

In this study, the authors quantified evaporation/sublimation (E) during ice-free and ice-cover periods (IFP and ICP) for a large lake on the Tibetan Plateau. Field observations were collected between 2014 to 2019 and used to quantify evaporation/sublimation (E) and then used to determine the main controls on E during the IF and IC period and annually. The results highlight a vast E (23%) during ICP in Qinghai Lake, and revealed the differences in controlling factors of E during IFP and ICP. This manuscript remains a very interesting piece of research, which provides important new insights by 6 years of direct observation. My previous comments/concerns have been adequately addressed with additional analysis and explanation by the authors, and as such the results and conclusions of the new version are more convincing. A few relatively minor issues remain but I believe that these should be able to be addressed without the need for further review.

Specific comments:

- 1) Line 41, '2003–2017' may be '2003~2017' as shown in Line124, 314, 315 and so on.
- 2) Line 104, '0.037°C/yr' should be '0.037 °C/yr'.
- 3) Line 131, '–0.1°C' should be '–0.1 °C'.
- 4) Line 135, I do not think it is precise to claim that the length of ICP is more than 100 days in QHL. The length of ICP was 83~121 days during 2002~2014 (Fig. S4 in this study), with only a very few years exceeding 100 days. Thus, 'lasts more than 100 days' is suggested to be 'lasts approximate 100 days'.
- 5) Line 338, 'This indicated that E of QHL was mainly controlled by WS' should be 'This indicated that E of QHL was mainly controlled by WS'.
- 6) Line 348, '–0.01°C/yr' should be '–0.01 °C/yr'. The authors need to carefully check the format of the full text, space is needed between numbers and units.
- 7) Line 367, '0.73–1.38' may be '0.73~1.38'.
- 8) Line 404, '3h⁻¹' should be '3 h⁻¹'.
- 9) Line 485, 'reduction of 11.1%' should be 'reduction of 7.56%'.
- 10) Considering the difference in the driving factors of lake evaporation during IFP and ICP, it should be very cautious in year-round E simulation by the traditional formula of E, before a reasonable verification in different seasons. One speculative comment is

whether the Penman formula series considering both aerodynamics and energy balance would work well for evaporation simulations during both IFP and ICP, although the parameter input for this model may be a bit more complex. I think this is worth exploring in the future study.