

Comments to the author:

The comments from the three reviewers were well addressed and several Figures from the responses show that you did the extra work to answer their concerns.

To publish this paper into ACP, I simply ask you to make two slight addition/modification to the manuscript.

We appreciate the editor's thoughtful suggestion and valuable time. I corrected the manuscript as you mentioned below.

1- The first one is to include in your paper the answer you made to Reviewer 1 concerning the following question that indicates areas where the EPIC has limitations to retrieve dust:
“Line 283: Could you explain why the algorithm does not retrieve dust aerosol over South America and southern Africa?

Response: With EPIC lacking bands beyond 780nm, MAIAC cannot differentiate between the smoke and dust despite it detects absorbing aerosols. As smoke is much more ubiquitous aerosol type, MAIAC makes dust retrievals only over pre-defined dust regions. At present, South America and southern Africa are not designated as dust regions in MAIAC EPIC.”

Response: The response is included at line 285.

2- The second one is on Line 219 of the latest version of the manuscript:

Change

“...based on a study of 19 mineral dust soil-derived aerosol samples from different main global dust source regions.”

To

“based on a study of 19 mineral dust aerosol generated from soil samples coming from the main global dust source regions.”

Response: Corrected at line 219.