

The revised manuscript is far improved in its readability and overall quality, and the authors addressed most of my points. However, I still have minor comments which need addressing. Line numbers are in reference to the tracked changes document.

Major comment: I have still found a significant number of grammatical and punctuation issues. I sincerely urge the authors to take time diligently proofreading the manuscript and editing appropriately.

Figure 11: you should move it up before the conclusion section.

Line 72-75: Are you saying there is no method to obtain the mass of an ice PSD beyond utilizing D_{max} and Nice? There have been efforts made to quantify ice particle mass accounting for their habit (e.g., McFarquhar et al. 2019; University of Illinois OAP software). In fact, you mention that a_m and b_m can be modulated as a function of particle habit (line 284-285). Perhaps I'm misunderstanding.

Line 123: You deleted where you introduced MCAO. In fact, this occurs for multiple acronyms in the paper (including NASA and DFG). Please thoroughly proofread and write out terms for every acronym.

Line 121-124: Correct the numbering of these bullet points.

Line 141-143: Be consistent in "Section" vs "Sect."

195-197: Why did you set a threshold of -1C degree to account for kinetic heating of the aircraft allowing for the ability to avoid de-icing and thus sampling these large drops? This heating can occur at a few degrees below zero (perhaps include a source). Otherwise, why even include this threshold? Since you said you looked through the in situ particle imagery.

Line 203: Here and I believe other places you say "typical" with quotation marks. Remove them.

Line 276-277: I'm unsure why you're introducing this in situ method only to show it in the case studies? Why include this at all?

I also ask this, since in the case studies you reference it but you never say why you don't use it versus the dual platform method. Why not use this method and avoid the uncertainties associated with collocating the remote sensing observations?

Line 313: Perhaps I missed it, but what are the radar sensitivity limits? Include them.

Line 403: This should not be titled Campaign overview. It is not that. Call it something like "Additional riming product discussion"

Line 411: This seems out of nowhere. I don't know what x is.

Line 418-419: I don't get how this further motivates your study. It seems this is showing the range of expected M and associated Z_e . If so, rewrite this introductory sentence accordingly.

Line 515-518: In the comments to the reviewers, you confirm resampling with replacement. State this in the manuscript.

Line 569: “convective cells”

Line 570-571: “liquid condensation” change to “condensational growth”

Line 600-601: Rewrite sentence.

Line 621: “models’ representations of MPCs”.