

Answers to the editor:

The authors have now read the manuscript anew and tried to check the English for the final version and to improve the readability. Basic checking of all images, tables, references and acknowledgements was also carried out anew. The co-author that we got the permission to add was erroneously missing from the previously submitted version.

Specific answers:

Line 9: The surface albedo time series, CLARA-A2 SAL, was used

The commas are now added.

Line 11-12: In addition, the melt onset from JSBACH was compared with the timing of green-up estimated from MODIS data.

Edited as requested.

Line 12: Similarly, the end of snow melt predicted by JSBACH was compared with ...

Edited as requested.

Line 14-onwards: "It was found that 15 the albedo threshold 20 % of the ..." makes no sense.

This comment puzzled the authors. The number 15 is the number of the line in question, not part of the sentence. This is completely clear from the manuscript provided by the link uploaded by Anna Wenzel (27 Nov 2018). Are the reviewers/editor reading some other, further processed version of the manuscript? The authors can check only the versions available for them.

Line 16: See above.

The meaning of this comment is difficult to guess, as the previous comment was not related to the contents of the manuscript. The authors tried to clarify the text.

Line 17: In two northern vegetation map areas (vague), a clear trend towards an earlier snow melt onset ...

The comma is now added and the areas in question are specified.

Line 20: "The increased stem volume explained the trend." - this is not a complete sentence, you need further details.

The authors thought the sentence would be understandable from the context, but anyhow completed the sentence.