

Main comments:

The comments of the reviewers have, on my view, mostly been addressed well. There are, however, two related ways in which I think the paper still needs work. These relate somewhat to reviewer 1's worries about the methodology of the paper.

According to the paper's introduction, the paper aims to "understand why decisions made by the snow modelling community over the past decades have led to little or no progress in the representation of Arctic snowpack processes, i.e. in the part of the planet that warms faster than anywhere else." No mention is made of further goals of the paper in either the introduction or the methodology section. But section 4's aim is to draw conclusions from the study about what snow modelling should continue to do and what it should start to do. While the issue with the paper here is partly structural, in that the reader needs advance notice about section 4, the issue is also methodological. What exactly is the basis for the recommendations in section 4? How do the recommendations relate to the material in earlier sections? What are the limitations of the recommendations? What is novel about the recommendations? These questions are hard for the reader to answer, partly because of the absence of information in the methodology section, partly because the arguments offered in section 4 are quick, and partly because the authors suggest that they do not assume the correctness of the opinions of those interviewed while some arguments seem to rest on these opinions (see the detailed comments on lines 583-591, 609-610, and 613-622).

The structural issue should, I propose, be addressed in the introduction. The methodological issue should be addressed in the methodology section. The conclusions should also include some clarification relating to the scope of the claims and their basis. I was particularly unclear about the argument for a plurality of modelling approaches.

Detailed comments:

Line 98: 'i.e.' seems inappropriate here. More importantly, the claim that perhaps no progress has occurred in modelling snowpack seems too strong because the previous paragraph does describe some progress and only states that there has been no progress in ESMs. Perhaps an additional sentence is needed in the previous paragraph to make it more explicit that most models still represent no snow processes (as recognised on the next page). This would help understand the claim that perhaps no progress has been made.

Line 154: Could you be more explicit about how the expertise of the extra four participants helped to address the existence of overlap in expertise?

Lines 208 and 238: The references are not entered properly here.

Line 286: "*Everything always start at...*" Missing 's'.

Line 340: The reference is not entered properly here.

Line 440-441: it is stated that the paper argues that anchoring is an important reason for the absence of Arctic snow processes in existing models. This seems out of place here, given that all you are doing in this section is reporting on the interviews. I would suggest deleting this sentence.

Lines 467-469: this sentence is hard to parse. I suggest reformulating.

Line 569: the statement about being sick of certain modellers is mentioned for the second time. This is a bit jarring because it is presented as if it is mentioned for the first time.

Line 583-591: the argument here for a plurality of modelling strategies was hard to follow and seems too quick. Is the idea just that the system is complex so multiple perspectives are needed? I would have expected more detail than this.

Lines 609-610: the paper here seems to be appealing to the opinions gathered in the interviews (reported in section 4.1) to make proposals for future modelling. Is this correct? Why is this appeal allowed here? My impression was that the paper was not supposed simply to endorse these.

Lines 613-622: the argument here about running future MIPs seems partly to appeal to the opinions of those interviewed. Is this permitted here?

Line 616: reference not entered properly here.

Line 676: "written it" should be "written".