

Several edits to this publication were made on behalf of the editor before the manuscript was posted as a preprint. To provide clarity to reviewers about the nature of these changes, we have summarized the editorial comments and our answers here briefly:

## Round 1

1. You mention that some measurement depths might be given relative to surface height at installation, and may drift as the surface height changes via ablation or accumulation. Is there currently a way to know whether a profile is affected by such an issue?

[Answer: We have added a statement in the manuscript.](#)

2. In Acknowledgment, "ERA-5 Land climate reanalysis data (Muñoz Sabater, 2019) was downloaded from the Copernicus Climate Change Service." is maybe better suited in data availability?

[Answer: Moved to the data availability section.](#)

3. You will be asked to separate the Acknowledgment into a "Financial Support" section, that contains all the funding information and a "Acknowledgment" which reports other types of support.

[Answer: Not sure how exactly to do this, but we added a specific statement in the Acknowledgemnt section.](#)

4. You will be asked to make in-text citation for all the entries of your reference list. It would be great to list these citations by regions, so the reader can scan if a reference they need is already included.

[Answer: We have added a table with a list of all the sources and glaciers, including their RGI region.](#)

5. Please add a statement on how to cite the dataset. Should the original sources be cited?

[Answer: Added a statement in the data availability. Not sure if it is exactly how requested.](#)

6. Currently, the dataset on Zenodo contains both compilation codes and actual dataset. It is common practice to separate the code from the data. Although the "data" folder is quite obvious, the ReadMe file contains a lot of informations for developers or contributors, which are confusion for normal users. In terms of portability, standard users do not need to download the source folder every time. Making the source figures available also raises the issue of license rights for those figures as you are now distributing them.

[Answer: We will address this during review, if possible.](#)

7. It is highly recommended to provide the codes you use to produce your plots. It could also serve, for the users, as examples of how to use the dataset.

[Answer: We will address this during review, if possible.](#)

8. I also have a general comment about the politics of data compilation and the visibility of data contributors. I discovered a lot of tensions when taking over SUMup. It centralized the work of many under only four names and some

researchers did not feel acknowledged for their work. I like that Zenodo now has more categories of contributors (like data contributors and data curators), which highlights and acknowledge this type of contribution. Yet, these types of contributions are currently not being used e.g. by hiring committees. This is specially a problem for young researchers who would critically need to accumulate citations on publications they (co)author. To this general issue, glenglat needs to have additional care for the countries and the local institutions that have been involved in the monitoring of their glaciers: I was quite surprised to see only few or no Russian/Chinese/South American names on the data contributors list although they are well represented in the reference list.

Answer: These are good and valid points, thank you. Data contributors were those who directly sent us data. Despite quite a lot of effort to get data directly from the authors, most people did not respond to our requests (e.g., calls on cryolist, personal communications). Therefore we drew the data from published sources, work that done by the authors, with some help from the Data Curators. We will discuss during review if we need to more fundamentally change the approach for highlighting contributions.

## Round 2

1. In respect to the reviewers, I would kindly ask you to update what you need before the review process starts. If the dataset structure is changed and example/plotting scripts are given, this will change the reviewers' approach to the dataset and potentially make them more likely to accept the review of your article.

Answer: We have additionally implemented the following changes:

As per the initial suggestion [by the editor], we have implemented a custom build-process for the Zenodo publication, reducing this to the CSV-files, a simplified documentation, the license information, and a version of the metadata (datapackage.yaml) converted to JSON.

In addition to the dataset available through Zenodo, the Github repository contains all of the Python code for the tests, the build process, and Zenodo publishing. Additionally, the repository now contains a Jupyter notebook with tutorials on how to download the data from Zenodo, read it into python, and produce statistics and plots similar to those in this publication.

Finally, we have beautified the table that lists all the glaciers for which glenglat contains data, including some basic data (number of boreholes and profiles, minimum temperature, measurement period), and all the sources. The entries in the table are grouped by glacier region and can now be found in the appendix. We have also updated a few numbers to correspond to the

newest version of the database. All figures have been checked for color-blindness.