Comments on the manuscript: "The evaluation of the potential of global data products for snow hydrological modeling in ungauged high alpine catchments" by Weber et al.

The authors have address much of my major concerns in the revised manuscript. As a consequence, I don't see any critical issues that require major revision of this manuscript. However, the revised version still needs further improvements, especially in writing and organization. I recommend this manuscript to be accepted with minor revision. Specific suggestions are presented in the below.

(1) Need thorough improvements in writing, especially to fix grammatical errors.

(2) Line 4 in Abstract: Specify the 10-year period (Sept 2000 – Aug 2010)

(3) Line 126: convert 'ha' into 'square kilometers'. I'm not sure if 'ha' is an MKS unit.

(4) Line 178: 'specifically' may be better than 'especially'.

(5) Line 308: 'data' may be better than 'curves'.

(6) Line 320: What is 'internal' variance? Please explain 'internal'.

(7) Lines 367-403: This is a huge paragraph that contains discussions on two separate subtopics, the sensitivity to the met data (367-395) and the sensitivity to the topo data (395-403). Dividing the paragraph into two paragraphs (for the met data and for the topo data) will it make easier to capture the key statements in this paragraph.

(8) Related to (7), Figure 6 may also be split into two like; Fig. 6a to present the met data sensitivity and Fig. 6b to present the topo data sensitivity.

(9) L149:151: Figure 9 may also be split into two like; Fig. 9a for the met data sensitivity and Fig. 9b for the topo data sensitivity.

(10) L495: Comparison of the topo data sensitivity to the met data sensitivity is largely irrelevant. May change 'all other setups' to 'all other DEM setups' to clarify that this statement refers to the topo data sensitivity experiment.

(11) Section 5. Conclusion is another huge paragraph with mixed subtopics. I suggest to split it into 4 paragraphs; Lines 593-605, 605-617, 617-631, and 631-641.