

Editor's Comments

Based on reviewers' comments and decisions, and my own evaluation, I reached my decision as major corrections of this "Commentary" article. Main issues are as follows:

Scientific goal/novelty: This is good and I support this article to be published.

Understanding/presentation: It is very poorly written; comprehensive understanding is very poor.

Presentation of ideas is poor. Concerns are: very long sentences, lost meaning of what is proposed, poor paragraphing and language issues.

Organization: It is very poorly written, and not easy to follow up.

Text flow: it is very poor/not well designed.

Conclusions can be itemized with a few bullets.

Authors Feedback:

Many thanks. I explain why the Cryosat-2 results for the Arctic ice thickness are reliable, while the Cryosat-2 results for the Antarctic ice thickness are not reliable. The Arctic ice thickness is increasing because the upper ice boundary as detected by the satellite is moving up. The Antarctic upper ice boundary as detected by the satellite is also moving up, but somebody claims the lower boundary is moving up more playing a Glacial Isostatic Adjustment for the motion of the land beneath the ice. Consistency with other monitoring products (lower troposphere temperatures, sea ice extension) further corroborates this conclusion.

The paper has been drastically re-written and properly organized.