

Comments to the authors:

The scientific meaning and academic value of this article is not described effectively. What is the contribution to the haze study due to this work? The conclusions and abstract are too simple and common, some conclusions are such specious arguments. A considerable part of the references listed is irrelevant to this paper. Authors need to study the relevant study results and articles carefully and refine more meaningful and detailed research goals. English expression need to be refined and modified.

1. “The Up-Vis on non-haze days was about 3-5 times higher than that on haze days.” There's a problem with this conclusion.

2. “Moreover, a strong correlation between PM<sub>2.5</sub> mass concentration and haze parameters shows an obvious influence of near-ground particle concentration on haze parameters, so the haze phenomenon could be alleviated by controlling pollutant concentrations near the ground”. What is the definite scientific meaning if this conclusion?