

We want to thank Dr. Singh for his interest in our work and constructive comments. Below his main arguments/suggestions are in italics, followed by our answer.

The comment was rather lengthy discussing the main argument, which is briefly summarized below: *“The main aim of this comment is to clarify findings of the higher absorbing organic content over Kanpur, India which is largely influenced by the emissions from a major coal-fired power plant (Figure 1) located close to Kanpur AERONET site, and not because of the very high biomass burning as suggested by the authors.”*

Panki power plant is located south-east from Kanpur AERONET site. Regardless of the season, south-easterly winds are certainly not prevailing. Actually, this wind direction is distinctly unexceptional (see Figure 1 of Ram et al. 2010, JGR in press). Therefore, we do not consider Panki influencing our main conclusions. Although Panki does not have a role as a single source in our retrievals, more generally we have emphasized that also the coal burning for domestic heating is likely a significant factor of OC in newly industrialized countries (based on our retrievals in Kanpur and Beijing).

*“Number of data points used in the retrieval of OC for the month of October to December should also be mentioned.”*

Now there is a table indicating the data volume. Also, boxplots are drawn with width relative to the data amount.

*“Arola et al (2010) may like to consider refractive indices month to month rather than considering averaged seasonal values”.*

This is a good point. We have also stressed the need for better constrained imaginary index values, from site-to-site, from season-to-season. Unfortunately, this kind of data are not currently available. We have stressed this and the need for further measurements (in the Conclusions -chapter).