

General comments:

Thanks a lot for your revisions that satisfactorily address my major comments. At present, the results and discussions shown in this study are made much more robust and convincing than the previous ones after the authors carefully considered the comments from the reviewers and the editor. Thus, I think this manuscript is ready for publication in *The Cryosphere* just after a few minor revisions listed below.

Specific comments:

Title: “Ocean-Induced Weakening of George VI Ice Shelf” => “..., West Antarctica” or “... in West Antarctica”

The insertion of all the figures and tables should be placed after their first mentioning in the main text.

L. 203: “Because ocean models approximate physical processes, they require tuning to better match observations.”_The causality is still confused, just remove this sentence.

L. 241: “in both 2014/15 (372 m/yr to 395 m/yr, Fig. 4a) and 2015/16 (375 m/yr to 397 m/yr, Fig. 4b)” => “in both 2014/15 (minimum: 372 m yr⁻¹, maximum: 395 m yr⁻¹; Fig. 4a) and 2015/16 (minimum: 375 m yr⁻¹, maximum: 397 m yr⁻¹; Fig. 4b)”

Line 247: “the spatial analysis effective strain rates” => “the spatial analysis of effective strain rates”

Fig. 5: the channels marked in black are indiscernible from the base maps.

Fig. 6: what do the dashed lines in (h) and (i) denote?