

Measuring Light Absorption by Primary Organic Aerosols: Optical Artifacts in Traditional Solvent Extraction-Based Methods

Shetty et al's new version of the manuscript is much clearer and addressed the major concerns highlighted in the reviewer comments. However, I still see some minor errors and contents that need to be addressed in the manuscript. In the manuscript, the symbols in each equation and in the text should be written in the same format such as in the Microsoft Equation format. It seems that, in the text, symbols are written in Microsoft font and not in the Microsoft equation format. I recommend using a comma between two lambdas (in line 196: λ_1, λ_2). In page 319, add a line by giving a reference that can be referred to obtain 0.39 for BC using parametrization at OC/TC ratio of 0 (Line 319) or add a line to support it. Also, explain is it possible to observe OC/TC as zero (line 319)? In lines 353-354, Fig. 5 does not tell anything about EC fractions >0.25 and typical BB as stated in the text. Add a line showing how it is associated with Fig. 5. Section 3.4, the title is recommended to rewrite such as Scaling Factors Based on Mie calculations. In line 408-409, it seems ambiguity of suggesting researchers avoid such scaling factors for determining OA absorption without exact knowledge of OC extraction efficiencies and particle size distributions. I suggest to authors to present data or references to support how knowledge of OC extraction efficiencies and particle size distributions will convince of using scaling factors for determining OA absorption.