Dear reviewer,

Thanks for doing this review again.

Concerning the first comment, we would prefer to keep "part 1" and "part 2" in the title, as these are really two parts of the "Characterization of aerosol particles at Cape Verde close to sea and cloud level heights", with part 1 dealing with particle number concentrations, size distributions, CCN concentrations and types of aerosol into different types, while part 2 then adds the information of INP number concentrations. As both manuscripts are about equally long, it would not be reasonable to combine them into one.

Another reason for using the numbering is, that if both manuscripts are published they are both "Gong et al., 2020", and it is, from a readers perspective, much easier to discriminate between " part 1" and" part 2" instead of referring to the more complicated titles.

But we do see the point that numbering the two studies only makes sense if both of the manuscripts will be published. The answers to the reviews of the second manuscript have already been resubmitted and we await the answer, and we suggest to the editor (and the reviewer), that we could wait with a decision on the final title until the outcome on the second work will be clear. In case of a rejection, we'd delete the "part 1", but in case of acceptance, we'd be in favor of keeping it.

Concerning the second comment, as this paper focus on CCN number concentration, it is better to classify particle sources based on particle number instead of particle mass (which is the case when focusing on chemical composition). But in any case, there is no big difference in the characterization done in Fomba et al. (2014) and ours. What is called type A and B in Fomba et al. (2014) is comparable to our marine type and dust type2, respectively. Our dust type 1 is close to type C in Fomba et al. (2014), and our mixture type is close to type D. Type E in Fomba et al. (2014) are the remaining back trajectories that could not be assigned to the above four major classes. Note that no criteria of classification of backward trajectory was explained in Fomba et al. (2014). Fig. 1 in Fomba et al. (2014) only shows one day backward trajectory as an example. This impedes a direct comparison of the two classifications. But we will include this roughly comparison in the new version.

We added the following in page 16, line 10 (new version):

"The marine, mixture, dust type1 and dust type2 in this study are comparable to type A, D, C and B in Fomba et al., (2014), respectively, who characterized particle chemical composition at CVAO over a time period of 4 years."