

To all three reviewers, first, I would like to thank you for taking the time to read this admittedly long and complex paper. We tried to cover a lot of bases thoroughly, and as reviewer Swap pointed out directly, it made some parts intractable. For me, living and breathing SE Asian aerosol meteorology, I can keep track of the various factors. But for those who are new to this, it can be quite involved. Most importantly, we took the advice of the reviewers and split the paper. This was actually not so easy the way reviewer 1 as there are significant interdependencies. We therefore took the advice of Swap, to break out the regional summary from the cruise. Indeed, this we feel this presentation is easier reading for interested parties.

To make a regional meteorology paper of sufficient substance, we added several figures and tables, to make our findings more tractable. We then had to add about 5 pages of discussion and repeat references. But, this was ultimately a good thing, as we saw things we had not noticed before-such as fire counts and AOTs did not directly correlated relative to the historical record. This breakout also made for a better paper for students to systematically associate regional scale meteorology with aerosol observations.

Part II now focuses entirely on the cruise. Although, we did need to retain the most relevant aspects of the meteorology analysis. We also had in a very limited fashion represent data from a few AERONET sites. Other than this, we largely tried to consolidate where possible. We also cut some portions from section 5, as each component in there would need to be its own paper if done properly. These modifications resulted in a reception of this paper by more than 13 pages of text.

Other comments were for grammar and minor clarifications, which we have fixed in the paper in short order. The marked up draft from reviewer Swap was appreciated.

Be well,

Jeffrey Reid