

## 2<sup>nd</sup> review for Pistone

This manuscript has been significantly improved after the revision. I am generally satisfied with the current version, and I would like to recommend it for publication with very minor revisions.

The abstract needs to be further refined for clarity. In the current abstract, the conclusions are not clearly presented. I suggest the abstract to be organized as follows:

First paragraph: motivation

Second paragraph: briefly described the CARDEX experiment and the key observations

Third paragraph: present the key finding (positive correlations between aerosol and cloud LWP). Then explain the possible mechanisms and the supporting observation results.

Some sentences in the abstract need to be modified. For example, line 14-15, it is better to indicate the criteria applied between the dry and wet cases, instead of stating that the data has been “filtered” to control the results.

The use of dash is not necessary in line 23-25, the first dash could be replaced with “that”, and the second one with a comma.

In the introduction:

Line 22-23, I'm not sure if it is necessary to say these clouds are “physically similar”, would there be any “non-physical” factors involved?

Figure 4: it is difficult to read this figure with the noisy lines and two colors so similar to each other. I suggest changing one of the colors to contrast better with the other one, use error bars or shading for the variability among different profiles.