

I've made the desired comparison, both in the supplemental and the main text. (I assume this is all the reviewer was looking for.) Here are the new sentences, added after the tables in both the relevant sections:

In the main text:

This is most likely an indication of real differences in the SLR vs. GRACE data, not something caused by the processing technique itself, as trend errors from the inversion method are expected to be just $1.3 \pm 1.6\%$ (see Table S1).

In the supplemental text:

The real-world trend differences between GRACE and SLR over the combined Greenland/Antarctica area range between 7% and 41% (see Table 1 in the main text), so an expected 1.3% error caused by the technique is acceptable in comparison.

Thank you again for your time,
Jennifer Bonin