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This is an excellent paper and it was a pleasure to review. In this paper, the authors provide detailed data and discussion about the differences between Tskin and 2-m surface temperatures over a variety of Arctic surfaces. They have done a thorough literature review and their work builds on previous work and fills in many important gaps. They quantify differences in temperature under different cloud cover conditions and in different seasons. The authors correctly state that is information is very important to understanding satellite-derived surface temperatures in the Arctic.

There are a few issues that can be addressed a bit better. Please see below.

p.1, line 9 I would put a comma after the word ‘satellites’
p.1, line 11 North Alaska should be re-stated as northern Alaska here and elsewhere in the paper
p.2, lines 7-9 Casey et al. (2017) showed that, due to calibration issues with the Collection-5 MODIS data in some bands, the darkening of the GrIS has been exaggerated in previous work such as Box et al. (2012) which is referenced. After taking into account the corrected calibration, there is very little decrease in albedo that can be measured using MODIS data. Please re-phrase after considering this information, including the Casey et al. (2017) paper.
p.4, line 22 I suggest changing the word ‘is’ to ‘was’
p.5, line 19 Please use all caps for TARA and spell out the acronym
p.6, 6th line from bottom: Barrows should read Barrow
p.9, line 15 delete the word ‘anyway’
p.10, line 12 neither should be either
p.11, line 4 please re-phrase the first sentence for clarity
p.13, line 4 indicated should read indicate
p.16, line 22 the word ‘are’ should be ‘is’
p.23, line 22 “. . .(2017) who find larger . . .”
p.25, line 24, line 30 radiations should be radiation

References

The Adolph et al. (2017) paper has been published in The Cryosphere. The reference shown in the paper is for The Cryosphere Discussions. Please update it.


p.26, line 15 Metop should be MetOp
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