

I think that the authors have followed the reviewer's comments so the paper can be published.

My only comment concerns the reviewer comment:

"Page 14371, Conclusions: It is important to mention in the Conclusions section that there are large uncertainties in all parameters analyzed except AOD and SCT (since SCT is dominated by AOD). The exceptions are sites with very high AOD such as Beijing, Kanpur, XiangHe, IER Cinzana, Hong_Kong_PolyU and Agoufou where very high AOD levels allow for accurate retrievals of all parameters analyzed (including SSA and ABS)."

Your response is:

"We have added the statement "only the results at stations with consistently high aerosol loading, i.e., those having sufficient Level 2.0 inversion retrievals, are the most reliable" in the conclusion section.

I would suggest to expand this single statement more following more or less following what the reviewer exactly says.

best regards

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for your comment. We have followed your suggestion by revising this statement as follows:

"except for the AOD, the other parameters also have large uncertainties at low AOD conditions even for Level 2.0. The exceptions are sites with very high AOD such as Beijing, Kanpur, XiangHe, IER Cinzana, Banizoumbou Solar_Village and Dakar, where very high AOD levels allow for accurate retrievals of all parameters analyzed."