

The authors of the manuscript (acp-2022-156) have well addressed most of my comments in the last round of revision. However, there remain two comments that I highly recommend the authors consider addressing before publication. Once the comments are addressed, in my opinion, the manuscript is suitable to be accepted by the journal.

1. I still think the current introduction section is too general; instead, it should include more explanation about the variabilities of soot from different sources (the first paragraph). This is very important to the readers to understand why the authors focus on comparing absorption, size, and mixing state of BC between the sites.
2. Add a time-series figure of BC and C₄H₉⁺ concentrations: The authors agreed that this could be a nice analysis, but decided not to add it to the current manuscript. Please add such a figure or explain why not adding. The figures can help readers understand the temporal variability of BC and HOA during a traffic plume. Adding the figure to the SI is fine.