

The study presents a new method for assessing forecasts of an expanding sea ice front by measuring the displacement of the edge. The method is promising and the author has done major revisions to the manuscript, thereby making the article suitable for publication in the Cryosphere. I address the response that the author has made to my comments and mention other minor points here:

1. In the revised version, the author has added more information regarding the applicability and the results derived from the method, thus issues with understanding the use scenario of the method have been addressed.
2. The author added lines to highlight how the method mentioned here is different from existing validation metrics. This issue has therefore been resolved.
3. Additional information has been added to the validation results in section 3.2 showing clearly the evaluation of the displacement distributions. The author has also replaced table 2 with Figure 5, which makes reading the results easier and intuitive.
4. In response to comment 2 (RC2), the author has included a subdivision of the validation domain into an eastern and western part, thereby including a spatial comparison of the results. While the average ranks of the model displacement vary only slightly between the two sections, the rank histogram in figure 7 shows that some slots have a larger frequency difference. The subdivision is therefore a good addition to the analysis.
5. The author has been kind enough to clear my misunderstanding regarding the distribution described in line 219 and also detailed the process how they arrived at the numbers given. The updated percentiles are correct.
6. At various points in the manuscript, the author has referred to the methods described in the paper as “present methods”. While this is generally clear, it can be confused with methods that are already present, in literature or common scientific practice. For example, in lines 235-237 of the new manuscript: “The present methods provide that are not provided with existing metrics” could be made clearer by instead using the term “The methods presented here provide....” or another suitable phrasing.