

Daniel Gilford
11/25/19

Second Review of Projecting Antarctica's contribution to future sea level rise from basal ice-shelf melt using linear response functions of 16 ice sheet models (LARMIP-2) by Levermann et al. [ESSD 10.5194/esd-2019-23]

I appreciate the authors considering and addressing my previous comments. I only have a couple questions for clarification and some minor grammatical suggestions to improve readability. Otherwise, this paper is acceptable for publication and will be a valuable addition to the literature.

Comments:

Pg. 4, line 3: "taking" I think should be "taken"?

Pg. 4, line 17-41: I realize this was probably written in response to a previous reviewer comment, but it is very repetitive with the next page. Perhaps only the summary list is needed and then each of the following sections can provide greater details of the method?

Pg. 6, line 9: What is meant by "this approach may not be valid for absolute values"? Do you mean if DeltaTg and DeltaTo were replaced with Tg and To? If so, I don't think this phrase is needed.

Pg. 6, line 31: Can you rewrite as "display a wide range of total melt rates over space", as this is what I think you mean by this sentence?

Pg. 10, line 14: Although you go into it below, it would be helpful to note here that overall there appears a bias towards more melting in the models than the observed values (Figure 7).

Pg. 10, line 39: This last sentence is repetitive and not necessary, as you explain it in line 30.

Pg. 14, line 13: Can you cite these "previous studies"?

Pg. 15, line 14: Please note that these are the median values.

Pg. 17, line 22: "provide" should be "provides".

References: It's a small thing that will probably be addressed in copy-editing, but it would be helpful to alphabetize the references.