

In their response to reviewers comments, the authors did not adequately address all of the points. Please provide further responses to the following comments:

**Referee #1, comment 1.** The referee suggested the authors carry out additional ensembles to evaluate the robustness of the simulated aerosol effects. This seems like a reasonable request. Is there some reason the authors decided not to do this?

**Referee #1, comment 4.** The referee requested additional explanation of why increasing CCN leads to an increase in graupel but a decrease in hail. The authors responded with a discussion of collision efficiency dependence on droplet size. It is not clear to me that they answered the referee's question. Moreover, I did not find any additional explanation in the revised manuscript. If the authors feel there is no need for additional explanation, they should explain why.

**Referee #1, comment 5.** The referee asked for a display of latent heat. The authors responded by stating they added plots of precipitation. This isn't what the referee asked for. If the authors think plots of latent heat are not appropriate, they should explain why.

**Referee #2, comment 1.** The referee asks for several details about changes in the features of the MCS with increasing CCN, including cold pool structure, longevity of individual cores, and shape/tilt of updrafts. The authors respond by stating that their analysis of cold pools failed, but they don't address the other issues. A complete response should be provided.