

continues from the previous submission

1. The item in lines 354-356 is misplaced, since bioaerosols have nothing to do with secondary organic aerosol. This item should be transferred in the section concerning aerosol and clouds. Also, I believe that this short sentence does not do justice to the importance of the issue. In fact, Airborne bacteria, fungal spores, pollen, and other bioparticles are essential for the reproduction and spread of organisms across various ecosystems, and they can cause or enhance human, animal, and plant diseases. Moreover, they can serve as nuclei for cloud droplets, ice crystals, and precipitation, thus influencing the hydrological cycle and climate (Fröhlich-Nowoisky et al., *Atmospheric Research*, 182, 346-376, 2016). These issues should be emphasized and in the above review paper pre-2010 appropriate references can easily be found.
2. Table 2 reports the most cited papers according to Scopus and WoS. Several papers are common to the two databases although in a different ranking. One can notice immediately that the most cited paper according to WoS does not even appear in the Scopus list. Unless the authors want to go into the reasons for this striking result (which I would not suggest), my suggestion would be to choose one of the two databases to be reported excluding the other.
3. Appendix 1 shows very interesting results on journals and regions of the references reported in the paper. I would suggest to include an Appendix 2 reported similar statistics concerning the contributions received by the authors from the call through the IGAC community. Knowing the number of contributions, their percentages by country, by age, gender, etc. would in my opinion help interpreting the outcomes of the paper.
4. Connected to the two above points, I would suggest to compile a table of the top ten papers suggested by the respondents to the author's call. It would be interesting to compare with the table 2 results.