

Comments to the Author:

Dear Drs. Williams, Rampal and Bouillon,

Thank you for your response to the reviewers, and thank you to the reviewers for their time and consideration.

Please proof read the paper. Some specific edits to consider are given below.
This has now been done.

1. Abstract line 8: "too little to induce a very large WRS". This is vague wording, if you can quantify or clarify do.

This sentence has been rephrased.

2. I suggest you be consistent in your hyphenation of sea ice. When it is a compound adjective (as in the title of the paper), you may hyphenate. If you do, do so throughout the manuscript. e.g. pg 2 line 23 is missing a hyphen. Note, it is up to you whether you decide to hyphenate sea ice or not. I do not see a journal policy on this. Just be consistent.

We have now used "sea-ice" throughout when it is a compound adjective.

Figure 2 is referenced before Figure 1. You could avoid this by moving the new section 2.3 up in the manuscript. It seems out of place where it is anyway.

We have swapped sections 2.2 and 2.3.

Page 12, line 10 (and elsewhere), punctuate e.g..

We have changed to e.g. throughout.

Page 13, line 1: There is one to many 'to's in this line. Also ration -> ratio

Corrected.

Section 5.1: Should this be in the results section?

We think it is best here as it is not really anything original theoretically, but only a not on the forcings used in the results section. If you still think it should be moved we could move it to an appendix perhaps?

Page 17 and elsewhere: Please reference the figures with their number and panel letter. From the instructions for authors:

"The abbreviation "Fig." should be used when it appears in running text and should be followed by a number unless it comes at the beginning of a sentence, e.g.: "The results are depicted in Fig. 5. Figure 9 reveals that..."."

It is unclear which figure you are referring to when you just reference the letters. At least this is the case when reading too quickly!

Figure references corrected, although we haven't abbreviated – should we do this?

Page 18, line 1: "solid curves in Fig. ?? are created"

Figure reference added.

Page 19, line 10: is (42) a missing reference?

It is an equation - this has now been clarified.

Sincerely,
Jenny

Non-public comments to the Author:

This article is an interesting contribution to the conversation on how to model wave-ice interaction. There are some aspects of the experiment set-up that are perhaps not realistic in the context of sea ice, and I appreciate that you point these out.

Consider thanking the reviewers in the acknowledgements if you found their input valuable.

Acknowledgements updated.