

Editor Comment:

Dear Julius,

I have just reviewed your careful and thoughtful responses to the reviewers comments. The last matter, which I hope you consider, is to revisit the comment about the no permafrost classification for <10Kohmm in Figure 6. The paper would be strengthened by qualifying this assessment.

I with these changes I am very happy to recommend the manuscript for publication. Congratulations and thank you for your work.

*Best regards,
Ian*

Author reply:

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for the positive feedback.

Regarding the last remaining issue, we have decided to slightly adjust the nomenclature in line with the reviewers' suggestions in order to somewhat soften the strict distinction.

The classes are now (1) permafrost unlikely, (2) low-resistive permafrost (probably ice-poor), (3) high-resistive permafrost (probably ice-rich), and (4) sedimentary ice. We have also made these changes in Figure 6.

We believe that the classification is now more generally applicable and does not completely rule out the possible exceptions mentioned by the reviewer. We have retained the threshold values themselves in light of our previous explanations. In our view, the relativisation that has now been achieved by renaming the classes represents a fair compromise that is, on the one hand, consistent with our measurement results and, on the other hand, uses terminology already established in the literature. These designations are now less absolute and thus follow the reviewer's recommendations.

We hope this has addressed any remaining questions, and we would like to thank you once again for your constructive feedback.

Best regards, on behalf of all Co-authors,
Julius Kunz