

Reply to Reviewer #1's comments

I thank the authors for addressing some of my comments. I have a few minor points to follow-up on.

Answer: We sincerely thank the reviewer for the suggestions and continued engagement. In response, we revised the manuscript according to the reviewer's comments.

- *First, it would be helpful for readers to understand the limitations of the dataset in the Abstract, in particular, in regards to the lack of use of lidar data for liquid classifications. I recommend that the author include this important information in the Abstract.*

Answer: We appreciate the reviewer's suggestion. In response, we have added a sentence to lines 24–25 of the Abstract: 'Lidar measurements exhibit lower feature importance due to rapid signal attenuation caused by the frequent presence of persistent low-level clouds at the NSA site.'

- *Second, the responses indicate that the references in the introduction were added but they were not.*

Answer: We apologize for the oversight in the previous revision. The missing references cited in the Introduction section have now been properly included and verified.

- *Third, I would appreciate if the authors could examine a few single-layer cloud cases as I previously suggested, even if in the SI section.*

Answer: We have addressed the reviewer's concern in an additional figure in the supplement, S3, and added a sentence to lines 435–436 in the main body of the text: "Lidar measurement's lower feature importance in deference to radar measurements was also observed on days with single-layer, low-level liquid clouds (Figure S3)".

Note to the editor, we have rearranged the numbering on our supplementary figures.