

**Review of the paper “Uncertainty from choice of microphysics scheme in convection-permitting models significantly exceeds aerosol effects”,
authored by Bethan White, Edward Gryspeerd, Philip Stier, Hugh Morrison, Gregory Thompson, and Zak Kipling**

The paper was improved in course of the revision.

I partially satisfied with the response of the authors.

Nevertheless, some comments remain unanswered.

For instance, both bulk schemes turned out to be insensitive to droplet concentration. Can the author comment this insensitivity? Do they consider this insensitivity as a natural property of cloud systems simulated in the study, or they attribute this insensitivity to the specific features of the bulk schemes tested in the study? Corresponding discussion should be included into the Conclusion Section.

In the revised paper the authors presented more detailed discussion of the bulk schemes used. Note that the fact that many scientists use for deep convection simulations the autoconversion scheme developed for slightly drizzling stratiform clouds does not indicate yet the ability of the scheme to simulate deep convection well.

Which scheme (Berry and Reinhard , 1974 or of Khairoutdinov and Kogan (2000)) show better results? Which scheme is recommended by the authors?

These comments and remarks are minor. So, I agree with publication of the paper with *minor* revisions.