

# Response to the review on “Scientific Workflows Applied to the Coupling of a Continuum (Elmer v8.3) and a Discrete Element (HiDEM v1.0) Ice Dynamic Model” by Shahbaz Memon et al.

We are grateful to the topical editor for providing his constructive comments. Please find our responses below:

---

P.1 L. 4: overheads -> overhead

P.1 L. 5: period instead of semicolon

P.1 L. 9: allowed users

P.1 L. 19: is increasingly reflected

P.2 L. 23: introduction, a discussion of the state of the art in glacier calving...

P. 20 L. 30: The abstracted workflow allocated only as many...

P. 8 L. 8: Under this assumption, we scale down the friction parameters HiDEM receives...

P. 9 L. 31: parameterize

All of the above changes have now been applied.

P.3 L. 23: I'm not sure what e-Science means here (Earth science? If so, write that)

P. 21 L. 7/14: again, change e-Science to Earth science

To avoid any confusion, we have now used alternative wordings (e.g. “application scenario” and “case study”) instead of “e-Science”.

P.6 L. 20: what is the contour Cont?

Now it is defined as, “.. the glacier contour (2d boundaries of the glacier), Cont, ..”

P. 18 L. 9: workload?

“Workflow” is indeed correct here.

P. 8 L. 13-15: This revised sentence is still confusing

We have corrected the sentence structure now.

P. 6 L. 8: time steps?

This has been changed to “time-step size”.

All the changes can be viewed in the PDFDiff document (found under the supplements).