Dear Dømgaard et al.,

I thank you for taking on board my (lengthy) comments following my first review of your manuscript. I am pleased to see that you have addressed pretty much all my comments, and where you haven't, you've given sensible reasons for doing so. Importantly, the writing style, methods, and the majority of figures have been greatly improved, and I'm very impressed with the work and effort you have all clearly put in since the first round of reviews. This has resulted in a manuscript of excellent quality, and which is of interest to the wider community. I believe in its current format the manuscript can be accepted for publication, subject to some very minor technical corrections (less than a page – see below). Congratulations on a great paper!

Technical Corrections

ABSTRACT

Line 12 – Put a comma after dynamics.

INTRODUCTION and STUDY SITE

Line 61 – I've always felt it's better to write any number less than 10 as a word, rather than in numerical format. So in this case, "2 to 3 years" would become "two to three years". I know many other journals ask for this style in particular (unsure about the Cryosphere) but in my opinion it looks better.

Fig 1 Caption – "Close up of the study site" rather than "zoom in".

Also watch your dates, here and elsewhere – it's either e.g. 23/8/2021 or 23-8-2021.

METHODS

Line 106 – remove the comma after mission II.

Line 108 – "resulted in decreased image quality", not lowered.

Line 109 – Try"…majority of the acquired images were captured from an oblique viewing angle…" instead.

Line 110 – "…computationally challenging to process…"

Line 111 –"…varying perspective and illumination conditions."

Line 149 – "…however, this varied depending…as well as to avoid areas with apparent morphological changes".

Line 171 – again you've written "1 day", rather than "one day" – I'd go with the latter and make sure you're consistent throughout.

RESULTS

Line 228 – put a space between your two values of drainage threshold and the two "m".

Line 229 – remove "from".