Dear Dr. Avanzi:

Re. Paper TC-2015-16

In view of the unanimous referee comments, and my own reading of the manuscript, I will have to accept the recommendation of the referees to reject this paper. The key aspects noted by the referees are that:

- 1. the paper presents and describes a very promising technique for future snow measurement surveys, with a great potential for hydrological studies,
- 2. the quality of the paper is good, but lacks the traditional measurement dataset for comparison and validation, and
- 3. that the authors should resubmit the paper with a more extensive validation data set.

Given this, and my discussions with a member of the editorial board, I would strongly invite you to re-submit this paper for publication when you have the necessary data. I am well aware of the difficulty of carrying out extensive snow surveys in difficult terrain, and with the large number of data points needed to validating high resolution remote sensing methods. However, I certainly feel that this is possible.

I have also obtained permission that TC/TCD will waive the processing charges when you submit a second, revised version of this paper. Please remember that you will have to state this in your cover letter when you re-submit.

In addition, if you would prefer, I can write a brief editorial comment that will be placed in the interactive discussion that will summarizes the praise for the manuscript from the three reviewers, the issue with the lack of data, and outlining that I hope that the paper will be resubmitted with additional data. When you do, hopefully, resubmit I can then add another editorial comment in the Interactive Discussion of the second paper in order to ensure that the link is clear between paper #1 and paper #2.

I look forward to seeing the second paper as soon as you have the needed data set.

Sincerely,

Philip Margh

Philip Marsh