We would like to thank the Editor and the anonymous Reviewer for having carefully read the revised version of the manuscript. We would like to thank the Editor for providing helpful comments, which improved the manuscript. Point-by-point replies to the comments are here below. For clarity and easy visualization, the Editor's comments are shown from here on in black. The authors' replies are in blue font with an increased indent below each of the referee's statements. The Line numbers (L.) in our responses refer to the unrevised manuscript. The relevant changes in the revised manuscript are below in green. Comments to the author: I would like to thank the authors for incorporating the suggestions made by the reviewers. The revised version looks pretty good and it is almost ready for publication; however, I have the following additional and final comments before I can accept the manuscript. **Minor/Technical Comments:** Lines 8 and 274: Should it be "thirds"? Yes. Line 17:...-38°C and RHi >145%... Thank you. We adapted this. ...-38°C when the relative humidity with respect to ice is above 145%... Line 18: ...temperatures and lower RHi vales... Thanks. Line 19: "water vapor deposition" Done. Lines 34-35: ...with respect to ice (RHice) and liquid water (RHwater)... Done. Line 65 and Figure 2: "Of note" sounds a bit strange to me. Deleted.

Lines 65-68: Do the authors know how these changes could have impact the delivered results compared if the "original" version was used?

These slight modifications, which are unrelated to the main instrument components, should not have impacted the results. We added a sentence.

Since the main components of the instrument, including the cameras, have been kept in their original condition, we expect that our instrument provides the same results as an unmodified MASC. Line 68: What do the authors mean with "on the instrument field"? We meant measurement field and reformulated two sentences. The instrument was installed at two meters above ground next to other field instruments that are part of... L. 121: In the WMO SPICE measurement field,... Line 89: SUCH with an undefinable habit, SUCH as broken... Thank you. Line 91:...columns, and rosettes) Done. Lines 109-110:...profiles of RHice were... Done. Lines 114-115:...temperature, RHice,... Done. Line 137: "Radiosondes were.....UTC". This was already mentioned above. I suggest to delete it. O.K. Line 151: What do the authors mean with "eventual riming"? Thank you. We meant riming degree. Line 154: I suggest to replace "meteorological parameters on ground" by "Ground-based meteorological parameters" Done. Line 166:...i.e. RHwater, pressure... Done. Line 169: The RHice of the profiles... Done. Line 170: "meters" Thanks.

108 109	Lines 172-173: RHwater
110 111	Done.
112 113	Line 243: how about "by the degree of unsaturated air"
114 115	Sounds good. Thank you.
116	Lines 250-252: I find this a bit speculative as the composition of the INPs was not monitored
117 118	in the present study. I suggest to change/soften the tone of this conclusion.
119 120	True. We reformulated it and say "we speculate that"
121 122	Line 251: INPs defined above.
123 124	O.K.
125 126	Line 264: "condensation freezing mode"
127 128	Thanks.
129 130	Line 283: Should it be "in relation to the temperatures observed"?
131 132	Yes.
133 134	Figure 1: In the same line you have "LOCATION" and "LOCATED". Please fix this.
135 136	Done.
137 138	Figure 8: What do the authors mean with "as shown in a"?
139 140	Thanks. We now refer to the appropriate Figure.
141 142	Figure 12: Should it be ""snowfall events"?
143 144	Yes.
145 146	Figure A1. Delete "the" before "pressure".
147 148	Done.
149 150	Table A2: Date and time FOR each
151 152	Thank you.