

The second-round review on “Tang et al., Water adsorption and hygroscopic growth of six anemophilous pollen species: the effect of temperature”. The questions I concerned in the first-round review were well addressed in the new version. I recommend that this manuscript can be accepted after addressing a major comment below:

The authors may carefully re-consider this conclusion “In-situ DRIFTS measurements suggested that water adsorption by pollen species was mainly contributed by OH groups of organic compounds they contained”. The description on “functional groups contribute to water adsorption” may not be reasonable. “OH group” may be “COOH group”. Can we say “COOH group” is a major contributor? Or, we can say “OH group” is kind of indicator for hygroscopicity of anemophilous pollen species? Please judge and weigh!

Figure 1: At RH=95%, the normalized mass looks like unstable and keeps increasing. Please make sure the description in the main text (Line 159-160) is identical to that shown in the Figure 1, especially for the mass at RH=95%.

Figure 3 and Table 2, RH<1% is taken in Figure 2, while, RH=0% is used in Table 1. RH=0% is unrealistic.

Figure 4, the RH is presented as 0-0.95, while, in other places, the percentage is used. Please keep the same style throughout the text.