

Dear Alison Delhasse and co-authors,

Thank you for thoroughly addressing the comments from the reviewers. I have only one further suggestion before recommending acceptance of your manuscript.

In the abstract, results, and conclusions, you describe the system as reaching a “new equilibrium.” However, the evidence provided does not fully support this conclusion, as equilibrium implies not only stabilization of mass balance but also constancy in other dynamic variables such as ice velocity and related fields. To avoid overstatement, I recommend using a more cautious formulation, for example stating that “the mass loss has slowed down” or something similar, rather than implying a fully established new equilibrium. Please revise these sections accordingly and clarify your interpretation to ensure consistency with the presented results.

Best wishes,
Cheng Gong

Dear Editor,

Thanks for your remarks. We definitely consider it in our last version of our manuscript. We agree that our results and analyses do not allow us to state clearly that a new equilibrium has been reached. This is why we have replaced sentences containing this type of position with more nuanced statements, e.g., “close to equilibrium”, “approaching a state of near-balance”, or “slowdown in mass loss”. These statements better reflect the potential towards a stabilization. Changes are mostly located in the abstract, results, and conclusion.

Best regards,
Alison Delhasse and co-authors