

The manuscript has improved, but it is still not acceptable. I cannot provide a second full review due to the lack of time, but I will raise the most important aspects from my point of view.

Measurements: there is not much said about aerosol measurements: inlet, losses, characteristics of the sampling system, conditions or pretreatment like drying and so on. Please give some more details!

Are data from the CPC after the TD used in this study? To my impression, not all data from table 1 are used in the study. They might be taken out or it should be mentioned, that they are not used here.

Section 3:

What do you mean by 'incipient particles'? A particular size range? Why do you think, they will be generally removed in clouds? Since you have the measurements, can you estimate how effective that process will be?

In the first review, I asked for more interpretation in this section, this could be improved, particularly in 3.1. and 3.2.

Please be more precise with height ranges: Sometimes it is said > 6 km, but it is meant between 3 and 6 km. Do not forget the lowest 3 km.

The summary needs to be improved and extended to conclusion. I asked in the first review for some more interpretation and did not see significant improvement here. Please add conclusions and interpretation. Good, that the dynamic/turbulent aspect was added, but dynamics does not only influence the nucleation rate (which cannot be studied with these data), but furthermore also the growth rate. This can be also a relevant factor. Is there any evidence for the dynamic impact?

The study should be thoroughly revised in terms of language. Many sentences are too long, some are worded incomprehensibly.