

Dear editor and referees,

We are very happy that our revisions were satisfactory and our manuscript has been accepted for final publication in The Cryosphere. We appreciate the comments we received during the review process, which much strengthened the clarity and impact of our study.

We also appreciate Richard Essery's comment regarding the performance of temperature index (TI) models and the suggestion by Reviewer 2 to put more emphasis on the very good performance of calibrated degree-day models. Our revisions did clearly state that the TI models were the best performing in this experiment as requested by Duncan Quincey, but we also clearly stated that this was only the case when calibrated. We have now additionally specified that this is the case when they are **calibrated and evaluated against the same data**, as correctly pointed out by Richard Essery. We find this the perfect formulation for our results. Therefore, the first point of our conclusions now reads: "Temperature index models perform best in this experiment, and better than energy balance models, when calibrated [and evaluated on the same data](#), ..."

We have also corrected the few grammatical mistakes noted by Richard Essery and thank him for that, and corrected the last inaccuracies of the reference list.

We look forward to seeing the paper published and hope the community will benefit from our findings.

Thank you and best wishes,

The authors of DCG-MIP