

Authors have improved the language and shown more evidences to support their viewpoints. I think the manuscript has met the requirement of ACP after revised. However, some issues should be addressed before accepted.

Major

For the discussion of the effects of BC and BrC on CCN formation and precipitation, I still think that the conclusion is arbitrary, and the description dangers the manuscript. Authors insist that BC and BrC, no other aerosols, prompt CCN formation and precipitation in the study region. Yes, we believe that BC and BrC can act as CCN. However, the ability of BC and BrC to form CCN is not necessarily stronger than that of other aerosols with different compositions. In addition, authors mention that the study region is significantly affected by fossil fuel combustion and biomass burning. The primary aerosols (except for BC and BrC) and secondary aerosols (such as nitrate, sulfate) formed from their precursors might have stronger effects on CCN formation and precipitation. Although authors have added the discussions of the ability of BC and BrC to form CCN, the conclusion is not persuasive for not considering the effects of other aerosols.

Minor

Line 237 'Which' change to ', which'

Line 285 and 288 delete 'strong' or 'significant'