

Comments to the Author:

This version seems to address most of the concerns, however both reviewers raised the point about the lack of calibration of the CCN. The revised version does address this, but by extrapolating between the pressure-corrected values to get back to the concentrations at the nominal values. I have to say I find myself agreeing with the report by reviewer #2 in that it would have made more sense to simply repeat the closure exercise at the corrected supersaturations, thereby removing the possibility of inaccuracies creeping in through the interpolation process. It would also be more consistent with previous works in the literature attempting to model measured CCN behaviour.

If the authors have a reason for not doing this, it should be stated, along with providing more detail on the interpolation process. If not, repeating the calculations for the corrected values would give a more scientifically defensible result.

Answer to reviewer #2 and editor

We accepted the suggestion of editor and reviewer #2 and we repeated the closure exercise at the corrected supersaturation to give a more scientifically defensible result. We also modified all references to nominal supersaturation after we mention the correction on supersaturations.

Now Table 3 refers only to corrected supersaturation values. Figures 5, 7 and 8 were modified according to reviewer and editor suggestion.

We believe we did all modifications needed according to suggestions.