Thanks for the revision. It answered most of my questions. I have two more comments regarding being specific in the key findings and adding the ratio between the actual snowfall rate vs. the liquid equivalent. It is important to be specific about the two details, otherwise the readers will find it confusing.

Comments:
Line 80-82: key findings. Please add two words to specify the 'surface snow rates'. Change it to 'hourly liquid-equivalent surface snow rates'. It is important to be clear in the key findings that the surface liquid-equivalent snow rate you are talking about is from the hourly surface accumulation data (ASOS).

We have changed the sentence on line 80 to read:
"The key finding is that locally enhanced linear features (i.e. mesoscale snow bands) in operational scanning radar reflectivity within northeast US snow storms (which exclude orographic and lake effect snow storms) are usually not associated with heavy hourly liquid-equivalent surface snow rates."

Line 158: If the S is not liquid-equivalent. You need to provide the information of the approximate scale between liquid-equivalent and non-liquid-equivalent. Is it 10? But for dry snow vs. wet snow, their scales are different. Please provide a range of the scale that is used in the literature and operational forecasting.

Thank you for pointing this out. The snow rate rescaled from reflectivity is liquid-equivalent, it just isn't hourly. We have changed the sentence beginning on line 157 to read:
"Note that the snow rate obtained from this relationship represents an instantaneous liquid equivalent snow rate from a single radar scan and hence is not expected to match the hourly accumulation liquid equivalent reported from the ASOS stations."

We have also revised the figure captions in Figs. 4 and 5 to clarify that this is liquid-equivalent snow rate.

Not sure why the supplement video (for Fig.10) appears not match the Fig 10 in the manuscript.

Thank you for noticing this. The titles of the videos have been fixed.