

Reviewer Response 1

We sincerely thank the reviewer for the positive and encouraging feedback. We have carefully addressed all minor clarification points below.

1. The MASC is mentioned as being present at the site, but is its data used in the analysis? I don't think it was mentioned in sections 2.2 or 2.3 and my apologies if I missed it. If not used, perhaps say so explicitly or remove mention of this instrument.

Response:

The Multi-Angle Snowflake Camera (MASC) was indeed deployed at the site; however, its data were not used in the present analysis. We have now clarified this in the manuscript and explicitly noted that the MASC was deployed but not utilized in this study.

Added in manuscript [L 113]: however, its data were not used in the present analysis.

2. In equation 2, is πab the same as the previously defined circumscribed projected area A ? If so, it may be useful to draw that connection explicitly.

Response:

Yes, πab represents the same circumscribed projected area A defined earlier in the manuscript. We have clarified this in the text by explicitly noting that the ellipse area ($A = \pi ab$) is consistent with the previously defined projected area.

Added in manuscript [L 181]: The corresponding ellipse area is given by $A = \pi ab$, where a and b are the semi-axes derived from the bounding-box dimensions using MATLAB's **Regionprops** function, consistent with the definition used previously.

3. Line 241: I believe the authors meant to refer to Figure 7b rather than 7a.

Response:

Thank you for catching this. The figure reference has been corrected