

\*\*\*\*\*

Author replies to the comments by the Editor:

\*\*\*\*\*

We thank the Editor for helping us to improve the manuscript. Thank you very much! Please find below the answers to the minor points suggested from your side.

Please note: page and line numbers in the updated manuscript might not be the same as in the previously submitted versions due to changes in the text. All relevant changes in the manuscript are highlighted in red, all removed text is struck through.

+++++

Comment:

+++++

Specifically regarding question 7 from reviewer #2, both the reviewer and I agree that the additional material / discussion on web bulb temperature correction is not needed.

-----

Answer by the authors:

-----

Thank you very much, following your suggestion we have not added any further material / discussion on potential humidity corrections to the final version of the manuscript.

+++++

Comment:

+++++

This sentence is quite awkward, I would consider rewording  
"Making use of the full potential of simultaneous observation of snow and meteorological conditions as provided by the SnoMoS, an effort is currently undertaken to develop parameters for the applied canopy model that are tailored to the specific conditions in (pre)alpine forests."

-----

Answer by the authors:

-----

You are right, we have followed your suggestion and have rephrased the sentence to (see updated manuscript, page 22, line 18):  
To further improve the implemented parameterization of inside-canopy processes, the simultaneous observations of snow and meteorological conditions as provided by the SnoMoS are currently used to develop model parameters that are tailored to the specific conditions in (pre)alpine forests.

+++++

Comment:

+++++

I would also add a comma two sentences later "In the current version, the model..."

-----

Answer by the authors:

-----

Thanks, we have added the comma (see updated manuscript, page 22, line 24).

\*\*\*\*\*

Author replies to the comments by Reviewer#2:

\*\*\*\*\*

We thank Reviewer#2 for again investing his time in helping us to improve the manuscript. Thank you very much! Please find below the answers to the changes suggested by Reviewer#2.

Please note: page and line numbers in the updated manuscript might not be the same as in the previously submitted versions due to changes in the text. All relevant changes in the manuscript are highlighted in red, all removed text is struck through.

+++++

Comment:

+++++

Fig. 12: I've read the motivation to have the same y-axis in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12 but as the ESCIMO.spread.v1 is far of the measurements I would not keep the wide range of the y-axis in Fig. 12.

-----

Answer by the authors:

-----

We agree with Reviewer#2 and have rescaled the y-axis in Fig. 12 to better match the range of values in the data. Thank you very much for pointing this out!

+++++

Comment:

+++++

Fig. 10 & Fig. 13: I would add the 45° lines in the scatter plots.

-----

Answer by the authors:

-----

Thank you, we have added the 45° lines in Fig. 10 and Fig. 13.