

Response to Technical Corrections

The authors would like to thank the Editor for his careful reading and constructive comments on our last submission.

We apologize for making it harder for the Editor to parse our previous rebuttal letter. It appeared to us a complete rebuttal letter with responses to all questions from both reviewers and the Editor would be the best choice.

We now reply in more details to each of the technical corrections from the Editor.

As an answer to my previous comment “L426. I would insist here on the need for high temporal resolution data. Right now this is not the case in the Hugonnet et al. dataset because ASTER acquisitions were scarce and their uncertainties rather high”, you simply wrote in the rebuttal letter “ Following the reviewers' ”. It seems that part of your answer was deleted. Can you provide the full sentence in a brief response?

We apologize for the incomplete answer in our previous rebuttal letter.

Following the Editor's comments on L426, we have now reworked the sentence which now reads: "The impact of surging over more localized scales thus need to be further quantified. This requires the thorough study of a greater number of higher temporal resolution datasets to cover the entire surge cycle of a significant glacier sample and provide low-uncertainty mass balance estimates."

L442. In my previous review, I suggested the replacement of "than" by "that". You made this replacement but for the wrong line! So now an error between “than”/”that” needs to be corrected L442 and L443.

We have fixed this.