

Thanks to the authors for the careful responses to the review. I have some minor remaining concerns regarding the paper. It would be very useful if the authors can include a tracked changes version of the re-revised manuscript in their response. It would be great if the changes made in the initial response to the two reviews and the changes made in response to these comments were tracked in different colours to facilitate the editing process.

In addition, what is the current status of the related and frequently cited Tong et al. paper? One can assume that the citations can at least be updated to 2016. Is it possible to state the journal to which this manuscript is submitted?

Responses to reviewer 1:

- Comment 4: The reviewer asks for the value of coefficient A; it can be reasonably expected other readers will also want to know this. Please include the value in the revised manuscript and not just in the review response.
- Comment 5 (and 3): Again, you seem not to have included anything in the paper in response to these comments, as far as I can tell (I have no tracked changes manuscript version). Please include the response to these review comments including the equation and coefficients in the revised manuscript.
- Comment 7: I cannot find the response to this comment in the revised manuscript either; please include it, in particular justification for K.
- Comment 8: Does equation 5 come from a different reference? Or other justification for this equation?
- Comment 9: In the text there is no reference to the lookup table for S_i values. Either include the table that is in the review response in the revised manuscript or include a reference to the table in a published manuscript. It also seems like here should maybe be a citation of the NAM model which the values are based on?
- Comment 10: Again I cannot find this information in the revised manuscript. Please include it.
- Comment 11: The figures are still relatively hard to see. If possible, changing to a sans serif font in the figures will improve readability.

Responses to reviewer 3:

- Please include a sentence or two summarising these points in the revised manuscript; in particular emphasising the benefits of the new dust scheme given the limited improvement in agreement.