

Dear Horst,

Thank you for your decision and thank you very much for the last round of comments about the language edits. Please find attached our revised manuscript, as well as a response to your comments (in bold font).

All the best,

Navaraj and co-authors

Line 88: "...due to burial of its solar panel ..."

Done

Lines 106-107: "...with a value of ... neutron monitor." This sentence is unclear. There is a dot after 3.08, should this be a multiplication sign? Probably because of this I do not understand how "3.08.epsilon" equals 1.14. Please also reword the entire sentence: K is first labelled as normalization factor, then as a correction factor? If not both statements refer to K, please make clear what the "correction factor" is.

We clarified that K and ϵ are two different factors. The revised sentence reads as: "where K (with a value of 3.08) represents a location-specific normalization factor. ϵ (with a value of 1.14) represents a correction factor used to adjust the sensitivity of the standard lead neutron monitor."

Line 147: "over" instead of "overs",

Corrected

Line 147-149: please revise the entire sentence, the order of arguments is confusing. Maybe make two sentences.

We separated the original sentence into two sentences: "During the installation, the sensor was buried beneath about 20 cm of fresh snow. The sensor measured 24 mm water equivalent (w.e.) of SWE, which means that the snow density was approximately 120 kg m^{-3} ".

Line 202: "by the COSIPY model"

Corrected

Line 210: remove "arises" or change to "arising". Shorter, however, would be better.

Corrected with "arises" being removed

Figure 2a: The red dots are not visible. Either draw dots that are larger than the vertical lines of the uncertainty bars or modify description in the caption.

We modified the caption description: "Daily values of (a) Cumulative SWE measured by SnowFox (blue line) and manual field measurements represented by red vertical error bars"

Line 241: Please revise the wording.

We split the sentence. The last parts now read as: "Still this interpretation remains speculative, as the different mass fluxes are not observed directly, but estimated from a surface energy balance model."

Line 241: "depending on"

Corrected

Line 243: "it is likely less sensitive to refreezing": Please explain more clearly. The sensor itself is not measuring refreezing, so it cannot be sensitive to it. I understand what you mean but suggest rewording. e.g. "...when the Snowfox is close to the surface, the measurements are less sensitive to capturing WE of refrozen meltwater..."

See response below

Line 244-245: "This is a challenge ..." I do not understand this sentence, please reword.

We agree that the whole wording of lines 243-245 was not clear. We rephrased the lines 243-245 as: "We stress that there are specific challenges in interpreting cosmic ray sensor measurements when the sensor is located into an existing snowpack (e.g., in the firn area of a glacier). If the sensor is buried close to the surface, meltwater that refreezes deeper than the sensor is not be counted as accumulated SWE. On the contrary, if the sensor is buried deeply, it is more likely that meltwater refreezes above the sensor and is thus counted as accumulated SWE."

Line 250: Please make sure to include a link to a data repository.

Done. Note that we also updated the reference to Khadka et al. (2024), which was just published.