Thank you for your reviewed manuscript. I see the authors did not incorporate much of my suggestions to reduce the abundance of numbers in the text, avoid detailed visual description of figures (the reader can do that by themself), add statistical significance (table, figures) and/or standard deviations together with (difference of) means (table, text), etc. In my view, those suggestions relate to common practice in scientific literature, please reconsider whether they are valuable to elevate the quality of the manuscript.

I have a couple of concrete requests:

- Figure with analysis of role of elevation change: I am surprised that the amount of SMB change due to climate change is much less in 2300 than 2200, can you please check?

- Analysis of velocity changes: can you please give proof of this, e.g., add a figure?

- The authors highlight the contribution of the elevation feedback to melt in the abstract. Can you please add a table with the integrated SMB with/without elevation feedback?

- Please check grammar and spelling e.g., through dedicated software.