

Response to the editor

I am pleased to accept your paper for publication in EO, subject to a few technical corrections. Following the revision, I received one reviewer report that rated the manuscript as excellent in all categories and recommended acceptance as is. The second reviewer declined the invitation to review the revised version; however, I am satisfied that their previous comments have been adequately addressed.

- We really appreciate your time and consideration in handling our manuscript.

I have nevertheless identified a few remaining issues that should be corrected or clarified before publication:

- SAR–buoy angle sign is inconsistent. In Sect. 3.1 the manuscript reports an angle difference of $+5.9 \pm 38.6^\circ$, whereas Figure 3 and Table 1 give $-5.9 \pm 38.6^\circ$. The latter also agrees with the conclusion, so Sect. 3.1 should presumably be changed to $-5.9 \pm 38.6^\circ$.
- Thank you for pointing this out. We corrected it by changing it to $-5.9 \pm 38.6^\circ$.
- Line 332: the SAR–buoy speed difference is written as $-0.1 \pm 2.9^\circ$. Table 1 and Figure 3 show $+0.1 \pm 2.9 \text{ km d}^{-1}$. Both the sign and unit should be corrected.
- We corrected the text to $+0.1 \pm 2.9 \text{ km d}^{-1}$.
- Figure 11b: The actual panel annotation on page 19 says “PMWraw–SAR,” but the caption reads “speed difference between PMW and SAR.” It should say PMWraw and SAR.
- We specified PMWraw in the caption.
- One wording point is the repeated use of “ground truth” for SAR: “high-resolution reference dataset” would be more adequate for the SAR data whereas I would use “ground truth” only for the buoys.
- We replaced “ground truth” with “high-resolution reference.”
- “over the last few of years” should be “over the last few years”.
- Done.
- For where $\text{SIC} > 85\%$ ” should be “For $\text{SIC} > 85\%$ ”.
- Done.
- The Emery reference contains “Fram Straitsatellite” without a space.
- Corrected.
- The Polona et al. reference is corrupted.
- Corrected.