We would like to thank the editor for further opportunity to improve our manuscript. As before, our responses are given in italic typeface following editor comments in regular typeface.

1) Figure 2: […] I am talking about the last two images in the sequence - please correct the dashed frame so that it matches the outline of the classified image. This way the readers can directly compare the photo with the classification result. Please also make sure that the classified image really is the result of the photo - in some instances it seems that areas that look like water are classified as gravel, so maybe the classified image is from a different point in time than the photo.

We are sorry for this misunderstanding, and we have amended the figure in two ways. The first is to overlay the classified image on the base image in the bottom panel so that readers can directly see how these align, and the second is to use an exact rather than approximate dashed polygon in the second to last panel. This should increase comprehension of the figure, but note that the weight of the dashed line (necessary for readability) makes the exact polygon look approximate. Also, the classified image is derived from the rectified image: you are correct to note some misclassifications. We felt it appropriate to use this pair to illustrate that a good classification does not mean a perfect classification.

2) However, in the corrected time series plots it looks like we do see diurnal variations in the data, ranging from 100 to 200 m in effective width even during the limited temporal window defined by the sun angle limitations. This point should be at least briefly discussed in the manuscript.

We have included discussion of this item in the manuscript (final paragraph, section 4.3), as requested. We now write: "These variations in We as the melt season progresses are detected even though diurnal variations in We can be quite large: melting of the Greenland ice sheet has a strong diurnal forcing reflected in Figure 4. Time of day effects are minimized via the similarity filtering (which leaves images with similar solar geometry), but measurable changes in We are evident despite this insolation matching and are compounded by classification errors (note the greater diurnal variation in melt season 1 during the end-of-season low flow, Figure 4). However, the filtering and classification procedure here ultimately yields We values that capture both diurnal and day-to-day variation in the Isortoq River. For the full melt season captured in 2012, the We hydrograph has good temporal coverage and diurnal variations are small enough so that the larger trends in melting are clearly evident and align with expected melt activity in that year."

3) Furthermore you state that daily or better coverage is achieved - from Figure 4 it seems like there are quite a few data gaps, so it might be of interest to explain that the method provided data on x out y days of the melt season for both years.

This is a good idea we have added to the manuscript (first paragraph, section 4.3). In melt season 1, there were 30 missing days over a period of 49 days, but this is mostly due to a 15 day gap in late August where there is no data due to inclement weather. Melt season 2 has excellent temporal coverage, with only 31 of 104 days missing. This miss rate of about 1/3 would occur without similarity filtering, as the majority of these misses are due to rain, fog, and snow events that preclude classification by any means: this is an issue for any high latitude camera-based study.

I also just noticed that the caption of Figure 1 does not refer to Figure 1b - please also explain what is shown here.

We have amended the caption to indicate that panel b is an example image taken by the narrow-focus camera: the camera that was left inoperable by wildlife attack. The caption now reads: "Only the wide focus camera (c) has a continuous data record from 2011-2012, as a presumed Arctic fox severed the wiring on the narrow focus camera (b)."