Re-review of ms acp-2017-1197

The authors have satisfactorily addressed the concerns of this reviewer adequately and publication is recommended. A few minor comments described below remain to be addressed.

p. 5, line 10. The extraction procedure appears to have been described in the previous page, line 31?

p. 6, line 21. artefacts → artifacts.

p. 6, line 31 – p. 7 lines 1 and 2. Unless the authors are referring here to the relative yields of the monoperoxypinic acid II under dry and wet conditions, this procedure does not seem to be valid for quantitation of isomer II, but rather a measure of consistency in instrument performance and sample preparation using camphoric acid as an internal standard. Quantitation relies on the assumption of (1) the same response factor for the base peaks of the MS/MS spectra of camphoric acid and isomer II of monoperoxypinic acid and (2) the base peaks of the MS/MS spectra of both camphoric acid (loss of CO_2) and monoperoxypinic acid isomer II (loss of H_2O) represent the same branching ratios of leading to the monitored product ions. If relative peak areas (yields) of isomer II under different conditions or in different experiments are being compared, then this approach is valid. The authors need to clarify this and not refer to the quantitation of isomer II.

p. 7, line 7. Figure 3 is described in the caption as the “base peak chromatogram” of the synthetic mixture. The authors might supply the specific *m/z* of the base peak.

p. 8, lines 18 – 19. Are integrals being compared derived from the molecular ions in full scan MS, or from base peaks of MS/MS spectra? It would seem that the authors can only estimate relative yields of monoperoxypinic acids. Given this stipulation, the conclusion that RH makes no difference is valid, since selected specific ions can be directly compared between dry and wet conditions.