Dear Editor,

Thank you for your careful checking our manuscript and information of interesting paper. We have misunderstood your comments in the previous version on the assumption of snow or ice density. We have revised the density of scenario 2, and calculated mass balance, and added Huss, (2013) in the reference list, as follows. Revised parts are written in red.

*** > ###  (: *** has revised to ###)

L10   -0.17  >  -0.18
L173 (Huss, 2013) has added.
     850 ± 60 > 900
L189  850 > 900
L228  -0.19 > -0.20
L229  0.17 > 0.18
L308  -0.17 > -0.18
L320  -0.29 > -0.30
L342  -0.17 > -0.18
L404  added Huss, 2013 in the list
L507  850 ± 60 (Latter one) > 900

Table 3  Mass balances of Scenario 2 and Average were revised.
Figure 8 has revised (mass balance of Kanchenjunga has a little bit decreased)

Thank you.

Regards,

Akiko