

I appreciate all the work that the authors put into the new version of the manuscript and find the new additions to the work helpful and interesting! I only have a few minor comments to consider.

The new addition of regional 10-fold cross-validation is very helpful. However, I am still left wondering what impact this has on ice slab extent? In L323, the authors list the most likely ice slab extent but I don't believe they ever mention the minimum or maximum extents. I think a few sentences addressing this range should be added to the results or discussion,

L68 – EESA → ESA

L114 - σ_{xpol}^0 is mentioned before it is defined (L121)

L162 – A word is needed between “fit” and “the” in this sentence.

L167-169: “The final ice slab classification results are insensitive to angular diversity or number of observations as long as there are a median of at least ~117 observations per pixel spanning at least 10 unique incidence angles, a criterion which is met for our study area.” This is not exactly true since in L147, the authors say that the minimum pixel observations was 29. What proportion of the study area has >117 observations?

L268 – ‘teh’ typo