

Review of revised manuscript, “GrSMBMIP: Intercomparison of the modelled 1980-2012 surface mass balance over the Greenland Ice Sheet” by Fettweis and coauthors.

I have examined the revised manuscript and a letter to the editor describing 8 significant changes in revision together with a tracked-change document. It should be clear that *the letter does not constitute a point-by-point response to reviewer comments*. I find that startling, and it should be noted by the editor.

From the letter and revised manuscript, it may be possible to chart progress on my seven points previously raised through some detective work, albeit without the authors’ reasoning for acceding or discounting each question. In the absence of this reasoning I can only again recommend minor revision. I attempt to assess the response to the previous review below.

1. The first point asked whether the model intercomparison should be more emphasized. The manuscript appears to have been re-ordered such that the model intercomparison now appears first. This seems like a reasonable response, and it appears that the manuscript is now more focused on the intercomparison section.
2. It was suggested that the figures be re-ordered by model type as rather than alphabetically. This does not appear to have been addressed. It doesn’t really make any sense to have the figures presented alphabetically, and grouping the figures by model type would better indicate the differences among these groups.
3. The third point suggested an expanded comparison with earlier intercomparison studies to provide some understanding of how models have improved. The authors do not appear to have taken up this point.
4. The abstract has been reduced in length and appears to be much improved.
5. Both reviewers commented on an overly-lengthy description of the models. The revision has added a clarifying Table 1. The introduction now also contains a section describing the four kinds of models considered. But it remains unclear as to why it is necessary to include ~300 words of description for each of the models within the main text. The specific models and most important parts of their individual characteristics should be added to the new introduction section, with the remainder of these details going into a supplementary section.
6. My sixth point asked about the difference in amount between models that computed snowfall with those that incorporated the snowfall of the reanalysis. It does appear that section 4 has been rewritten to better address questions of the model differences. Ok here.
7. A list of acronyms was suggested. The authors do not appear to have taken up this point.