Dear Editor,

please find our revised manuscript as well as the point-by-point response to the reviewer's comments.

Minor changes in the manuscript are :

- 1) Addition of an outline of the sections as requested by the reviewer
- 2) Removal of Lines 183-189 (and associated section in the supplement) about the influence of specific events. This analyses interested a reviewer from the first round, but we agree with the reviewer here that is comes out of the blue and we don't think it is directly linked to the story of this study.
- 3) Corrections of small typo-mistakes.

Best regards,

C. Kittel on behalf of all co-authors

Review of Kittel

The authors conducted one of the most intensive revisions that I have seen, which I commend. They addressed all of my and the other reviewers concerns in large detail, and the entire manuscript has benefited as a result. Therefore I will recommend publication, after some of my small remaining comments below are addressed.

We would like to thank again the reviewer for the first comments we received as well for the new reading of our revised manuscript. This has really helped us to improve our manuscript and we are glad that we addressed them all.

Minor comments:

Introduction:

Especially in the new version of the manuscript, I miss an outline of the sections in the last paragraph. I.e.:" section 2 we discuss ... ", "in section 3 ..". etc.

Added, thanks for the suggestion.

Lines 140-141: You note "a summer melt increase" but the figure just shows the cumulative anomaly.

Changed for: Our four simulations project an increase in cumulative summer melt over the ice shelves that strongly differs depending on the forcing ESM during the 21st century.

Lines 183-189: Where does this part come from? It comes out of the blue, and I am not in favor of discussing results solely based on figures in the Supplementary material.

This analyses interested a reviewer from the first round, but we agree that is comes out of the blue and we don't think it is directly linked to the story of this study. It is now removed but the results will remain available in the interactive discussion for people who might be concerned.

Figure 4, last line: "used"◊"using". Thanks.

Throughout the edited parts (in blue in the track changes file), some new sentences were a bit hurried with minor typos. I will not note them all separately, but please check the final version well on small errors.

We checked it again and hope we found them all, thanks for the information.