The authors highlight two objectives for the manuscript. The second objective seems to be addressed well by showing improvement of the lake-breeze predictions with the GEM run at a grid spacing of 250m although the conclusion is not new. However, I am not sure this is the case for the first objectives that the authors set up for this study even in the revised version. As pointed out by the authors in the response letter, the ability of the GEM predicting lake breezes has been evaluate by other studies (e.g., Lemonsu et al., 2009; Leroyer et al. 2014). The configurations are similar to others. The authors should show or demonstrate the importance and contributions of this study for both science and techniques to our readers. If the authors want to highlight the capability of the model performance of the lake-breeze prediction under the two different synoptic wind regimes, the related findings must be included in the abstract. Does the GEM have a regional version? If it does, some related words must be included in the manuscript. A little bit more description about the GEM and how it can be run at a fine resolution of 250 m is necessary to the readers who are not familiar with GEM, which is not sufficient in the revised version. In addition, all the responses to the reviewers’ comment should be included in the revised manuscript rather than in the response letter only because the readers will have similar questions or perplexity later. For an example, “enhanced vertical velocity” (L255) that reviewer(s) did ask has not changed in the revised version. Please check similar issues for other responses. Some additional minor comments

1. HALO (L105) is not defined, please check and make sure that all the abbreviated terms have been defined.
2. I am not sure that north-north-easterly and east-north-easterly are appropriate or not。
3. L91: I assume that “experimentally” and “semi-operationally” convey same or similar meaning.
4. L95-96: The authors highlight that the main objective of this paper is to test the ability of the GEM model to predict Lake Ontario Lake breezes under two different wind regimes”. Later, the authors mentioned two different regimes of vertical motions on Line 246, two flow regimes on Line 248-249. How can they be linked to each other? Can the authors illustrate these two regimes further? What are the model performance differences in simulating lake breezes under these two different regimes?
5. L09: What are the “vertically staring modes”?
6. Several words appear just once in the beginning but never use later, like “radial velocity”, “vertically staring modes”, “black global temperature”? Do you have to keep them?
7. L130: An explanation of “lightly quality control” is needed.
8. L157: What does “2-km hourly output” include? Is the lake surface temperature changed or not during the simulations? How this change the model results?
9. L173-178: Are the first two criteria easy to identify?
10. L227: “Due” or “Due to”?
11. L363: How can you know this is possibly due to diffusive processes in the model? Please define “diffusive processes” in the model.
12. Some grammar errors still exist: Following are (L448). At lease I saw a similar grammar error in other place in the revised version. Please check through the manuscript.