

Author response to Editor Decision: Publish subject to technical corrections (24 Jun 2021)

Alex Brisbane, 28th June 2021

We are grateful to the editor and anonymous reviewer for the additional time they have spent reviewing the updated version of our manuscript. We have addressed the “technical corrections” in line with all recommendations, as outlined below.

p. 5, line 74: Should say "... when an ice core has not been recovered..."?

Done.

Figure 7: c) top plot: should this not be azimuth 0 not 90 ?

Well spotted! Corrected.

Figure 7: I would label P-wave and S-wave in one of the boxes, maybe a) top left plot (isotropic) just to help the reader get their eye in quickly. I would also label the shear wave splitting in c) middle plot again to guide the reader. This is a nice clear example of the shear wave splitting.

Good idea. Done.

Figure 6: P wave travelttime is this in seconds? Maybe worth adding this.

Yes, done. In addition, we have clarified at L328 that amplitudes from the ATRAK software are displacement.