

Response to editor's comments

1. Editor's comments

Editor Decision: Publish subject to minor revisions (review by editor) (16 Feb 2020) by Anne Perring
Comments to the Author:

Dear Jakko and coauthors,

I appreciate the substantial revisions you have made in response to the reviewers comments. I have two additional/correlated comments of my own that I think would further strengthen the manuscript. Once these are addressed I will be happy to accept the paper for publication in ACP.

1) Reviewer 2 mentioned a couple of parts of the manuscript which struck them as long yet, in the revisions, little was cut while many things were added. The introduction especially strikes me as overly detailed and I would recommend rewriting to include only the background information necessary for the reader to follow the work at hand. As written it is a very thorough literature review with one to two sentences on each of many references. I would recommend reorganizing so that you have three or four thematic paragraphs in which you discuss, for example, 1) previous studies that have looked at health effects of RWC aerosol, 2) prior findings of fractional contribution of RWC sources in Europe, 3) findings about RWC in other places (if necessary) and so on.

2) Figure 4 does not need to be 3d or shown with perspective. I recommend revising to be a normal bar graph.

2. Response to editor's comments

We have shortened the introduction and reorganized the literature review material, as per the editor's suggestions. In our view, the new version of the introduction is more to the point, and more clearly structured.

Figure 4 has been presented two-dimensionally.