

Dear authors

I am pleased with your revised manuscript. The referees have two small points I ask you to address. Some additional minor editorial points are listed below.

*Referee #1*

I only noted one technical detail that should be corrected before publication: the acronym for the Nash-Sutcliffe coefficient is sometimes written "NSC" (e.g., line 214), sometimes "NSE" (e.g., line 247 and in Table 2). Please stick to one acronym throughout the manuscript.

*Referee #2*

On line 122 it is said that SNOWPACK does not use the precipitation data and on line 130 it is said that "A threshold of 50 % in relative humidity was set for all stations for rainfall/snowfall discrimination". Does that mean that SNOWPAK sees rain or snowfall when the relative humidity is over 50 %? I am confused. How does SNOWPACK deal with precipitation coming from the observation and the bias adjusted RCM data. Could the author clarify this?

*Editorial comments*

Line 35 (and elsewhere in the manuscript): You may consider replacing "man-made".

Lines 74-78: The way the hypotheses and research questions are stated is a bit unusual and you never refer to the abbreviations (H1, etc) you introduce. You may as well just state: We hypothesize that ICV is a major ... and IAV will change. Hence, we address the research questions: What are the uncertainties ... and how does...

Line 114: I am not sure whether you were actually considering snow transport by wind in your SNOWPACK simulation. If yes, I suggest you change "wind transportation" into "snow transport by wind". If no, I suggest you delete "wind transportation".

Line 248 (and elsewhere in the manuscript): My preference is elevation rather than altitude. "Altitude is for things that fly" I was once taught by a reviewer.

Line 531: You may consider adding "the high-elevation station" Weissfluhjoch. This would provide some explanation.

10 July 2020  
Jürg Schweizer