

The article is still poorly written and tedious. Data from various measurements were used in this article including surface instrumentations like D-MPSS, Q-ACSM and lidar system. However, there are only lengthy analysis and few merits. Lidar has its advantage in measuring aerosol vertical hygroscopic growth in ambient environment, which is not evident in this article. In addition, errors due to the different observation methods and uncertainties from optical parameters from lidar should be considered.

Other comments:

The abstract is too long-winded and then innovation is difficult to find. Only one paragraph is suggested for the abstract.

Line 68: replace “does exsits” by “does exsit”

Line 101: replace “were” by “was”

Line 110: replace “is” by “are”

Line 112: replace “is” by “are”

Line 113: What is “This”?

Line 128: delete “is ”

Line 230: replace “underestimates” by “underestimate”

Line 290: replace “of” by “for”

Line 343: replace “were” by “was”

Line 535: Poor writing

Line 578: replace “led” to “lead”

Line 618: replace “oppoding to” by “opposed to”

Line 702: “solely based on... ”