

Author's response to RC1

This manuscript applies a recently published method assimilating local snow depth observations and able to propagate information in space to build a new 10-year reanalysis of snow cover based on the OSHD system over Switzerland. This dataset offers an unprecedented resolution and spatio-temporal coverage and is based on state-of-the-art components in terms of meteorological forcing and physical snow model. The dataset will be highly useful for the community to study the spatio-temporal variability of snow over the country and is going to become the new reference for that purpose. Unfortunately, the links currently provided in the introduction, conclusion and list of references are not working, so I was not able to check the availability of the dataset and its conformity with the description. This obviously has to be solved and checked by the editorial team before publication.

Thank you for your careful review and constructive feedback on our manuscript. As noted in AC1 (<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2026-159-AC1>), we apologize for the inconvenience caused by a formatting error of the URLs in the preprint. Upon publication, the temporary review link will be replaced by a permanent DOI, resolving any data access issues.

The introduction of the manuscript provides a robust analysis of the existing literature and products and their associated limitations, justifying the need for a new snow cover reanalysis over Switzerland. The manuscript reminds the main methodological principles of the simulation system which have been presented in various previous publications. The assimilation method is especially innovative compared to existing literature. The evaluations directly provided in the manuscript are limited to comparisons between snow depth simulations to non-independent observations. Although a previous publication suggests that leave-one-out experiments exhibit scores similar with simulations assimilating all observations, this choice is somehow questionable in terms of representativeness of the skill at large scale. The article also presents annual maps of peak SWE, Snow Melt Out Date and number of snow days obtained from the simulations. It illustrates well how the reanalysis can be beneficial for large scale snow monitoring. It could have been expected to compare some of these diagnostics simulations with satellite products as Snow Melt Out Date can be derived from optical imagery.

The language is perfectly clear and accurate and I did not find any typos in the document. The quality of the presentation of results is excellent. The article structure might be considered as not very standard compared to common literature because the discussion of the known limitations of the system is relatively short in the current version and is not a dedicated section after the presentation of the results. Nevertheless, this article is still easy to read and make the very valuable effort to make public a dataset useful for a potentially large community of users (although unfortunately the dataset can not be accessed from the preprint as mentioned before).

I recommend publication after solving the data access and considering the minor comments below.

We appreciate the positive feedback and acknowledge your recommendations on the evaluation and discussion of the presented dataset. Following your suggestions, we will revise these sections of the manuscript. Please see our detailed responses to your individual points below.

- L60 Crocus instead of CROCUS (it's not an acronym).

We will do as suggested.

- L83, L325, L330 and L520 The link does not work and must be replaced by a doi which is the interest of zenodo.

We apologize for the inconvenience caused by a formatting error of the provided URLs in the preprint. As the review link will be replaced by a permanent DOI (which is already reserved) once this publication and the accompanying dataset are accepted, this will not be an issue in the published version.

- L167 It is unclear how the kilometric liquid / solid precipitation fraction of ICON is downscaled on the 250 m grid.

Downscaling the precipitation fraction of ICON requires a rather technical solution, which is based on the partitioning scheme in Eq. (1) of Oberrauch et al. (2024). For each ICON grid cell, we adjust the temperature threshold T_{thresh} so that the computed fraction of solid precipitation f_{solid} matches the partitioning of the ICON model output. The adjusted temperature threshold is then interpolated to the 250m grid and reapplied to calculate f_{solid} at high resolution. We will include a description of this downscaling procedure in the manuscript.

- L221-225 The authors explain that the assimilation procedure removes temporal discontinuities due to the switch from COSMO to ICON. However, from our experience (Vernay et al., 2022) temporal discontinuities in the assimilated surface observations might also result in discontinuities in reanalyses. Could the author comment the availability of the 444 snow depth stations over the 10-year period and implications in terms of temporal homogeneity of the resulting reanalysis ?

Snow depth observations are available for all stations over the entire 10-year period. Furthermore, data are manually quality-controlled and gap-filled. Occasionally, individual stations with unrepresentative records are removed (e.g., instantaneous snow depth increases caused by an avalanche hitting the station). While we have not specifically investigated potential discontinuities arising from the removal of a small number of stations, Oberrauch et al. (2025) demonstrated very little difference between model runs using all 444 stations and those using only 300 stations. Since we remove at most a handful of stations per season, no noticeable discontinuities are expected.

- L232-236 In a publication presenting a new dataset, it could have been expected to present directly the main evaluations of the published version instead of relying on a previous publication based on a different version of the system. If possible, I think it would not be redundant (and even very useful) to incorporate evaluations of Snow Cover Fractions from optical imagery.

An extensive evaluation of the same model system used here is available in Oberrauch et al. (2025), including validation against Snow Cover Fractions from optical imagery. While cited in the previous section (line 223 *ff.*), here we clearly missed the opportunity to mention this validation again. To address your comment, we will add a section that includes a new figure showing results aggregated from Oberrauch et al. (2025).

- L242-249 I am not fully convinced that Figure 4 gives an accurate overview of the skill of the dataset as these observations are assimilated and despite the interpolation process, they can not be considered as independent evaluation data. Oberrauch et al., 2024 clearly show that the leave-one-out experiment exhibits a lower skill. I think it would be more fair to present the skill of the reanalysis from a leave-one-out experiment.

We agree that this does not constitute a fully independent evaluation and will update the point-based evaluation using the leave-one-station-out simulations.

- L250-260 These comments are very useful but they could be moved to a discussion section after the presentation of results in Section 4. I also think the discussion about limitations should be a bit extended. First, for the self-sufficiency of the paper, it would be nice to incorporate a short paragraph summarizing the main limitations of the assimilation procedure (as discussed in detail in Oberrauch et al., 2024) and a short paragraph explaining the limitation of the 250m resolution in terms of vegetation description (for instance based on the literature of G. Mazzotti). Then, the choice to not assimilate SCF products contrary to some references mentioned in the introduction could also be discussed : what are the main motivations : data availability ? challenges of spatial data assimilation ? and what are the future perspectives to assimilate remote sensing observations in future releases of this dataset ?

Following your suggestion, we will add a separate discussion section to include a summary of known limitations. As correctly suspected, limitations in data availability and quality are the primary reasons spaceborne observations were not assimilated. To introduce any kind of temporal discontinuities, we abstained from assimilating SCF datasets of the required quality (e.g., Keuris et al., 2023), which were not available to us over the full 10-year period.

- L303 It would be useful for the users to have an idea of the volume of the total dataset and to mention whether the compression facility of netcdf is used or not in the nc files (and with which compression level) or if compression is only achieved through the zip of all files.

Total file size for individual water years is under 800MB, making ZIP compression more of a convenience for downloading. While the archive size reduction is minimal, further compression (using the NetCDF internal compression) does not seem necessary.

- L309-310 I am not sure if “version history” refers to the dataset or to the codes. Tagged versions of the different code components used to run the simulations will be a useful addition in terms of metadata for reproducibility.

Herein, “version history” refers to the dataset. In line with the comment below, we will add the code version (tag to a public GitHub repository) to the metadata.

- L330 Even if the purpose of the manuscript is to describe a dataset, a description of code availability used to produce the dataset would improve again the agreement of this work with the FAIR principles.

We will add a code availability statement that provides references to the version of FSM2OSHD used to prepare this dataset.

References

- Keuris, L., Hetzenecker, M., Nagler, T., Mölg, N., and Schwaizer, G. (2023). An Adaptive Method for the Estimation of Snow-Covered Fraction with Error Propagation for Applications from Local to Global Scales. *Remote Sensing 2023, Vol. 15, Page 1231*, 15(5):1231.
- Oberrauch, M., Cluzet, B., Magnusson, J., and Jonas, T. (2024). Improving Fully Distributed Snowpack Simulations by Mapping Perturbations of Meteorological Forcings Inferred From Particle Filter Assimilation of Snow Monitoring Data. *Water Resources Research*, 60(12).
- Oberrauch, M., Cluzet, B., Magnusson, J., and Jonas, T. (2025). The Performance Gains of Assimilating Limited Information Into a Fully Distributed Snowpack Model Depend on Model Complexity and Input Data Quality. *Water Resources Research*, 61(11).