

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your careful checking our manuscript and information of interesting paper. We have misunderstood your comments in the previous version on the assumption of snow or ice density. We have revised the density of scenario 2, and calculated mass balance, and added Huss, (2013) in the reference list, as follows. Revised parts are written in red.

*** > #### (: *** has revised to ####)

L10 -0.17 > -0.18

L173 (Huss, 2013) has added.

850 ± 60 > 900

L189 850 > 900

L228 -0.19 > -0.20

L229 0.17 > 0.18

L308 -0.17 > -0.18

L320 -0.29 > -0.30

L342 -0.17 > -0.18

L404 added Huss, 2013 in the list

L507 850 ± 60 (Latter one) > 900

Table 3 Mass balances of Scenario 2 and Average were revised.

Figure 8 has revised (mass balance of Kanchenjunga has a little bit decreased)

Thank you.

Regards,

Akiko