Liljestrand et al. have made significant improvements to the manuscript and satisfactorily addressed my comments. Below, I list some minor changes that should be addressed prior to publication. I do not need to see the manuscript again prior to acceptance by the journal.

65: High cost is also a significant drawback to lidar data. I would mention it in this paragraph.

82: Suggest deleting 'with the increase of users… remote snowpack information.' This seems unnecessary. It would be fine as "Thus, it is imperative to…"

85: This paragraph could be improved. The topic sentence should describe how SWE is the variable that is most important in snow sampling. Then you can describe how improved SD improves SWE. I would also more explicitly mention that SD is the variable you can reliably measure 10 times in a field day as well as the variable which is measured by lidar. As such you are mostly constrained to lidar. But, you could potentially model/extrapolate density to get estimates of SWE.

Line 90: 'broader' is vague, maybe 'more spatially extensive.'

153: Add the year to the date.

Fig. 3: Make the normal distribution lines thicker or change the color. Difficult to see.

187: Delete 'e.g. 12 hours.' Seems unnecessary.

339: Wording could be improved here. Do you mean: there is variation in performance when few samples are used, but the variation is limited with larger sample sizes?

Fig. 10: suggest add a line where y=0 to make the graph easier to interpret.

341: delete 'highly'

353. Suggest deleting the two commas surrounding 'or human error in the depth probe measurements.' Current iteration is clunky to read.