

Dear Editor,

Hereby, we would like to submit a revised version of our manuscript and a response to your comments in the following way:

Thank you very much for this corrected manuscript along the lines of the referee. You indeed answered to most of it. I am still left with two items:

a) The reviewer specifically asked that all meteorological variables are mentioned with only one decimal.. he says "do this throughout".. but I still found some with two decimals!.. can you perform this full screening of your manuscript to be sure none is left over... thank you

Corrected as requested. Now all meteorological variables are mentioned with only one decimal.

b) The referee still regrets that you use strong correlation as "causality".. you changed that in the place he mentions it (d18O vs. Temperatures), but the reviewer suggests that you might have made similar statement elsewhere in the paper.. please ensure that this is not the case and correct accordingly if it is the case!..

We agree that we should not mix correlation and causality. Therefore, we checked the text and deleted a part that created this ambiguity.

“Relatively high correlations between daily $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and temperature ($r=0.89$), and also between daily $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and specific humidity ($r = 0.85$), highlight the role of temperature and humidity as the main drivers of $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ variations in water vapour.” Is removed (Revised manuscript, Subsubsection 4.1.1, line 378).

We hope that the revised manuscript now is qualified for publication in The Cryosphere.