

## General comments

It is evident that the authors have put much work into improving the readability and overall quality of this manuscript. I can gladly say that I think they succeeded, and I only have small rephrasing suggestions! I recommend this for acceptance with minor technical corrections for publication.

## Line-specific comments

Below, the line numbers represent those in the revised manuscript.

**L45:** All these new references are from work based on aerial and terrestrial photographs. I suggest to move the reference before the “Corona and Hexagon” satellite names, or to rephrase the sentence to fit the references better.

**L120:** It would be nice with a second reference to your appendix table with the ArcticDEM ID here.

**L126:** This is the first time SRTM-3 is mentioned. Could you clarify in a parenthesis what the difference is to SRTM-1? (It’s stated further down, but the reader is introduced to the abbreviation here)

**L135-141:** Great explanation!

**L145:** I believe the second “shadow” in this sentence should be in plural.

**L234-235:** “[...] shows a sinusoidal up and down.” sounds like a word is missing. Perhaps “[...] shows a sinusoidal variation up and down throughout the seasons.”?

**L265:** Please change “[...] 10 times that of [...]” to “[...] 10 times more negative than [...]” or similar to lower ambiguity about this statement (it’s unclear in which direction it is 10 times different).

**L418:** If you wrote “less negative” instead of “lower” the sentence would read better in my opinion. -1.42 is lower than -1.08, but the magnitude is the opposite (as I presume you allude to). I find it less confusing to write “less negative”.

**L488:** Romain is indeed a “hepful” person! (Little typo in “help”)