

Dear Editor,

We thank the Editor for taking the time for a final review of the manuscript, and accepting the manuscript in TC. We have made the following final corrections, in response to the Editor's comments.

Line 23: I think the definition of 'outlet glaciers' is not accurate, it could be understood in a way that any glacier catchment that is part of an ice cap is an outlet glacier. I suggest replacing "which also can be referred to as outlet glaciers." with something like "which are referred to as outlet glaciers where their ablation areas take the shape of glacier tongues."
Changed to "...which are referred to as outlet glaciers if their lower reaches are separated by mountain areas."

Line 24: I suggest replacing "input" with "mass loss", I think this would be clearer.
Done

Lines 230/231: Should the Andreassen citation stand in brackets instead of between semi-colons?
Done

Line 237: Maybe replace "so long" with "as long as" or "while".
Changed to "as long as"

Line 305: "... has to little data to conclude." I think it should read "have" (plural) and unclear to me what to conclude. Maybe replace with something like "have too little data to determine how close they were to a steady-state".
Done

Lines 539-540: "half of the ice cap would still disappear." The statement is somewhat unspecific, this could be stated more precisely, indicating e.g. the percentage loss in surface area and ice volume.
Changed to "almost half (47%) of the ice-cap volume would be lost"

Figure 7, caption: Is the full stop after "transects on Jostedalsbreen" in the right place? -
Done

Line 688: two times "and" in a row. Is this wanted?
Removed

Code and data availability: This section does not mention the DTMs that were constructed for 1966 and 2020. Optimally, for reproducibility of the study they should also be made publicly available. I assume the Gillespie et al. (2024) dataset is already openly accessible, but is it planned to make the DTMs also available upon publication? Or are there restrictions due to copyrights that do not allow making them open source?
Yes, we will make the 1966 DTM available. We also added a few further details here about the access to model code and data.

Colour schemes in figures for readers

We have checked the proposed figures using the proposed Coblis – Color Blindness Simulator (<https://www.color-blindness.com/coblis-color-blindness-simulator/>). We found that:

- Fig. 4: We think this looks good in the Color Blindness Simulator, except for the rare type of color blindness called Monochromacy/Achromatopsia. Since this occurs with a frequency of only 1:30 000 to 1:50 000 of people, we think the figure is fine as is.
- Fig 9. Same as Fig. 4.
- Fig. 11. Same as Fig. 4.
- Fig. A5. Looks good for all types of color blindness in the simulator.

Highlight article and short summary

Thank you for picking our paper as “Highlight article”. We have not made any changes to the 500-character short summary from the original submission.

Best wishes,
the authors