

SUMMARY

I thank the authors for their work in responding to my comments. My major concerns have been adequately addressed. A few more minor points have arisen in the revised version that I ask the authors to respond to, at which point I believe the manuscript will be suitable for publication.

MKW

MINOR COMMENTS

Difference figures: We may have opened Pandora's box a little with the colormap switch in figures 2 and S4, but it strikes me that the difference plots you show in many of the right columns of these and other multi-panel figures (Figs. S2, S5-10) would also benefit from a colormap that shows a "neutral" shade for "no difference." Then you'd only be using the jet/rainbow colormap for scalar variables. I don't think this is a *requirement* but I strongly encourage you to give it a try and see if it improves interpretability.

Boundary layer flow figures (S13-15): These are a great addition. I have a suggestion based on my own experience making these kind of plots – instead of having the quivers show wind speed and direction, use line contours for wind speed and use the arrows to show *only* the wind direction. You can use the same plotting function to show wind direction, just normalize by vector magnitude so all the arrows are the same length. This is helpful because the southerly flow is often rather weak, so the tiny arrows force the reader to zoom to something crazy like 300% to be able to confirm that, yes, there is indeed a slight southerly component by the coast.

TYPGRAPHICAL COMMENTS

L615-616: "there was no underlying expectation for a change in levels during southerly flow events" – unclear what you mean by "levels" here. I think you mean sea salt concentration, so maybe just change "levels" to "concentrations"

L878: "utilizing similar data sources in greater proportions" – the phrase "greater proportions" is ambiguous because "proportions" signifies a change in relative distribution. I think you're trying to say you use more cases than Juliano did, so I suggest rewording "in greater proportions" to "across a broader range of cases."

L879: "proven correct" is an overstatement. Suggest rewording to the following: "We find strong support for our first hypothesis that more final aerosol pollution..."