

Dear Liz and Bernd,

Thank you very much for polishing the paper, comments and suggestions. We hope that the current version of the paper would avoid obscurities and grammatical irregularities and reaches TC requirements.

Regarding to Bernd's comments:

1. Page 2, line 36: From the wording, it is not clear that the lunar rocks gave insight into the origin and evolution of our planet, not subglacial samples (at least not into the origin). A better wording may be: "... comparable to the lunar rocks, which gave insight ...".

Corrected.

2. Page 2, line 56, "The polar engineering community continues to work on the development of the new concepts and technologies for sampling subglacial lakes". This sentence refers to the time after the latest field tests. But the references are from 2002 and 2007???

Reformulated as following: "In addition, there have been several proposals for sampling subglacial lakes that did not go further than preliminary conceptual level (Blake and Price, 2002; Fleckenstein and Eustes, 2007)."

3. Page 3, line 79: "do" => "does"

Corrected.

4. Page 3, line 90: "lakes" or "a lake", but not "a lakes"

Corrected.

5. While the English is understandable, it still needs to be improved. For example, quite some "the"s and "a"s are missing.

The paper was checked by professional English editors two times (before first and second submissions) but perhaps not good enough. Scientific editor, Liz Bagshaw, helped us to check and to polish the current version of the paper.