

I have read the revised manuscripts and the author's response to the reviewers. I thank the authors for considering most of the suggestions and significantly improving the manuscript's clarity.

The authors have added some metrics on the quality of the co-registration which was conducted to derive geodetic estimates, which is certainly welcome. However, it is slightly surprising that with a standard deviation of 0.81 m/yr of elevation change between 2014 and 2020 on off-glacier areas, the geodetic estimate of glacier mass changes is as low as ± 0.06 m w.e./yr. Over the last decade, the quantification of uncertainty on geodetic mass balance in the literature has been done following different methods with variable levels of complexity and is still the focus of recent research. It can be acknowledged, however, that only the mean geodetic estimates are used in this study, for the homogenization of the MB time series, such that the method chosen and the obtained geodetic estimate uncertainty should not affect the main results.

The reanalysis of this long time series of mass balance measurements will surely be useful for the community and was initially made possible by the numerous weeks spent in the field to conduct these measurements over the years, which undoubtedly represents a substantial amount of work.

The authors have addressed previous comments adequately and made the suggested modifications. I recommend the manuscript be accepted for publication.