

In general, the paper was improved and the writing more clear. However, the paper is still very technical, and for someone not in the field of modeling, like myself, it is quite hard to comprehend the different aspects and various details of the paper. I still have some remaining comments about the paper, listed below.

The authors respond to the question about giant particles that this is not relevant for the present study, but I agree with Reviewer 2 and also would like to refer to the paper by van der Does et al. (2016) for the relevance of so-called “giant particles”. It would be very interesting to show proof of why these “giant particles” can be transported up to these great distances, by the mechanism of vertical mixing which the authors propose in the manuscript.

The SALTRACE paper by Weinzierl et al. is mentioned, however it should say “(submitted)” instead of “(2016)”, since it is not published, and therefore: not accessible yet. Examples found at: 2/29-30, 3/14, 13/4.

A different example is Haarig et al. (“2017”): it is perhaps somewhat unconventional to cite unpublished work this way, especially unsubmitted work; 15/11.

15/26-27: For the SALTRACE data, the authors now added maps of the position of the aircraft during the sampling period, however it would also be interesting to see elevation profiles of these flights as indeed the altitude at which particles are being transported is very important.

Technical comments:

Several times “Western Atlantic” is written, which should be “western Atlantic”. Found at: 1/6, 1/7, 1/19, 3/4, 19/26 (same with “central Atlantic”)

2/11: “Particle size distribution” should be “particle-size distribution”. Also found at 2/19.

2/19: “[...] in the Caribbean indicates [...]” (+ s)

8/12 and 8/28: Here the term “convective mixing” is still used, however in the rest of the paper this is now called “vertical mixing”.

11/5: The authors state here “as assumed in literature”, could you give examples of such literature?