

Thank you to the editor for going through the paper once more in detail and spotting a number of mistakes. Your comments are in italics and our response to each comment in bold.

Line 17: 'WAIS' – acronym not defined **Done**

Line 25: 'sea-level rise' should always be hyphenated. Please also check that use of a hyphen in the phrase 'early warning' is consistent throughout the text **All instances of hyphenation in early warning and sea-level rise fixed**

Line 34: update the Oppenheimer et al. reference **Done**

Line 70: PIG is already defined on line 37 **Done**

Line 194: pacific -> Pacific **Done**

Line 422: the relaxation time increases as you approach the tipping point (TR -2 decreases) **Done**

Line 731: please use consistent units for basal melt rate **Done**

Suggested edits:

Line 14: 'committing a glacier to...' – MISI theory was developed to describe ice sheet behaviour but can be applied to glaciers under certain conditions. Suggesting revising the text to reflect the original purpose of the theory **The difference is largely semantic and although frequently associated with an idealised ice sheet configuration in reality the theory is most relevant to individual glaciers since these are the dynamic portions of the ice sheet where grounding lines will be advancing/retreating. It is true that Weertman originally referred to ice sheets in his 1974 paper, but that is not a limit on the theory and what is important are the mathematical assumptions on which the theory is based, most notably of course that it is two dimensional. Since we do give an overview of MISI theory in the first paragraph and this association with glacier retreat is very common we do not feel that it would lead to confusion regarding the important aspects of MISI theory and referring to glaciers in our case makes sense since this is what we are modelling.**

Lines 23-24: sentence revised in response to reviewer comments, but grammar is now awkward **Done**

Line 30: do you mean 'increase in accumulation'? **Yes indeed, changed as suggested**

Line 76: 'multiple smaller tipping points' – smaller than what? Are these in addition to the main three tipping points identified by your analysis? **Here we refer to the three tipping points identified in the paper and we said smaller to reflect that several tipping events led to a collapse of the glacier, rather than one single event. Wording altered to make this point clearer.**

Lines 80-81: in your response to reviewer 1 you explain the difference between early warning signals and early warning indicators; it would be useful to also summarise the difference for the reader **Done as suggested**

Line 117: 'to be more similar' -> 'to become increasingly similar' **Done**

Line 129: details of the rescaling are unclear; you do not define what you mean by 'a critical value' and it is not clear what value 0.5 (white noise) is mapped to **We added a sentence defining what is meant by a critical value. We now explicitly refer the reader to the details of the rescaling in Livina and Lenton (2007)**

Line 274: 'a range of melt rates between these two states' – it is implied, but not explicitly stated, that each steady state can be related to a specific melt rate, please clarify **Reworded this sentence**

Line 295: 'We show results' – make it clear that this phrase relates to results presented above **Done**

Line 340: 'may have failed' -> 'may fail' **Done**

Line 361: 'this methodology' -> 'our methodology' **Done**

Line 368: delete 'that we did not identify' **Done**

Line 402: 'a +1.2°C change in ocean temperatures' – relative to what? **Specified this is relative to initial model conditions**

Figure 4 caption: 'The steady states... are plotted as dashed grey lines' – rephrase to say that the steady states plot along the grey dashed lines, and the details are shown in Fig. 4b **Done**