Reply to Anonymous Referee #1 comments on revised manuscript " Comparison of manual snow water equivalent measurements: seeking the reference for a true SWE value in boreal biome" by Maxime Beaudoin-Galaise and Sylvain Jutras, The Cryosphere Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2021-354-RC1, 24 Jun 2022

On behalf of Sylvain Jutras, co-author, and myself, I thank the anonymous referee #1 for his comments and suggestions on the revised version of our manuscript. Following the reading of his report, responses to each comment have been formulated point-by-point. It is possible to see the changes made to the manuscript in a new author's track-changes file.

Comments from the reviewer in blue Answer in black Modification to the manuscript in red (line number related to track-changes file)

Thanks for the adaptions. I have only three minor points left, all in Conclusions:

1. L622: The sentence makes no sense, instead I suggest: In the context of the boreal biome, which is different from an arctic or alpine environment, the "true" SWE of the snowpack is frequently determined in a snow pit with a non-continuous sampling strategy using a small size density cutter.

The sentence has been modified as suggested.

2. L626: This snow pit-based method has been used to measure the SWE of the snowpack, but in the literature, there is no evaluation of its uncertainty and its measurement error at this level.

The error in this sentence has been corrected.

3. L647: ...performance of the Hydro-Québec sampler (HQS) and Université Laval sampler (ULS), which both use a plate at the ground surface to prevent snow loss.

This addition has been made in the revised version.