

Dear Dr Turton and co-authors,

Thank you for your patience with the extended review period of this paper. I am pleased to see a positive set of reviews, with some constructive suggestions that you have addressed in your initial response. I now request that you upload your updated manuscript including the changes detailed in your response. I also request a number of minor amendments (listed below) in addition to those suggested by the authors.

L31: perhaps include a reference to a hydrofracturing paper – eg. Bell, Kingslake or Banwell.

L74: errant comma after '(fluxes directed towards the surface are defined positive), '

L88: 'aim to extend the scope' is not really sufficient justification for the study. Please tell us plainly how this study is novel. Both reviewers raise this issue, and I noted it in my initial assessment. It is clear from the paper that the study is indeed new, but that it necessarily builds on existing work by yourself and other authors. I think this just requires better 'selling' in your introduction, and also in your conclusions.

Table 3: Following Jan's suggestion, since you have included percentages in brackets for some rows, why not include for all? That gives us a quick idea of the % of melt days, foehn days as well as the foehn days with or without melt. Also, the final 'foehn' in the caption is capitalised – is this intentional?

L530: the first sentence of the conclusion is rather long. Could you cut it in half?

L541: can you tell us how the results of this study differ from those published previously? At the moment, this rather reads as if it's just another paper in a long line of similar studies. Given the concerns about novelty (see reviews and my comments previously, and above), I would appreciate a strong defence of why this particular paper is important.

Thank you for your contribution to The Cryosphere, I look forward to reading your revised manuscript.

Kind regards,

Dr Liz Bagshaw