

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO EDITOR

I am satisfied that you have addressed the reviewer's comments more or less, apart from two minor technical concerns, which I would like addressed. Other than this, this is a high quality paper that will make an excellent contribution to ACP. Consider it accepted with 2 minor technical corrections.

The authors acknowledge the editor for the suggestions made to the manuscript. The response to each of the suggestions is written below in a point-by-point manner, with editors' comments in bold and the replies in non-bold. Moreover, a revised manuscript with the changes tracked for easier reference is provided.

Minor technical comments:

1. Two of the reviewers (and myself) noticed and commented on the use of Figures in Supplemental to be distracting. My own rule of thumb is that Supplemental Material is for Stand Alone Material that does not need to be referred to in order to understand the discussion of the paper. However if a Figure or Table is referred to multiple times, requiring the reader to search for the material for a valid proof or validity, then that piece of work should appear in the main paper, not in Supplemental. The purpose of Supplemental should not be just a place where Figures and Tables are dumped in order to lessen the overall number of Figures & Tables. It is better to have more figures than fewer, rather than the reader having to be distracted by having to refer constantly between 2 documents. In such a case, they still need to access all the Figures discussed regardless of where they appear.

I find that the following have been referred to and discussed 3 times in the paper and you should consider (as suggested by reviewers) that they be added to the main paper:

Table S1, Fig S2, Fig S3.

After considering the suggestion made for the reviewers and the editor, the authors agree that the Table S1, and Figures S2 and S3 should be in the main text. Therefore, they have moved to the main paper and are now Table 1, and Figures 1 and 3 in the new version of the manuscript.

2. I agree with one of the reviewers that most of the Figures have text labels that are too small. I do not agree that you have made them as large as possible. The only Figure that is not problematic is Figure 2. Please make a concerted attempt to increase all font sizes (axes labels & numbers at a minimum) in Figures that you can. Reducing the number of tick labels by 50% can create more room for larger fonts. Also consider thicker lines for some of the traces, as they are difficult to discern from the lighter colors.

As suggested, the axes labels and numbers have been modified to increase their font size. Nevertheless, the authors will make sure that the text in all figures is readable during the proofreading.

Additional comment from authors to the editor:

The authors would like to notice that new information on sampling site section has been added, and the model of the DMA has been corrected. Moreover, in section 3.2 (submicron aerosol chemical composition) a clarification on the OM-to-OC has been added.