need to incorporate seasonal evolution of surface types. We will rewrite the conclusions to make it more nuanced, and it will read:

Continued atmospheric warming coinciding with a darkening ice surface will increase the ice sheet surface meltwater production and runoff. Here, we show the importance of the distribution of dirty ice surfaces, which are likely the result of accumulation of impurities melted out from internal ice layers rather than contemporary deposition of atmospherically transported dust. Future research should investigate the importance of surface accumulation of impurities and if its surface area can change to significantly influence GrIS albedo and surface ablation.

Response to Detailed comments

1. p4738 L 7 “excluded in surface mass balance models” : Depending on how you define a surface mass balance, I do not completely agree. For example, Van Angelen et. al. (2012) included a spatially variable background albedo in RACMO which accounts for the spatial variability in surface properties once the snow is gone. Also MAR, for example, allows for ponding water, etc..
 - We will add in that these surface properties, such as ponding water, and snow spatial distributions, are characterized in SMB models. See also our response to reviewer 2 Specific Comment #2.
2. p4738 L20: “are not exclusively a function of darkening from the surface from ice crystal growth”: that is absolutely true, but the existent models also do not claim that. See major comments 1-3
 - This particular line does not include a reference to SMB models. However, we hear the reviewers concerns about ensuring accurate representation of the state-of-the art SMB models, and believe that the many revisions to our manuscript described at many places in this response address those concerns satisfactorily.
3. p4739 L22-28: Any idea what the effect of increased roughness on the changes in albedo is?
 - We will add a sentence describing the current understanding about roughness changes, albedo and melting. It reads:

Not many studies have quantified the effects of surface roughness on bare ice albedo in the ablation zone, besides macroscopic surface features (e.g., Warren et al., 1998; Zhuravleva and Kokhanovsky, 2011). Chandler et al. (2014) indicates that seasonal development of topographical features, as well as the transition from snow to bare ice, can have implications for sensible and latent heat fluxes, yet is rarely

characterized in the ablation zone.

- In the discussion section, we will mention a need to address this in follow up research. It will read:

Future work should examine the importance of increased surface roughness on changes in albedo.

4. p4740 L7: Add “and crevasses and other types of roughness begin to form” ?
 - We will add ‘crevasses and other types of surface roughness’ as an additional mechanism for lowering surface albedo in the ablation area, as requested.
5. p4740 L24-28: You are perhaps too optimistic about satellite albedo estimates and too hard for the RCM albedo description. This should be more nuanced.
 - We will rewrite this sentence to make it more nuanced. The new sentence reads:
Remotely-sensed and modeled albedo has been validated with ground measurements from dispersed Greenland Climate Network Automatic Weather Stations (GC-Net AWS; Knap and Oerlemans, 1996; Steffen and Box, 2001). These comparisons reveal that MOD10 satellite product provides albedo estimates with an overall RMSE of 0.067 (Stroeve et al., 2006). Early implementations of RCM used constant albedo values for bare ice or very simple schemes, which resulted in very large intra-model differences in runoff (42% Vernon et al., 2013). More recent RCM implementation allow for spatially distributed bare ice albedo that evolve with grain size growth and contamination of black carbon on snow (Van Angelen et al., 2012, Alexander et al . 2014).
6. p4749 L28: "relatively smooth terrain" I understand what you mean, but this might be confusing for the non-experienced reader. I would change it to "lack of surface roughness in the RCMs"
 - We will change the text to ‘lack of surface roughness in the RCMs’ instead of ‘smooth terrain in the RCMs’ as requested.
7. p4749 L29: Perhaps it is worth to mention the Van Angelen et. al. (2012) already has a spatially variable ice albedo scheme.
 - We will revise the text and mention the existence of ‘a spatially variable ice albedo scheme in RCMs (Van Angelen et al., 2012)’.
8. p4741: L9-29: I think this section, which provides a complete summary of your manuscript is perhaps too long as it reads more as an abstract.
 - We have shortened this paragraph as requested.
9. p4743 L8: “in close proximity”: is close proximity enough when you have only a 1.1m footprint? If there is only close proximity, you are sampling different plots for each transect overpass (and I think you are anyway). Therefore, and given the large fine scale spatial variability (as seen in Fig. 5), you are obtaining transects which are very difficult to compare.
 - We will clarify that we are not aiming to do a point-by-point comparison for the different ASD transect dates. Instead, we are comparing them based on their smoothed spatial patterns (i.e., 50 m bins averages in Fig. 5b) and their overall distributions. We recognize that these are not identical points, but are sufficient to capture the general spatial pattern along the transect given the similarity of our bin-averages.

- We will add a sentence that reads:

While samples were not taken from exactly the same sites preventing a point-by-point comparison, the transect sample distribution and smoothed spatial patterns can be analyzed for change over time.

- We also revised our calculation of the ASD footprint and found it to be ~0.18 m (see our response to reviewer 2 Specific Comment #10).

10. p4743 L14 “spectra > 1.0” based on the assumption that you have an equal amount of outliers in each side of the mean, you will underestimate the final albedo, because you tend to remove only the positive (>1) outliers. Can you comment on that?

- We will add the sentences below to comment on the issue raised by the reviewer. Note that while this makes the section longer, it will now appear in the Appendix section. It reads:

Apparent outliers were identified using the Spectral Analysis and Management System software (SAMs) to identify outliers. Outliers were defined as raw spectra that were significantly different to the other spectra across the entire spectral range (visible and near-infrared wavelengths) taken for the same sample. For June 16, 20 spectra were deemed outliers (total spectra collected = 555); June 19, 17 spectra were deemed outliers (total spectra collected = 560); and June 25, 12 spectra were deemed outliers (total spectra collected = 480). The outliers for these transect dates comprise less than 4% of all spectra collected, and thus, likely had an insignificant impact on the final albedo calculations. On June 17, spectra with unrealistic >1.0 values were collected, as will be shown later all data from this day were considered low-quality and removed from the dataset.

11. p4743 L15: To obtain broadband albedo you should never (!) average over the entire spectral range, but you should apply a weighted average based spectral response curve and the amount of incoming radiation per wavelength. Otherwise you will obtain albedo data that are not comparable to the albedo values derived from broadband sensors (See for example Table 3). Given these large discrepancies (0.1), I also think it is very difficult to interpret the melt rates calculated based on these visible albedo values.

- We will recalculate broadband albedo as a weighted average based on the spectral response curve as requested. We have described this further in our response to reviewer 2 General Comment #4.

12. p4743 L24-25: Can you give an idea (+ add it to the text) of the amount of observed tilt as it can give an indication of the albedo uncertainty

- We do not have observed tilt information for the AWSs, however we have calculated reasonable uncertainty ranges caused by tilt and will add them to the manuscript. The calculations are based on the equation given by Van den Broeke et al. (2004), Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology. The text reads as:

Based on Fig. 3b in Van den Broeke et al. (2004), a theoretical tilt of 1° on 18 January at Kohnen station, Antarctica (75°S, 0°) is associated with ~15 W m⁻² offset in net shortwave at noon local time. This is associated with an absolute error of 5% with a tilt of 1°. Here, we assume double the uncertainty (± 10%) since tilt information was not recorded.

13. p4744 L5: (e.g. Lhermitte, S., Abermann, J., Kinnard, C. (2014). Albedo over rough snow and ice surfaces. *The Cryosphere*, 8(3), 1069–1086. doi:10.5194/tc-8-1069-2014 or Warren, S., Brandt, R., Hinton, P. (1998). Effect of surface roughness on bidirectional reflectance of Antarctic snow. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 103(E11), 25.)
- We will add the citation on surface roughness effects on snow and ice albedo, as requested.
14. p4744 L16: Although the differences between data sets are logical (I expect higher albedos for 300-1100nm than for the entire SW spectrum), it complicates comparison as the absolute differences between the data sets are almost bigger than the spatial and temporal variability. Therefore, it is important to include a rough correction for the different spectral ranges (e.g. based on a reference spectrum) .
- We are not aware of any simple conversion from MODIS broadband albedo to the 300-1100 nm range based on the reference spectrum. However, we have calculated the relative weight of the reference spectrum in the 325-1075 nm range (corresponding to the ASD wavelength range), compared to the MODIS range (300–3000 nm), to show that the ASD visible and near-infrared wavelengths are dominating albedo, which suggests that spatial and temporal comparisons are sound. We have added the following to the manuscript to clarify this point:
- Direct comparison of α_{ASD} , α_{MET} , and α_{MOD} are not possible, and α_{MOD} is expected to have lower values than the other two datasets. However, relative comparisons of spatial and temporal patterns are reasonable, because the MODIS albedo is dominated by the ASD visible and near-infrared (i.e., 325-1075 nm) wavelengths. In a standard Top-of-Atmosphere solar irradiance reference spectrum, the 325-1075 nm range comprises 80.52% of the total irradiance in the 300-3000 nm range.*
15. p4744 L17: What do you mean by similar results and do you effectively expect that? For example, based on the spectral differences I do expect for the 300-1100nm data a higher albedo for the white ice and a lower albedo for the dark ice compared to the broadband albedo values.
- We will clarify that we expect to see similar temporal and spatial variability, but not similar absolute values. The new sentence reads:
- The three albedo dataset's different wavelength ranges prevent comparison of absolute values. However, the dominance of reflectance in the ASD visible and near-infrared wavelengths (325-1075 nm) in determining broadband albedo means that temporal and spatial variability can be compared among the three datasets.*
16. p4744 L18: Are mean ASD data per MODIS pixel a reasonable assumption? I have my doubts. Firstly, because the MODIS observations have footprints that often are much larger and include data from neighboring pixels (i.e. pixel 2 data in pixel 1 data and vice versa). It is true that the MODIS pixels data are resampled to a fixed grid, but this does not remove the larger footprint effects (See for example Dozier, J., Painter, T. H., Rittger, K., Frew, J. E. (2008). Time-space continuity of daily maps of fractional snow cover and albedo from MODIS. *Advances in Water Resources*, 31(11), 1515–1526. doi:10.1016/j.advwatres.2008.08.011). So this implies that both pixel 1 and 2 are often not that separable and certainly not allow a clear separation of the ASD measurements. This should be discussed.

- As mentioned previously, we are not attempting to conduct a 1:1 comparison between MODIS and ASD albedo data. The intent of the ASD data averaged per MODIS pixel was meant to examine how our data falls within the MODIS seasonal pattern. The authors will address the reviewer here by: 1) clarifying in the manuscript that we are not conducting a comparison of absolute values, and 2) improve the discussion regarding issues of MODIS pixel separability and include a reference to the Dozier et al. (2008) paper.
17. p4745 L3-13: What is the temporal resolution to calculate CC? Every second, minute, 15mins, hourly? And how do you define variability (range? standard deviation?)
- We will clarify in the manuscript that the temporal resolution is every second. The text reads:
As a proxy for cloud cover, relative cloud cover, hereafter CC, was calculated every second as the ratio of modeled clear-sky and observed incoming solar radiation similar to Box (1997).
 - We will clarify in the manuscript that variability here refers to the range in CC during transect times.
18. p4745 L6: How do you account for surface albedo values in the Iqbal model as the Clear sky incoming radiation is strongly dependent on the surface albedo (e.g. Sedlar, J., Tjernström, M., Mauritsen, T., Shupe, M. D., Brooks, I. M., Persson, P. O. G., et al. (2010). A transitioning Arctic surface energy budget: the impacts of solar zenith angle, surface albedo and cloud radiative forcing. *Climate Dynamics*, 37(7-8), 1643–1660. doi:10.1007/s00382-010-0937-5)
- The Solar Radiance model does not account for surface albedo values. It only solves for incoming radiation, not outgoing radiation (which would then need to account for surface albedo values). The model computes total incoming solar flux through a horizontal surface, zenith declination, solar azimuth, direct beam irradiance on a surface normal to the beam, and the diffuse component on a horizontal surface. As far as we can tell, Sedlar et al's paper shows that net solar radiation is dependent on surface albedo, not incoming solar radiation.
19. p4745 L18-19: 662 and 239: is that average incoming radiation or average variability?
- We will clarify that these values are the average incoming and outgoing radiation during transect dates.
20. p4746 L3-14: You spend a large amount of text on discussing why you are only using 3 of six transects. I think that is not completely relevant for your story and could therefore be moved to supplementary material.
- We will follow the reviewer's recommendation to separate the quality control of transect data from the Methods section, and move the quality control assessment and associated figures (i.e., Figures 2-4) of the ASD data to the Appendix section.
21. p4746 L9: "reduced the amount of longwave radiation" I would expect clouds to increase the longwave radiation? Or do you mean longer wavelength SW radiation? Anyway, I think it is best to remove all cloudy ASD observations from your data set.
- We agree with the reviewer and will revise the sentence to state that cloudy conditions

effectively increase the amount of longwave radiation at the ice surface.

22. p4746 L20-26+Fig.4: I would not draw any conclusion from this figure. First of all, there is no linear relation apparent at all (six points with a ASD albedo of 0.5-0.6 and a highly variable MET albedo + one clear outlier) so any interpretation is not very meaningful. Secondly, how come you have 5 points (base) and 4 points (top) for the ASD data if you only have three useful transects?
- We have revised Figure 4 to account for a couple of errors, see response to Dr. Pope's ASD Data Collection Comment #5 and reviewer 2 Specific Comment #19. The updated figure exhibits better agreement between α_{ASD} and α_{MET} .
23. p4747 L9: Why do you suddenly restrict your wavelengths to only the 400-700nm range? This makes again any comparison very difficult and would overestimate the albedo differences between white and dirty ice compared to the values of the broad-band albedo. This will cause overestimation in all your later results.
- We will revise the manuscript to use the 325-1075 nm wavelength range. See more details in response to reviewer 2 General Comment #22.
24. p4747 L11: Which bimodal distribution? This is completely unclear in this part of the text if you haven't read the next parts yet.
- We will revise the analysis to only incorporate high quality broadband α_{ASD} measurements from the 16, 19, and 25 June transects. α_{ASD} spectra made within 40 m of ablation stakes were individually assessed to classify each surface type into two distinct groupings: clean and dirty ice.
 - We agree with the reviewer that 'bimodal' is not an appropriate description of the histograms. To clarify, we will rewrite the text in the following way:
At Sites D and E, albedos of white and dirty ice, hereafter $\alpha_{ASD\ DW}$, $\alpha_{ASD\ DD}$, $\alpha_{ASD\ EW}$, and $\alpha_{ASD\ ED}$, were estimated from the histograms of α_{ASD} observations made within 40 m of stakes for each transect date. Manual inspection of each of the spectrums at Sites D and E confirm that samples with $\alpha_{ASD} < 0.4$ are qualitatively similar to typical spectrum for wet or debris rich ice as shown in Pope and Reese (2014), and distinctly different from α_{ASD} above 0.4.
25. p4747 L18: By taking the 400-700nm albedo data you overestimate the differences in albedo between white and dark snow and you tend to separate the bimodal distribution much more than would occur in reality in the broadband spectrum.
- We have replaced the 400-700 nm albedo with 325-1075 nm albedo, which will minimize the error pointed out by the reviewer.
26. p4747 L22: I think it is not very realistic to fix s to a fixed value as I expect the white ice values to have much higher standard deviations than the darker surfaces due to the non-linearity of albedo decrease to increasing impurity/melt. You also can see this in Figure 8. Moreover, why do take a standard deviation of 0.09, when your observations show much larger standard deviations (e.g. Table 3)
- We have computed additional standard deviations for each surface type to address the reviewer's comment. We will add in additional standard deviations into our calculation to take into account the expected higher standard deviations associated with the white ice albedo values. The standard deviations will be unique for each

distinct surface type's spectral albedo.

- A standard deviation of 0.09 was selected based on the average standard deviation of all α_{ASD} for each surface type. The standard deviations in Table 3 correspond to all α_{ASD} measurements collected for each transect date, excluding the α_{ASD} measurements associated with distinct surface types. We are removing Table 3 from the manuscript (see response to reviewer 2 Specific Comment #19).

27. p4747 L24-28: I think that using fractions from another study over another year determined over a very small footprint may help to provide a nice thinking exercise, but give very little indication of what is actually happening in reality. Moreover, as you tend to overestimate the differences between, for example, dark and white ice (see previous two comments) I believe your modeled bimodal distribution is overestimating the bimodal distribution observed in reality. Therefore, I would recommend to remove this analysis from the manuscript.

- We decided to keep the modeled distribution. Prior studies, to our knowledge, have not attempted to model the overall albedo distribution of the ablation area in this way. We believe these computed distributions inform the subsequent interpretation of the MODIS distributions, and may be of value for future ablation area albedo research. Finally, we have corrected the issue the reviewer is raising with overestimating the difference between dark and white ice by replacing visible albedo with broadband albedo.

28. p4747 L10: 463m is indeed the resolution for the zenith observations but the final effective resolution will almost always be different depending each overpass (see also earlier comment)

- Yes, 463 m spatial resolution assumes that the MODIS pixel data was collected at nadir. We have revised the sentence to read:
The spatial resolution of the original MOD10A1 data is 463 m at zenith observations (exact resolution varies with overpass time),...

29. p4749 L14: Is it day-to-day variability or are you just sampling different sites? Based on my earlier comment, I tend to believe the latter.

- We agree with the reviewer, and will rewrite the text to clarify this. The text will read:

While discrete α_{ASD} observations often differ from the nearest observation made at another transect time due to slight day-to-day changes in sample location (fig. 5a), ...

30. p4749 L15 “spatial range? You mean spatial variability?”

- We have corrected the sentence to say ‘spatial variability’ as requested.

31. p4749 L23 “uneven decline” I understand what you mean, but it is a very confusing way to formulate it.

- We rephrased the sentence to clarify the meaning. The new sentence will state that the α_{base} and α_{top} follow a ‘non-linear decline’, as requested.

32. p4749 L26 “inconsistent decline” What is inconsistent about it? It is completely consistent to me. A steady decline + noise + some snowfall events

- We agree that the term ‘inconsistent decline’ is a poor choice to describe the figure. We will rephrase this sentence in the following way to better describe the figure:
The MOD10A1 albedo time series declines from June 1st to June 21st. A snowfall event on June 28-29 raised MOD10A1 albedo compared to the June 21st values. July MOD10A1 albedos exhibited some temporal variability, but were generally lower at the end than the start of the month. August MOD10A1 albedo increased from early to late in the month with a snowfall event on 18 August, triggering large increases in albedo values above 0.75.
33. p4745 L3-4: “The general darkening observed in α_{base} ”. Sorry, but I do not see that general darkening, as it seems to be a darkening followed by a increase in albedo again.
- We agree that “general darkening” does not describe α_{base} well. We will rewrite the sentence as such:
High-quality daily average broadband $\alpha_{ASD \text{ Pixel } 1}$ and $\alpha_{ASD \text{ Pixel } 2}$ data don’t exhibit the increase in albedo at the end of June, as seen in the α_{base} and α_{top} data, which may be reflected by differences in footprint sizes. Instead, $\alpha_{ASD \text{ Pixel } 1}$ and $\alpha_{ASD \text{ Pixel } 2}$ data exhibit a steady decline over the month of June, while $\alpha_{MOD \text{ Pixel } 1}$ and $\alpha_{MOD \text{ Pixel } 2}$ data remain relatively constant over the same time period.
34. p47450 L4-6: “temporal variability shows general agreement”. Sorry, again I do not see that general agreement. α_{MET} decreases followed by an increase, whereas α_{ASD} ’s only decline. α_{MODIS} ’s seem to be fairly constant over the period when α_{ASD} ’s decline.
- We agree with the reviewer (see also reviewer 1 comment #33 response above), and will rephrase the sentence in the following way:
Absolute magnitudes among the three ground- and satellite-derived albedo products diverge due to sensor, wavelength range and spatial resolution differences. However, all products have higher albedo values in the first than the last observation in the month of June, prior to the 28-29 June snowfall event.
35. p4750 L13-22: Isn’t an overestimation (factor 2) of the difference in melt rates (observed difference light-dark=2.31 10^{-7} m/s, vs. calculated difference light-dark=4.63 10^{-7} m/s) resulting in an overestimation (factor 2) of the effect of albedo difference on increased melt rates?
- We will recompute melt rates since the ablation rates were not converted to SI units properly (see response to Dr. Pope’s Distribution Discussion Comment #8).
36. p4751 L8: see my earlier comments, but I believe you severely overestimate the bimodal distribution (e.g. by too high difference between white and dark ice, by underestimating the standard deviation (especially for white ice), etc.)
- We will recalculate the computed distributions with additional standard deviations for each surface type. See response to reviewer 1 Detailed Comment #26.
37. p4751 L12-17 “darker surfaces progressively populate” Is it dark surface that grow or is it just the (degraded) snow that disappears? Similarly, is the dichotomy not the result of disappearing snow and thus possibly already included in the SMB models?
- See our previous response to Dr. Pope’s Distribution Discussion Comment #8. The darker surface that progressively grows is a result of degraded snow that disappears to expose the impurity-rich ice surface beneath. We will revise the manuscript to explain that disappearing snow plays an important role in governing surface albedo.

- It is our understanding that SMB models consider impurities from dust deposition, but not from melted out sediments (e.g., dark band). We will revise our discussion to make it more nuanced about SMB models and include advances to SMB albedo schemes as described in Alexander et al. (2014) and van Angelen et al. (2012).
38. p4751 18-21: I do think the results in Fig.11 are overestimating the melt rate effects (see my previous comments)
- We agree with the reviewer and will recalculate the melt rates using broadband albedo instead of visible albedo. We will also clarify that these melt rates were not absolute values, but were modeled in relatively simplistic terms to quantify relative changes in ablation rates related to distinct surface types.
39. p4751-4752 L22-2: Aren't you here also stating that the difference is due to the presence/(dis)appearance of snow? Consequently, it could already be in the SMB models.
- After careful analysis presented in Dr. Pope's Distribution Discussion Comment #8, we find that the reviewer is correct. In the revised manuscript, we will clarify that at the 100x100 and 150x150 spatial extent, it is likely that the transition from snow to ice may have contributed to this bimodal distribution seen in Fig. 12.
40. p4752 L3-7: If I am correct MOD10A is giving direct beam albedo (i.e. black sky albedo), which is strongly dependent on the solar zenith angle. So how much of that variation would be caused by variations in SZA?
- From what we understand, the MOD10A1 product provides daily black sky albedo in the absence of modeled or observed aerosol optical depth information (e.g., Stroeve et al., 2013). As such, the MOD10A1 albedo data may be classified as a directional-hemispherical reflectance (DHR) case, different from our ASD albedo data (bi-hemispherical reflectance). As identified in several studies, the accuracy of albedo data retrieved from both satellite and observational systems declines as the SZA increases, particularly beyond $\sim 70 - 75^\circ$. However, since we are focusing our analysis on summer months (primarily June to September), SZAs are minimized (e.g., see Box et al., 2012). As such, SZA should not influence the MOD10A1 albedo retrievals used in this study. We will update the manuscript with this information to clarify for the reader.
41. p4752 7-9 + Fig.14: I do think the results in Fig.14 are overestimating the melt rate effects (see my previous comments)
- We agree and will revise the manuscript accordingly. See similar response to reviewer 1 Detailed Comment #38.
42. p4752 L27 "due to fluctuations in diurnal shortwave fluxes": What do you mean by that? Isn't the unsteady decline driven by small snowfall/redistribution effects, etc?
- The unsteady decrease in albedo during our field campaign in late June 2013 was linked to fluctuations in daily radiation fluxes, and by extension, a brief cooling period (see figures in response to Dr. Pope's Distribution Discussion Comment #8), disallowing the albedo to decline continuously as we may expect it to otherwise (refer to α_{base} and α_{top} lines in Figure 6). Based on visual assessment in the field, and continuous monitoring of the site, no snow fell in our study area between 8-26 June 2013.
 - We will clarify in the manuscript that the fluctuation in diurnal shortwave fluxes refers to variability in daily incoming and outgoing solar radiation.
43. p4753 L9 I don't agree with these assumptions and I think they tend to overestimate your bimodal distribution (see earlier comments)

- We will add a sentence to clarify that the bimodal distribution is an idealized representation that likely overemphasizes the two modes. It will read:
Compared to reality, the modeled distribution probably overemphasizes each mode and does not account for darkening of each surface type due to ice crystal growth over the melting season.
44. p4753 L14: “abrupt shifts” Could these shifts not just be the shift from (degraded) snow to ice, or from dry snow to wet snow? And isn’t that exactly what Alexander et al. formulate?
- We will revise the text to clarify that these abrupt shifts are due to snow to ice transitions. See response to earlier comments.
45. p4753 L24-27: “and not solely grain size metamorphism” I do agree, but neither Box or Tedesco, nor any other SMB model, do claim that either. Both Box and Tedesco clearly indicate that the longer exposure of ice and the lower summer snowfall was responsible for the lower albedo values in the ablation zone.
- We have removed the reference to Box and Tedesco as requested. We have also rewritten the manuscript to emphasize the importance of snow to ice transition in overall albedo.
46. p4753-54 L28-2 I do agree, but as you can see in the figure, the initial drop or the partial snow variability is much more important (albedo variability of 0.2) than the the subsequent decrease due to darkening (albedo variability of maximum 0.1)
- To address the concern of the reviewer, we will revise the sentence in the following way:
Consistent with Chandler et al. (2014), the initial drop in ablation zone albedo is likely due to the transition from dry to wet, and patchy snow surfaces. Successive lowering of albedo after snow melt is predominantly due to an increase ice crystal size and possibly also by expansion of darker surface area coverage (e.g., cryoconite holes, accumulation of impurities, and stream organization).
47. p4753 L4: ‘Substantial’ are the differences also equally substantial if you compare to a more realistic reference albedo values of 0.4-0.35 that would be used as a background ice albedo for this region?
- We will recalculate the computed distributions, using more realistic reference albedo values for bare ice, to reevaluate relative melt rates. Figure 11 will be redone, as discussed in earlier responses, to address reviewer comments. The manuscript will be updated accordingly.
48. p4753 L17 “Previous studies have ...” I do not agree (see earlier comments)
- This statement will be revised and nuanced, see our response to comments above (see reviewer 1 Detailed Comments #45).

Response to Anonymous Referee #2

Response to General Comments: It is stated in the conclusions that abrupt shifts in albedo can occur as a result of changing dust concentrations. Abrupt shifts primarily occur for MODIS data, and seem more likely to be associated with changes in snow cover, while the observed changes at local sites (which are presumably snow-free) are actually more gradual. The conclusion that abrupt changes in albedo can be associated with sudden changes in impurities does not seem to be supported by the data and should be revised.

- We will revise the text to reflect the reviewer’s comment as requested.

1. The authors suggest that “white ice” albedo is greater than 0.6, similar to the albedo of snow (Figs. 8 and 9). Thus the bimodal distribution of albedo over ice may be similar to the bimodal

distribution for areas including both snow and ice. These numbers are higher than the cited range for bare ice (p.4740, line 10) of between 0.3 and 0.6. If the authors are certain that “white ice” is indeed ice and not firn or snow, the observation that ice albedo can be higher than 0.6, and that changes in ice albedo can occur over the course of a season, are important findings of this study and should be emphasized. If there is a possibility that there is snow cover present in the study area, the manuscript should be revised throughout to consider this possibility. In the case of MODIS data, I think that snow likely plays a role in the albedo distributions. The authors should more thoroughly discuss differences in the distributions and changes in the distributions for local data vs. MODIS data.

- We are not going to make this a distinction between white ice or firn. We will remove the term white ice, and refer to this instead as ‘high albedo’ for clean surfaces and ‘low albedo’ for dirty surfaces. High albedo appears to be pure ice, free of snow. Low albedo is ice with impurities.
- In the discussion, we will discuss why white ice is likely not firn (it’s unlikely to form along the low reaches of the ablation area). We will also address that the likely sources of variability in the 2012 MODIS pentad averages (e.g., related to shifts in meltwater ponding). See additional comments in response to reviewer 1 Major Comment #3.

2. The authors should discuss the discrepancy between the observed distribution along the transect over which ASD measurements were taken, and the bimodal distribution inferred from the surface types of Chandler et al. (2014), which appear to have very different peaks. Figure 1 suggests that the transect passes over relatively bright areas, while the MODIS pixels and the area of Chandler et al. (2014) may cover a wider range of values. Also, it was noted that during sampling with the ASD, streams and cryoconite holes were not sampled, which would seem to reduce the frequency of dark surfaces sampled. The discrepancy should be noted in the results and discussed in the discussion section.

- We will add a text to explain that the modeled bimodal distribution is idealized and can only be compared qualitatively to MODIS distributions. Furthermore, we will explain in the discussion that the transect is under sampling dark surfaces, as requested.

3. The procedure used for calculating broadband albedo values (P. 4743, Lines 14-16) appears to involve simply averaging albedo over a series of spectral intervals, which would assign too much weight to albedo values where incoming solar radiation is small. The best way to calculate broadband albedo would be to integrate incoming and out- going shortwave radiation and divide the total outgoing amount by the total incoming amount. Please recalculate broadband albedo values if possible.

- We will recalculate broadband α_{ASD} as requested. The process will be repeated for individual spectra associated with a known surface type. The process of recalculating broadband α_{ASD} will be included in the Methods section of the ASD appendix.

4. In some cases, the authors use “broadband albedo” and in other cases use “visible” albedo values for a smaller wavelength range. It would seem that broadband albedo would be more indicative of changes in absorbed energy and hence the energy available for melt. The authors should explain why different wavelength ranges are used, use broadband albedo in all cases, or perhaps compare differences in results for “visible” vs. “broadband” albedo if there are substantial differences.

- We will compute broadband α_{ASD} in all cases throughout our analysis (e.g., Figures 5, 7-9,

10-11, and 14; Tables 2 and 4). See above for how we will compute broadband α_{ASD} (reviewer 2 General Comment #4). Depending on these results, we will either use broadband α_{ASD} in all cases or compare differences in results for visible and broadband α_{ASD} , if the differences are substantial.

5. I suggest moving the discussion of melt rates (P. 4750, Line 13 – P. 4751 Line 6, and perhaps Lines 7-11) to a separate section (Section 4.3) that follows the discussion of albedo distributions (Section 4.2). This would allow the manuscript to flow better and would allow the authors to introduce the bimodal distribution of albedo before presenting results regarding its influence on melting.
 - We will move the text containing the discussion of melt rates to after the discussion of albedo distributions, as requested.

Response to Specific Comments

1. Consider revising “ablation zone” to “ablation area” throughout.
 - We will replace ‘ablation zone’ with ‘ablation area’ throughout the entire paper, as requested.
2. P. 4738, Line 7: The statement that the role of distinct surface types on surface albedo is “excluded in surface mass balance models” is not true. The MAR and RACMO models, for instance, account for the presence of bare ice. Perhaps a statement such as “not represented in detail. . .” or “represented in a relatively simple manner” is more accurate.
 - We will add in ‘represented in a relatively simplistic manner’, as requested.
3. P. 4739, Lines 9-12: The feedback also involves a melt-induced increase in the percentage of the surface covered by bare ice, impurities and meltwater, which further enhances melting. Please include these effects.
 - We will revise the manuscript to mention an increase in debris, meltwater ponding, and bare ice facies as additional effects of the feedback.
4. P. 4739, Lines 15-16: Again, while some processes such as the transport of dust are generally not included in RCMs, some processes, such as the presence of surface water and bare ice are accounted for (though perhaps in a relatively simplistic manner). Please clarify.
 - We will clarify that bare ice and surface water are accounted for, albeit in a relatively simplistic manner, in RCMs (e.g., MAR; Alexander et al. 2014), and some models account for black carbon concentration on snow surfaces (e.g., RACMO2; van Angelen et al. 2012). We will also explain that processes such as dust/sediment accumulation, the distribution of cryoconite holes, and spatial variability in debris-covered ice are generally not included in RCMs.
5. P. 4740, Line 25: Alexander et al. (2014) indicate some discrepancies between MODIS albedo products.
 - We will revise the text to include a statement highlighting the exception to reasonable albedo estimates identified in satellite products, namely the discrepancies between MODIS albedo products, as requested. We will add the reference to Alexander et al. (2014).

6. P. 4740, Line 26: “Physically unrealistic” seems too extreme. The latest version of RACMO (van Angelen et al., 2012) uses (realistic) MODIS background albedo. The schemes employed by MAR account for the presence of bare ice and capture the change in albedo as bare ice is exposed. Please revise.
- We will revise the text to state that it’s represented in relatively simplistic terms. See response above to reviewer 2 Specific Comment #4.
 - We will reword the text to acknowledge that RACMO uses realistic MODIS background albedo data and that MAR accounts for the presence of bare ice and changes in snow cover.
7. P. 4740, Line 30: The word “poor” suggests that there is something wrong with the schemes used. Perhaps, “relatively simplistic” is more accurate.
- We will include ‘relatively simplistic’ as requested.
8. P. 4742, Lines 21- 22: Since the foreoptic was used, perhaps it would be better to indicate the field of view with the foreoptic?
- We will clarify that only a RCR was attached to the ASD. See additional response to Dr. Pope’s ASD Data Collection Comment #3.
9. P. 4742, Line 22: Is the diameter of the spot 1.1m or is the area 1.1m² ? Please clarify.
- We have revised the calculation of the spot size after finding an error with the calculation. The new estimate is ~0.18 m. We will explain that the spot size refers to the diameter, as requested.
10. P. 4743, Line 14: Perhaps “albedo spectra” should read “spectral albedo values”?
- We will correct to ‘spectral albedo values’ as requested.
11. P. 4743, Lines 14-16: As noted in the general comments, the statement “Broadband α ASD . . .” is ambiguous. Is broadband albedo calculated by averaging albedo values over each spectral interval provided by the spectrometer.
- We will recalculate broadband albedo, as requested. See response to reviewer 2 General Comment #4.
12. P. 4744, Line 11: This is a bit unclear. Change “MOD10A1 albedo” to “MOD10A1 albedo for pixels”.
- We will change it to ‘MOD10A1 albedo for pixels’ as requested.
13. P. 4744, Line 17: Please define “similar results”. For example, results would be expected to be similar for the distribution of albedo values and temporal changes in albedo.
- We will reword this section to provide a better description. See response to reviewer 1 Detailed Comment #15.
14. P. 4745, Lines 10-13: These two sentences probably could be removed as the information seems redundant.
- We will remove the two sentences to avoid redundancy as requested.
15. P. 4745, Lines 18, 19: Are the “average” values in parenthesis the average range of diurnal variability? Please clarify.
- We will clarify that in the text as requested.
16. P. 4745, Lines 19-21: Since CC is derived from observed incoming SW, it seems self-evident that they would be well correlated. Perhaps this sentence should be removed. If the authors wish to keep it, the phrase “yet on average, remained low” is unclear and should be revised. Also, since CC is based on a combination of modeled clear-sky SW and observed SW, perhaps this should read

“Derived CC reveals” rather than “CC simulations reveal”.

- We kept the sentence to show that the model was able to adequately capture cloud conditions during transect dates. The phrase will be revised for clarification as requested.

17. P. 4745, Lines 26-27: Could hysteresis also result from changing surface conditions over the course of a day?

- We will revise the text to acknowledge that the hysteresis may also partly be due to changing surface conditions.

18. P. 4745, Lines 20-26: Given the high range of variability that is observed along the transect, the comparison shown in Figure 4 seems unnecessary. It appears that the average α_{ASD} over the entire transect is being compared with the albedo at the stations, but this is somewhat unclear. I suggest removing this figure, or alternately comparing station measurements with α_{ASD} measurements within a small radius of the weather stations.

- We will clarify that Figure 4 compares the first and last α_{ASD} measurements for each transect date that is closest to the AWSs. Only α_{ASD} measurements from high quality transect dates were used in the updated figure (see response to Dr. Pope’s ASD Data Collection Comment #5).

19. P. 4745, Line 25: Table 3 is only mentioned here in passing. Please provide more discussion of the data shown in Table 3 or alternately, remove it.

- We will remove Table 3 from the manuscript.

20. P. 4746, Line 1: Here it is stated that Top Met Station measurements are excluded, but it appears that the measurements continue to be mentioned in the results and discussion section. Please clarify.

- We will exclude the Top Met Station in the revised manuscript except for in Figure 4.

21. P. 4747, Line 10: Why are “visible” albedo values used here while albedo values for the entire spectrum are used in other analyses? See general comment 5.

- We will recompute our data using broadband α_{ASD} values. See response to reviewer 2 General Comment #5.

22. P. 4747, Line 15: Please provide a few more details regarding how cryoconite hole albedo was parameterized.

- We will revise the manuscript and better explain how cryoconite holes albedo was parameterized, as requested. The text will be as follows:

Cryoconite hole albedo, hereafter α_{cryo} , was parameterized using published values of Bøggild et al. (2010). Here, broadband albedos for damp cryoconite material and cryoconite basin surface types under clear-sky and overcast conditions were averaged together to estimate α_{cryo} .

23. P. 4747, Line 25: Perhaps the authors can refer to the figure from Chandler et al. (2014) that shows fractional changes in surface types, for clarity.

- We will add in the reference to the relevant figure (i.e., Fig. 6 from Chandler et al., 2014) as requested.

24. P. 4749, Lines 2-7: The additional terms (such as net LW radiation and sensible and latent heat fluxes) could be mentioned for clarity.

- We will add in these terms for clarity as requested.

25. P. 4749, Line 17: Do the authors mean that the station values are “distinctly different” from average α_{ASD} ?
- We will clarify in the manuscript that we are referring to the α_{base} and α_{top} values being ‘distinctly different’ on ASD transect dates. The text will read:
 α_{base} and α_{top} are distinctly different from one another on the three transect dates (Fig. 6), reflecting the surfaces they were installed on.
26. P. 4750, Line 1: Are the values for 28 June and 14 August switched here? It may be better to report the trend over this period as the variability is rather high.
- Yes, the values appear to be switched, and will be corrected in the manuscript. We will report results as a trend over this period, as requested. See related responses to reviewer 1 Detailed Comments #32 and #33.
27. P. 4750, Line 2-4: This claim can only be made for the month of June. Please clarify.
- We will clarify that this is for the month of June as requested.
28. P. 4750, Line 23: Mention turbulent heat fluxes in addition to longwave radiation.
- We will mention turbulent heat fluxes as requested.
29. P. 4750, Lines 23-24: “Relative melt rates between. . .” The calculations capture the fact that melt rates are substantially different, but not the magnitude of the difference between melt rates. Please revise for clarity.
- We will revise the manuscript as requested. The text will read:
Regardless of this, relative melt rates between light and dark surfaces are considerably different, and thus useful for investigating seasonal melt rate changes as described next.
30. P. 4750, Lines 26-27: To the contrary, there seems to be a wider range of ablation rates for “dark” rather than “white” ice. Please revise.
- We will correct to reflect the wider range of ablation rates for dark ice as requested.
31. P. 4751, Lines 1-6: Could it be that sensible heat flux from stream water, which is not accounted for in radiative estimates, can lead to increased melting?
- We will include this as an additional process that may not have been accounted for in the radiative estimates. The text will be as follows:
Considerable spread in ablation rates for stream observations could be explained by varying stream depth (Legleiter et al., 2014). The depth of these ice streams determines the attenuation and scattering of radiant energy, thereby influencing the observed albedo measurements. Sensible heat flux from the stream water, not accounted for in radiative estimates, may also be a mechanism for increased melting.
32. P. 4751, Line 9: Clarify that these are computed frequencies for the nearby region of Chandler et al. (2014).
- We will clarify that these are computed albedo frequencies for a nearby area of Chandler et al. (2014)’s study, as requested.
33. P. 4751, Line 18: As noted in the general comments, please mention differences between the appearance of the distributions for α_{ASD} vs. those derived from the data of Chandler et al. (2014).
- We will mention differences between the appearance of the distributions between the in situ α_{ASD} and Chandler albedo data as requested. See our response to reviewer 2 General Comment #3 and reviewer 1 Detailed Comment #38.
34. P. 4752, Lines 18-20: For the MODIS data this could easily be a result of snow melt exposing impurity rich ice below, since the albedo values for “white ice” and snow are similar. In fact this seems to be a more plausible reason for a sudden shift in albedo.

- Yes, this is a more likely result for the MODIS data. We identified a snowfall event at the end of June that likely contributed to the bimodal distribution seen in Fig. 12. This will be restated to reflect changes associated with our strategy and response to Dr. Pope’s Distribution Discussion Comment #8.
35. P. 4753, Lines 2-4: Perhaps note that MODIS albedo (shown in Fig. 6) is observed to decrease nonlinearly, with a smaller rate of change towards the end of the season. Also, since an alternative explanation is provided in the subsequent sentence, “mitigates” should be replaced by “may mitigate”. van den Broeke et al. (2011), p. 378, attribute a gradual decline in albedo over the course of a season to the gradual removal of snow patches from the surface. Perhaps this is also a possibility at this location, unless the authors observed no snow patches during the field expedition.
- The authors will note that the MODIS albedo exhibits a nonlinear decrease over the melt season, with smaller changes in variability near the end of the summer season (as seen in Fig. 6).
 - We will include the possibility of snow patch removal on the ice surface as a contributor to changes in ablation area albedo (although snow was not observed in our study area during the field campaign in June 2013) in the Discussion section. We will revise the text as follows:
Accumulation of exposed below-surface impurities (Wientjes and Oerlemans, 2010) and the gradual erosion of snow patches in local depressions on the ice surface (van den Broeke et al., 2011) may mitigate the rate of change in ablation area albedo.
36. P. 4753, Line 5: Replace “ground albedo” with “surface albedo” to avoid confusion with the albedo of tundra in proglacial areas.
- We will replace ‘ground albedo’ with ‘surface albedo’ as requested.
37. P. 4753, Lines 17-22: Alexander et al. (2014) also used a lower resolution of 25 km, which may limit the ability to distinguish between dust and ice in some areas. However, the results of this study suggest that “white ice” can have an albedo similar to that of snow, which means that the distribution for ice may be similar to that for areas covered by both snow and ice.
- We will acknowledge that the different results seen in Alexander et al. (2014) may also be related to the lower resolution of the MAR model.
38. P. 4753, Line 25: Tedesco et al. (2011) and Box et al. (2012) discuss the role of grain size metamorphism at higher elevations, where it may play a role in changing snow albedo. However, both studies indicate that the exposure of bare ice (i.e. a change from light to dark albedo) likely plays an important role in changes in albedo in the ablation zone. What is different about the findings here is that a shift from high to low albedo is observed for areas that are apparently snow-free. Please revise.
- We will revised this statement to reflect that the transition from high to low albedo was observed as a primary mechanism for lowering albedo in the snow-free, lower reaches of the ablation area.
39. P. 4753, Lines 27-28: For the MODIS data there do seem to be abrupt transitions, perhaps associated with the addition and removal of snow. In the case of the observed and computed albedo distributions, the changes seem more gradual, perhaps in association with impurity changes. Please note these differences.
- The reviewer is correct, and we will revise and note these differences in the manuscript accordingly. See response to Dr. Pope’s Distributed Discussion Comment #8.
40. P. 4754, Lines 7-11: As noted above, the observed abrupt shifts in MODIS distributions may be a result of snow addition or removal rather than changes in impurities, so the statement that changes

in deposition of impurities will likely result in abrupt shifts in albedo seems to be a bit of a stretch.

- We will revise the manuscript to clarify that in the 2013 MODIS albedo distributions, it appears that the bimodal distribution seen is actually from the addition and removal of snow. We will include a new analysis of the 2012 MODIS albedo distributions, which likely cannot be explained by transitions from snow to ice or vice versa. Instead, the 2012 MODIS albedo distributions likely reflect abrupt shifts in ablation zone albedo from the exposure of impurities on the ice surface as well as ice crystal growth and possible expansion of dirty ice areas. See response to Dr. Pope's Distributed Discussion Comment #8. Differences in the observed shifts in the MODIS albedo distributions for 2012 and 2013 melt seasons will be added into the Discussion section of the manuscript.

41. P. 4755, Line 1: "of which these processes. . ." is awkward. Please remove or include in a new sentence.

- We will remove 'of which these processes' as requested.

42. Figure 1: The text within the inset is hard to read. Can the text or inset be made slightly larger? Also, there is no scale bar for the inset.

- We will make the text within the inset and the inset itself larger as requested. A scale bar will be added in the inset into Figure 1 as requested.

43. Figure 1, Caption: Indicate that the yellow boxes show MODIS pixel extents.


- We will indicate in the caption that the yellow boxes show the MODIS pixel extents as requested.

44. Figure 4: As noted above, I suggest removing this figure. If the figure is included or revised, the x and y axes should be adjusted to have the same range, and the graph should be made square so that both axes are scaled equally. The difference in the axes results in the appearance of a weak relationship between the variables, although there is some correlation indicated by the statistics.

- We will keep Figure 4 in the manuscript. It will be updated per reviewer suggestions. See the response to Dr. Pope's ASD Data Collection Comment #5 and reviewer 2 Specific Comment #19.

45. Figure 6: The circles used to indicate individual MODIS measurements don't show up on the legend. If possible please revise the legend.

- We have updated Figure 6 below.



Updated Figure 6. High-quality daily average broadband $\alpha_{\text{ASD Pixel 1}}$ and $\alpha_{\text{ASD Pixel 2}}$, α_{base} (for $\text{SZA} < 70^\circ$), and $\alpha_{\text{MOD Pixel 1}}$ and $\alpha_{\text{MOD Pixel 2}}$ time series for the 2013 melt season. $\alpha_{\text{ASD Pixel 1}}$ and $\alpha_{\text{ASD Pixel 2}}$ pixel-averaged values correspond to high-quality ASD transect dates 16, 19 and 25 June. Note, α_{top} was removed as requested (see reviewer 2 Specific Comment #20).

46. Figure 9, Caption: Mention that the distributions are computed for the site of Chandler et al. (2014)

- We will include that the distributions were computed for a nearby site of Chandler et al. (2014) as requested.

47. Figure 11, Caption: Mention in the caption what the melt rates are relative to.

- We will include in the caption that the melt rates were relative to ‘early summer ice (1 Jun)’ distribution as requested.

Response to Technical Corrections:

1. P. 4738, Line 13: Change “30 August.” to “30 August 2013.” for clarity.
 - Changed to include the year as requested.
2. P. 4739, Line 22: Change “Large-scale” to “The large-scale”.
 - Included ‘the’ at the beginning of the sentence as requested.
3. P. 4739, Line 25: Change “lack of” to “a lack of”
 - Added ‘a’ as requested.
4. P. 4741, Lines 18-19: Suggest changing “surface type’s fractional area” to “fractional area

- of surface types”.
- Switched to ‘fractional area of surface types’ as requested.
5. P. 4741, Line 22: Change “changing albedo and surface type coverage’s impact on” to “impact of changing albedo and surface type coverage on”
 - Changed the sentence to ‘impact of changing albedo and surface type coverage on’ as requested.
 6. P. 4744, Line 24: Change “were” to “was”.
 - Changed to singular form as requested.
 7. P. 4745, Line 10: “information” can be removed.
 - Removed unnecessary word as requested.
 8. P. 4745, Line 26: Fig. 3a is referred to here, but α_{top} measurements are not provided in Fig. 3a. Please revise.
 - Revised to say that α_{top} measurements are not shown, as requested.
 9. P. 4745, Line 4: Should the reference be to Fig. 3a rather than 3b?
 - The reference is to Fig. 3b. Fig. 3a refers only to SZA dependence. The reference to the hysteresis in α_{top} measurements is misplaced and will be removed from the sentence. This statement was intended to highlight that only the Base Met Station CC was presented in Fig. 3b, and relate it back to the hysteresis observed in the albedo observations collected at the Top Met Station. This will be clarified in the manuscript.
 10. P. 4748, Line 4: Change “data is” to “data are”.
 - Changed to ‘data are’ as requested.
 11. P. 4748, Line 26: Remove “to” from “ \geq to”.
 - Removed ‘to’ as requested.
 12. P. 4749, Line 15: Change “ α_{ASD} spatial range” to “The spatial range of α_{ASD} ”.
 - Changed the sentence to ‘the spatial range of α_{ASD} ’ as requested.
 13. P. 4749, Line 25: Change “by” to “for”.
 - Replaced ‘by’ with ‘for’ as requested.
 14. P. 4750, Line 6: Change “temporal variability show a general agreement” to “there is a general agreement with regards to temporal variability” or something similar.
 - Switched the sentence to say that ‘there is general agreement with regards to temporal variability’ as requested.
 15. P. 4750, Line 9: Change “within 10 m” to “within a 10 m”
 - Added in ‘a’ as requested.
 16. P. 4752, Line 11: Change “GrIS’s” to “GrIS”
 - Changed to singular form as requested.
-