

I am pleased with most changes that have been made to the manuscript.
I have two remaining concerns.

One is figure 10. Per my request, it had been changed it to display four different regions rather than the original altitude layers, but when these new results were inconclusive, the figure was reverted to height layers. Having looked at the original altitude plot, it seems to me that in terms of the Re distribution, only the highest altitude layer was significantly distinct from the rest. For the version of this figure that showed geographic regions instead, the authors noted that the 180-120W DJF area had a broader size distribution than did 60E-120E JJA, which was a region characterized by more frequent convection. The unique characteristics of the other regions were less conclusive.

I would like to see key impacts of altitude and geography combined into one plot. This could be accomplished different ways, but for example: an upper panel could have all TTL clouds below 16.5 km, the other could be only TTL clouds from 16.5-17.5 km (from the original figure), and the two lower panels could show 180-120W DJF and 60E-120E JJA, respectively, to highlight differences in the distribution (broad versus narrow) with respect to convective activity focused in these areas. As before, I think it is useful to see the number of samples included within each layer or region.

The other concern came out in my back and forth with Aurelian (the other reviewer) about the numbering of wave phases. Upon review, I realize the sequence originally came from the K16 paper (specifically their figure 5) and the current manuscript is consistent with theirs in this regard. While I believe the sequence in K16 is illogical as it stands -- phase 3 and phase 4 results ought to have been swapped -- I'm not going to require any change here, for the sake of consistency with K16, and because the adoption of any particular numbering sequence is done by convention.