

Review of van de Berg et al 2020.

Dear editor and authors,

the authors have taken on board many of the suggestions from myself and the other two reviewers, and the manuscript has improved in terms of accuracy and explanation. I particularly appreciate the effort to highlight that the 2.2km resolution runs were experimental and to show that, despite producing a relatively accurate SMB, the results are not physically realistic. My concern that this paper could spark the use of high-resolution hydrostatic models has now been resolved with this additional effort. I also think the Taylor diagrams have become clearer to interpret through enlarging some areas (Fig 5) and by including more description in the text. There are now only one or two very minor corrections required. After this, I recommend publishing this manuscript. As a side note, I suggest that the authors are careful with their use of 'his/he' when talking about the reviewer (e.g 'We would like to thank the reviewer for his constructive comments'), as this review was anonymous, and I am actually female.

Pg3, Ln 49: remove 's' from models to read: 'This type of model'

Pg3, Ln 50: change 'yet' to 'currently'

Pg 8, Ln 193: reword second part of sentence to: 'with the abbreviated name in brackets'

Pg21, Ln 438, 'It' needs to be lowercase.

Pg21, Ln 442, suitable should be suitably.

Pg 22, Ln 453, change to: shows the increase in SMB if *the run* was started with...

Check use of British or American spelling throughout. On page 19, line 371 'behavior' is spelt in the American way. Whereas page 21, line 434 'kilometre' is the British spelling.