

Review of “The influence of multiple groups of biological ice nucleating particles on microphysical properties of mixed-phase clouds observed during MC3E” by Patade et al.

Comment: The authors made a good job to incorporate most of the comments listed in round 1. The new provided information and the new Discussion sections makes the revised manuscript stronger.

Reply: We thank the reviewer for his positive comments.

However, one of my main concerns was the length of the manuscript. My first major comment stated: " The manuscript is unnecessarily long. Several parts can be transferred to a Supplementary Material in order that the Results section can focus on the most important findings making the document more concise and readable. I think Figures 11, 12, and 13 together with the related text should be moved to the Supplementary Material. These results add little to the manuscript and make the document longer than needed." and the Replay was:

"We thank the reviewer for his valuable suggestion. We have tried to reduce the length of the article in revision by removing plots and discussion associated with sensitivity tests where only Fungi and Bacteria loading was changed. A few other plots that are less important and associated text has been removed to reduce the length of the manuscript. The result section is now more focused. A separate discussion section is added."

This is not completely true given that the first version consisted of 49 pages (excluding references) and the revised version contains 55 pages (excluding references). This means that instead of reducing the length of manuscript this was increased by 6 pages. The authors need to do a better job in excluding information that is not of high importance. This information can go into the SI to improve the readability of the ms.

Reply: In the earlier revision, we tried to reduce the length of the manuscript by removing less important plots and related text from the main texts. In addition, a few plots were transferred to the supplementary information. However, at the same time to incorporate suggestion from reviewer 1, a few Tables, and text was added to the main manuscript which affected its length. We accept that the manuscript was still lengthy.

In the revised manuscript we have reduced the length of the main text significantly. The revised manuscript is now much short and more concise. The original length of 55 pages is reduced to **40 pages** to make the manuscript readable. The less important information is added to the Supplementary material.