

We appreciate the reviewer's feedback regarding our conclusions on the sub-glacial water structure beneath Thwaites. The reviewer accurately points out that we have not eliminated all possible water geometries, and therefore it is inappropriate to imply definitive diagnosis of the water body in THW2/UBH0c/X243a as distributed without further evidence. We agreed with the reviewer's original feedback on this point, and apologize if our original revisions were not sufficiently clear.

To address this, we have further revised the abstract, discussion, and conclusions to state that "of the scenarios we tested", the reflector in THW2/UBH0c/X243a appears "most consistent with" a series of canals or a lake. We also explicitly state that our simulations were not exhaustive of all possible subglacial water configurations. We have also removed language referring to the water bodies in our simulations as "distributed".

We agree that the conclusions drawn from our simulations should be specific. However, we disagree with the reviewer's insistence that we remove all reference to lakes or canals, and that our work does not demonstrate consistency with these water structures. Our simulations clearly demonstrate that scenarios involving canals and/or lakes can replicate the magnitude of the reflectivity signature. Therefore, while we have agreed to carefully qualify our concluding language, we consider it is appropriate to highlight the consistency between the radar reflectivity and our simulations involving canals or lakes.