

Remaining minor comments and technical corrections:

(in red the changes that should be made). Line numbers refer to the tracked changes document.

Lines 67-71: Good to add this small paragraph as summary of the novelty. I suggest removing lines 70 and 71, so finishing the paragraph at “[...] trusted snow model.”

Line 58: I think it should be snowpack.

Line 139 “is **A** temporal limitation”

Line 140: Full stop at the end.

Line 151. “model parameters **THAT** must be specified”

Line 152. I guess it’s **topography**, not topology.

Line 155. I think it should be **snowmelt** (Also in line 267 and 269).

Line 156: **was** followed.

Line 158: **were**, not was.

Line 159: 10x10 **meters**?

Table 1. (and anywhere else if I missed it) Units must be written exponentially as per The Cryosphere submission guidelines.

Line 166: “... number **OF** times **A** model grid cell ... ”

Figure 2b and 2c: I asked the authors to provide a plot of number of observational stations in time and the mean snow depth of those stations over time. This is now in Figure 1 right panel. It can be seen that before 1960 there were only around 5 stations measuring snow depth over Iceland. This dramatically increases after 1960. Those few stations before 1960 seem to have a shallower snow depth than the stations in the period after 1960 (judging by the dark line in the plot). If a trend is computed over the yearly average of all stations in Iceland, this can give an inaccurate trend. Perhaps those 5 stations were located at coastal Iceland (lower snow depth), and the stations from 1960 are located more inland (higher snow depth). The trends from 1930-2021 would therefore be artificial if it is computed over the average snow depth of all stations for each year. The correct thing would be to do the average trend, instead of the trend of the average. That means, calculate a trend for each of the IMO stations, then show the average trend. This should be done for the results in Figure 2b and 2c. Alternatively, trends could be computed only from 1960, with higher confidence that the distribution of stations is not changing significantly.

Line 208: Why temperature in K? I think it should be in Celsius.

Figure 3 caption: specify which model simulations are these.

Figure 4: Even though the authors have addressed my comment here, something still looks odd. The colour scale of SCF change in 4a goes from +100% to -100% (is this supposed to be per decade?). Judging from the colours, some areas in Iceland are quite close to +100% change over the period 2001-2021. This seems too much since values in table 2 show that the MODIS trends are in the order of 2-4% per decade, which sounds more sensible. I believe either the labels or some calculation is wrong.

Line 260. I suggest to rephrase: "... , their trend is opposite. The observational data show an increasing SCF trend while the simulations show a decreasing trend over the historical period 1950-2020."

Line 269: "leading to A countrywide"