

The revised manuscript by Schneider et al. has significantly improved from the original version. I only have a few minor comments below that the authors should address prior to acceptance.

I appreciate that the authors took care in adding more sufficient background. Perhaps a bit long in some places. I suggest shortening the discussion on Hartmann et al. to a 2 – 3 sentences so it is similar in length to the others.

The paragraph starting on page 1 is quite lengthy. The authors should consider splitting up into multiple, more focused paragraphs, e.g., one on previous work, one on boreal forest background, and one on biogenic INPs. That leads nicely into the second (last) paragraph that provides a synopsis of the current work.

Page 5, line 208: Why was only the one inlet heated? Would that not introduce variability that would affect the sizing results?

Again, the paragraph starting at the end of page 5 is quite long. Consider breaking up into size distributions (DMPS+APS), fluorescence measurements (WIBS), and chemical measurements (L-ToF-AMS).

Page 6, line 239: Can eliminate the sentence starting with “Note” as that is redundant.

Section 3.2: Another long paragraph. Consider splitting up to make more concise paragraphs.

Page 9, lines 293 – 303: This information belongs in the methods section.

Page 10, lines 341 – 343: Wouldn’t this be expected given the wind measurements were above the canopy and the INP measurements were below?

Page 16, line 452: What a remarkable reproduction of the data! Very great result.