The authors have made significant improvements to the manuscript. However, it remains unclear how two of my major comments on the initial draft where addressed.

(1) Statistical significance still doesn't quite appear to be assessed correctly. The text is still vague on this, but it appears that the authors are only checking if the means +/· the standard errors overlap. Just because the errors bars do not overlap, does not mean the difference is significant. An actual statistical test (e.g. 2 sample t-test) needs to be used to assess differences. For example, in Table 3 for "All Layers" the lidar ratio differences are not statistically significant at 95% confidence (p=0.16). The authors should revisit the statistical test used and/or better explain what is being done in the text.

Explain what is being uone in the text. (2) I comment the authors for undertaking a full treating of multiple scattering. But, it is not clear how exactly the authors performed the correction. In the text, the authors simply state that they "perform a full treatment of multiple scattering following the model of Hogan (2008)". But the Hogan model is a forward model: i.e. it requires inputs of the true (single scattering) backscatter/extinction and from that computes the measured (single and multiple scattering) signal. Therefore, what is retrieved from the lidar cannot be directly inputted into the Hogan model to get the multiple scattering effects. I suggest that the authors elaborate more on how they correct for multiple scattering.