

Reviewer 1

General comment

The authors have substantially improved the manuscript and have included the reviewers' suggestions and comments. The manuscript especially benefitted from the expanded discussion session on the generality of the authors' findings and the inclusion of the precipitation contributions and ice mass microphysical source terms in Figures 7 and 8.

I have one small comment regarding the revised version of the manuscript, which I think should be addressed before final publication in ACP:

The authors added a footnote on page 3, pointing to differences between their work and work by Eirund et al. (2019). However, in my opinion these are quite significant differences that deserve more attention than a footnote. I think it is worth pointing out these differences in the main text (not as a footnote) to clearly distinguish this study from work by Eirund et al. (2019).

We thank the Reviewer once more for carefully reading our manuscript and appreciate the renewed feedback. With respect to the Reviewer's comment, we have changed the manuscript as follows. We deleted the footnote and included following sentence at the end of Section 1 (ll. 82-84):

"We note that our investigation differs from the Eirund et al. (2019) study of idle Arctic stratocumulus organization in two respects: (1) our meteorological context of a CAO in which not only are the mean winds not still, but gale-force, and (2) our focus on CCN depletion, which is critical to the downwind cloud transition here."