

Dear Editor and Reviewer, we would like to thank you for your positive response and acknowledgement. In response to the Reviewer's suggestions, we have revised the manuscript in the following manner:

Comment 1: Specifically, add a comment that Lamb and Gentine did not model coated aggregates. This point was not emphasized clearly enough by Lamb and Gentine and it should be emphasized here in Line 55.

Response: Thank you for the comment. In the revised version, we have specified that Lamb and Gentine did not model coated aggregates.

Comment 2: The use of a miniCAST at different setpoints is not representative of the coated atmospheric soot particles the authors cited in their rebuttal. However, it is reasonable to use these particles for validation of the present work. Please clarify this in the abstract ("laboratory measurements of miniCAST soot") and Figure 6 caption ("laboratory study at different miniCAST setpoints" instead of "at different forganics").

Response: Thank you for the comment. In the revised version, we have specified that measurements were laboratory-based from a miniCAST soot generator.