

I thank the authors for their corrections and substantial manuscript improvement.

I am afraid I missed a likely erroneous statement in my original review, which the authors just rephrased in the corrected manuscript : "To a first approximation, under steady state the temperature gradient is inversely proportional to  $k_{\text{snow}}$ . Since the simulated thermal conductivity profile is inverted, we expect simulated snow surface temperatures to be colder than measurements while bottom temperatures should be warmer, given that simulated and measured temperatures are similar near the middle of the snowpack" (p28 in the authors' response).

An inverted Keff profile in simulations should indeed lead to colder surface temperatures but also colder soil temperatures (at the bottom, Keff is higher-than-in-real, so temperature gradient is weak and departure from the 22cm T°C value is low, leading to colder-than-real bottom snow temperature). What is seen fig 6, -- ie that crocus (eg : wind) simulations are colder than observations at the surface, and warmer at the bottom of the snowpack -- is probably more an effect of different arithmetic Keff averages between observations and simulations.

I think the manuscript is now ready for publications, pending that the authors address this minor and last comment.