

We first would like to thank the reviewer comments which will help to improve our manuscript.

A lot of competent work has been performed comparing the MAR regional climate model against the ERA-Interim and especially ERA5 global reanalyses in relation to surface meteorological observations from the margins of the Greenland ice sheet (ASR as well). My main concern is that the analysis is incomplete as it stands because the analysis does not represent the entire ice sheet (see Figure 1). Obvious surface data sets for an expanded evaluation are from GC-Net and Summit. And because SMB is the focus, snow accumulation and melt extent in relation to satellite passive microwave observations comparisons are needed. In summary, more than a Brief Communication is required.

The SMB analyse of MAR is not the goal of our paper. We aimed to evaluate the near-surface climate of different reanalyses against the regional climate model MAR. As reanalyses do not provide SMB, this would be a single assessment of the MAR ability to represent the SMB and melt at high resolution. This is the subject of a future planned paper where we will evaluate the MAR SMB and melt at high resolution with satellite passive microwave observations among other things when ERA5 will be available over its whole period 1950-2019. Over 1979-2018, MAR SMB forced by ERA-Interim and ERA5 are very similar but over the ERA40 period, it could be very different.

We agree that having a larger observation cover over Greenland ice sheet for our analyse will be better. However, the reason why we chosen only the PROMICE observations (which cover mainly the ablation area of the GrIS) is these ones are not assimilated into the reanalyses. This means our comparison is completely independent of observations. If observations of GC-Net and Summit network are included, statistical results would be more favourable to the reanalyses as they are not independent of these observations. However, if the editor requires such an additional analysis, we can add a supplementary observations-dependent comparison with more in situ observations.

#### Other comments

1. Title: "Interest of a" makes the title strange.
2. Page 4, line 5: "following"
3. Page 7, line 11: "an insignificant".
4. Page 10: Provide the title for the Cox et al. Reference.
5. Page 12, line 18: "ATSR"?

Ok, thanks. All of these will be taken into account in the revised version of our paper.