

Reviewer #1 comment

The paper has been improved by responding to my technical comments in a reasonable way. However, the main omissions, namely the need to also present the AOD-AERONET and PM_{2.5} openAQ evaluation for CAMSRA and MERRA-2 has not been addressed. It is unsatisfactory that a paper which shows in detail differences between the NARA, CAMSRA and MERRA-2 (Figs. 6, 7-11) limits the evaluation with observations (Fig. 2, 12, A1) to NARA. The presented evaluation is relatively simple and repeating it for MERRA-2 and CAMSRA seems doable, and it is of great value.

Response: Thanks for the interest in the intercomparison between pNARA v1.0 and other reanalysis datasets and we agree it is valuable information. As we mentioned, however, the evaluation of three or more datasets requires collaboration of agencies to have the agreement on the approach, and this is not the main purpose of our study. We would like to keep our focus on substantial differences among datasets which reflect the state of art of aerosol science rather than the evaluation of performance from multiple reanalyses. Hence, we added the further comparison among reanalyses with respect to AOD at 550 nm from AERONET and surface PM_{2.5} from OpenAQ in Appendix A for reader's information.