Throughout the manuscript you use SD for Standard Deviation. Many snow papers use SD for snow depth, consider an alternative abbreviation (StDv/ SDv etc) or spelling it out every time for clarity! I found this confusing and had to reread multiple times when I thought the manuscript was referring to snow depth.

Line 67 - regional weather forecast models are recently used -> regional weather forecast models have been used recently.
Line 69 - This line is not grammatically correct. Remove significantly.
Line 70 - remove global snow hydrology or explain what this means.
Line 107-08 - "high-resolution Weather Research and Forecasting (WRF) model run" -> Weather and Research Forecasting model run at various resolutions.
Line 112 - "on the accurate estimation of peak SWE" -> rewrite this to be more grammatically correct.
Line 113-114 "This study can provide information related to the regional water management and hazard prevention. " Expand or remove this sentence.
Line 145 - Please rephrase to emphasize these are weather stations with snow pillows.

Line 241 - "The ERA5-L SWE at 9km resolution performs less well than the WRF9K simulation" Less well is not grammatically correct, please fix.

Section 3-1. I am unsure what "SD - CanSWE SD" means. Is this the SD of each dataset minus the SD of the CANSWE dataset? If so, can you explain this in the text more directly. Also, if so, can you give a better justification of why you showed this as opposed to just the standard deviation? I am not sure the Stdev of the mean time series makes sense as opposed to calculating the Stdev of the spatial distribution of SWE? It makes sense that the Stdev of the time series is strange as obviously SWE starts at zero and ends at zero, so we have a large distribution of possible SWE values over the series. Or did you calculate the Stdev for each day and then calculate the SD time series and then a total average over the time series? This section really needs more clarity. Also, if you keep the Stdev of this daily time series, please fix the caption, the last sentence doesn't make sense.

Line 283 - Remove "obvious"
Line 287 - swap the order of "deposition" and "redistribution."

Table 2 - It might be nice to include the average/mean elevation bias for WRF9/3/1k.

Figure 7 - Are you sure that the increased error in the melt season is not due to the incorrect temperature from lapse-rate correction of the elevation bias incorrectly influencing the melt timing?

Table 5 - Clarify what the signs of the numbers mean. I mean have missed it, but I could not find. Is a negative number the peak SWE date is earlier than CanSWE or later?

Line 394-408 - In this section you start by saying that the elevation bias is correlated to mean bias error, but then later on in line 403 you say the "elevation bias is not significantly correlated with error metrics at any resolution" Please clarify this statement and rewrite this paragraph as necessary. Is mean bias not an error metric?

Line 478 - Please rephrase, elevation bias does not affect RMSE MAE or SD, but it does impact MB. This in turn influences your RMSE and MAE Thus, you cannot conclude that elevation bias is not a factor in your error statistics.