

2nd revision for: "The sensitivity of satellite microwave observations to liquid water in the Antarctic snowpack" by Picard et al., 2022

1 General

I thank the authors for carefully considering my comments and the extensive replies. Both of my general remarks are adequately addressed, despite I think figure 6 would benefit from showing the mean \pm standard deviation for each frequency instead of 1000 individual, but this is up to the authors preferences. I have only a few minor comments left (see below).

2 Specific comments

L87: (Comiso et al., 2003) → remove extra)

L304: when the e-folding depth is only 5.2mat Roi Baudouin. → frequency missing

L312: this increase in density... → I guess you mean "increase in ice layer density"?

Figure 5: The authors showed the same results using the coated sphere permittivity model in the response letter to the reviews. I think this comparison should be (shortly and qualitatively) discussed in the main manuscript, since the reader gets an idea of the impact of the model choice.

Figure 11, caption: add "The values of the dry brightness temperatures are marked by the triangles."

L517: "or in on the eastern Roi" → remove "in"