

Response to referee #1

We appreciate the referee for the comments on our manuscript. All these comments are very important guides to improve the quality of our manuscripts. We will discuss and attempt to answer the points you raised in the following (replies are in blue):

General comments:

This manuscript describes the development of a deep learning methodology using neural networks and post processing of remote sensing imagery to automatically detect glacial boundaries. This work builds upon existing efforts in the field to address the labor-intensive task of surveying glacial changes over time for the purposes of further study. The method proposed uses an improved neural network design based on the Deeplabv3+ architecture to classify glacial pixels in the satellite imagery, and adds Convolutional Block Attention Modules to aid in identifying important glacier features during the automatic extraction task. The description of the method details is rigorous, which includes consideration such as the use of weighted Dice coefficient loss during neural network training, the use of image subsetting/patching to contend with computational limits/image constraints, and the use of Test Time Augmentation to produce a high confidence classification of glacial boundaries. The study evaluates this improved methodology on glaciers in the Tanggula and Kunlun Mountains using Gaogen-6 panchromatic/multispectral optical satellite imagery. The overall accuracy (99.58% out of 100%) and Kappa coefficient (0.9915 out of 1.0) of the resulting classifications is high, and while there are differences in the estimated glacial coverage between the method and existing glacial inventories, the study shows potential for further development and application.

Overall, the manuscript, its methodology, and its findings are sound. This study builds upon previous work, and it advances our understanding of automated glacial feature extraction, though it is limited in scope. There are some remarks to address and minor copy-editing which are listed below and under the specific comments. Given this, I recommend minor revisions with attention to comments, at the editor's discretion.

Thanks a lot for your approval.

Major comments:

1. One concern to raise is the choice of evaluation metrics. Existing literature in the field of automated glacial boundary extraction (Mohajerani et al. (2019, TC), Baumhoer et al. (2019, RS), Zhang et al. (2021, RSE), Cheng et al. (2021, TC), Robson et al. (2020), and He et al. (2021) use a wider variety of metrics not limited to OA and Kappa coefficients. More specifically, OA as a metric is subject to bias/skew depending on the test data, as small but important errors along glacial boundaries can be underrepresented given a large enough domain that is more easily classified. Most of the above also provide more robust accuracy metrics as the mean distance from the boundary in meters/pixels, and the Mean Intersection over Union. Thus, it is recommended that these two metrics be included for a more robust representation of errors along glacial boundaries, and allow for an easier comparison of this study's methodology with respect to others in the field.

Thanks for your valuable suggestion. We replaced the evaluation metrics with Kappa coefficient, Mean Intersection over Union, F1-score and average symmetric surface distance, which were used in the experimental results to compare our method with other methods in the field. However, we

calculated the average distance to the boundary in slightly different ways. For example, Marochov et al. (2021, TC), Baumhoer et al. (2019, RS), and Cheng et al. (2021, TC) studied the boundary of a specific glacier, such as its terminus or grounding line. Therefore, only the extracted boundary of the target glacier was used to calculate the average distance to the ground truth, which ignores errors of recognizing other features as glaciers in the imagery. Since the results of semantic segmentation are directly compared with the ground truth in our paper, the results obtained from semantic segmentation are usually the boundaries of all glaciers in the input image, so there may be cases where non-glacier regions are recognized as glacier when extracting boundaries. We take this into account and calculate the error of non-glacier region boundaries, as detailed in the revised manuscript.

2. Another concern is the scope/applicability of the technique to other glaciers, and under more difficult imaging conditions than just thin clouds/snow. While the methodology shows good results on the testing data, it is limited to 4 ideal images of 2 locations (Tanggula and Kunlun Mountains). Existing works (Cheng et al., 2021) have proven the applicability of similar methods to wider applications, but additional testing on different domains/image conditions/SAR data may be useful ensure that this neural network has not overtrained on the training data. Since this may be outside the scope of the study (as touched upon in the conclusion), this may be done at the authors' discretion, but it may be of interest to see how well the neural network model has generalized from the data it has trained on.

Thanks for your helpful suggestions. As you mentioned, adding more test data would be very useful, but currently we have limited access to high-resolution images, so we can only test our method in as many cases as possible. To further demonstrate that our method can be applied to more areas, we added six control experiments in section 3.3. This includes 10 different areas in Tanggula Mountains, Kunlun Mountains and Qilian Mountains. In addition, we added a discussion section (Section 4.1) to discuss the effectiveness of this method under different conditions. Under more difficult imaging conditions where there is thick snow cover, the method may identify snow as glaciers, but we do not recommend the use of poor quality images, considering that glacier studies are usually based on good-quality images.

3. Section 4.2 provides a potentially valuable comparison between the study's glacial extent data product, and that of manually curated glacial extents. However, due to the time differences between the measurements (2020 for the study, 1999-2003 for GGI, and 2013-2018 for TPG2017), the comparison is not as useful as it could be. While this may also be out of scope for this study, it would be interesting to see a co-temporal comparison of glacial extents if such data exists. Otherwise, the differences in area/% changes make the potential errors from the methodology hard to separate from potential changes in the glaciers over time.

Thanks for your suggestion. As you said, it would make more sense to compare glacier datasets at the same year. However, the fact is that the Gaofen-6 satellite was launched on June 2, 2018, and the CGI and TPG2017 datasets were completed in earlier year. Undoubtedly, there are differences among these glacier datasets due to glacier recession. Considering that glacier change usually occurs in its ablation area, while its shape especially in accumulation zone remains stable. So the comparison in section 4.2 is to confirm that the data we acquired are similar in shape to those of GGI and TPG2017, proving the reliability of the data.

Specific Comments:

P2 L31: “researches of” -> “research on”

P2 L 37: “a relatively accurate results” -> “relatively accurate results”

P4 L82: “a upsampling” -> “an upsampling”

P4 L88: “internal correlation, its basic” -> “internal correlation. Its basic”

P18 L295: Zhang et al. (2019) and Cheng et al. (2021) both use single spectrum data inputs and don't utilize spectrum information, and already rely on texture/shape information.

P19 L305: “And,” -> “Additionally,”

P20 L331: “2m that” -> “2m, such that”, “more detail” -> “more detailed”

P20 L331- 335: Consider splitting these long sentences/rephrasing (i.e., “intact glaciers, although in a few cases...” -> “intact glaciers. However, in a few cases...”

P21 L347: “glacier extracted” -> “glacier extraction”

P21 L349: “extracting complete glacier” -> “extraction complete glaciers”

P21 L350: “And then comparison” -> “Comparison”

P21 L351: “which could distinguish glacier” -> “which could distinguish glaciers”

Thanks for your earnest suggestions. We corrected all these mistakes as you mentioned. With the help of Dr. Jake Carpenter whose native language is English, we carefully checked all sentences to avoid these grammatic mistakes.