

Reviewer Recommendation and Comments for Manuscript Number egosphere-2024-1044  
**Mapping subsea permafrost around Tuktoyaktuk Island (NWT, Canada) using electrical resistivity tomography**

Ephraim Erkens et al.

Dear Authors,

Thank you for your detailed responses. I appreciate the effort you have put into revising the manuscript. The new structure significantly improves the readability, and the newly added figures provide supplementary information that aids in understanding the paper better.

In my opinion, the paper is ready for publication. I have merely the following remarks/ideas:

Line 156: You mention that you roughly estimated the noise level. It might be beneficial to specify the noise level at this point. Later, you mention a noise level of 10% in relation to the synthetic model. Does this also apply to the noise level of the field data?

Line 174 / Figure 3: Consider adding labels to the different regions in the figure for clarity.

Line 271 / Figure 6: Small arrows could be added to indicate the direction of the profiles. Also, the letters a-d could be made more prominent for better visibility.

Lines 281–284: The general introduction of the types of errors (points 1) and 2)) might be more effective if placed before the start of section 3.2.1. This could provide a clearer context for readers.

11/12/2024, Johannes Hoppenbrock  
TU Braunschweig  
Institute for Geophysics and Extraterrestrial Physics  
Braunschweig, Germany