

The revised reversion of Yang et al. does address several of the manuscripts original limitations. The manuscript is still clear and well written and the scientific problem addressed is important to the scientific community. However, a few issues remain that leave questions as to whether the findings in the manuscript are robust and meaningful. My major and minor comments on the revised manuscript are as follows:

Major Comments

- 1) The authors have included two additional episodes to address the issue of scientific robustness. With these two additional episodes, it appears that the impact of aerosol radiation interactions, usually via API, are similar in all episodes despite variability in the magnitude and spatial extent of the CAPAs. With these finding we can reasonably conclude that these values are indeed representative of CAPAs in this region during the period of 2014-2016. However, this did not address any issues with changes in time/emissions (i.e, 2001-2005 or more currently 2018-2020). If the authors are not going to do any additional episodes, they need to convincingly justify why the period of 2014-2016 is representative of /or important for current/future conditions.
- 2) The authors have added caveats to the conclusion to address the issue of lacking SOA formation pathways in their simulations. These listed caveats are important, but the authors have overlooked the possibility that increased O3 from PM2.5 reductions will generate more SOA via increased oxidation. This feedback could partially compensate the increased O3 formation the authors predict will happen.

Minor Comments

- 1) The response to the previous Reviewer2 Minor comments 7-10 should be included in the manuscript if not already done to facilitate ease of understanding.
- 2) The color bars for Figures 5 and 6 needs to be the same for all episodes to facilitate easy comparison.
- 3) In Figures 2 and 3 the y-axis need to be consistent for all episodes to facilitate ease of comparison.