

Response to editor comments (notice we have not responded to all comments & suggestions by the editor. If there is no response given here, then we have modified the text following the editor's suggestion)

General comment

We appreciate the editor's concern that our revision to include specific bullet point questions without further references within the manuscript does not fulfill reviewer 1's suggestion. Therefore we have included references back to these questions primarily within the results sections 3 and 4, now referred to as "fundamental question 1, 2, or 3".

Specific comments

Pg. 12, comment 1: This is not a contradiction to what was previously stated. If there are more than 1 cloud layer below 2.5 km, these cases are fully removed from the analysis. If one cloud layer below 2.5 km exists, with a higher cirrus cloud with radar indications of ice-only hydrometeors, this lower cloud is retained in the analysis.

Pg. 14, comment 1: The discussion regarding the sub-cloud stability of marine stratocumulus at lower latitudes has been removed as, as the editor points out, there are different mechanisms between the two cloud systems leading to decoupling.

Pg. 19, comment 1: The figure has been updated following the editor's suggestion to highlight times when the upper layer cloud reveals radar signatures depicting ice-only (gray) and liquid hydrometeors (black)

Pg. 21, comment 1: This discussion regarding general characteristics observed during both case studies is now described in a separate section titled: Synopsis of both case studies.

Pg. 25 comment 1: Yes, the lack of a large number of profiles and the variability in vertical location of the wind speed maximum between surface and cloud top results the mean and standard deviation of normalized wind speed to vary with height.