Author's response to the reviews of " Sensitivity of iceberg drift and deterioration simulations to input data from different ocean, sea ice and atmosphere models in the Barents Sea (Part II)"

We again thank the reviewers and the editor for the valuable input. We think that, after the applied major revisions, the manuscript has increased in quality significantly and think that it's publication will be a valuable contribution to the field.

The authors already provided a detailed response on the reviewer's and editor's comments in the interactive discussion. All comments were considered, and the suggested changes were applied to the manuscript. The highlighted changes can be found in the Author's track-changes file.

The main changes in the manuscript are:

- Laying out the "story-line" of the study more clearly by restructuring, deleting and adding sections. We revised the manuscript (especially the discussion) on cohesiveness.
- Explaining the goals, scope and limitations of the study more clearly from the beginning and managing the readers expectations. We also highlight the novelty and importance of the study.
- Including a short comparison of the environmental variables from Part1 and using the knowledge in the discussion. Corresponding to the review of Part1, we explained more carefully how we carried out the comparison, its limitations and how it connects to earlier findings.
- Providing clear results and take-away-messages.
- We also added a discussion of the suitability of the environmental datasets as input to iceberg simulations and recommendations of their use in different applications.
- We also improved the language and revised all figures and tables.

If the reviewers or the editor require a detailed list of changes, the authors can certainly provide one. We are also happy to receive a second round of reviews.