Referee report to egusphere-2025-1954

Md. Al-amin Hossen et al. have carefully reviewed the manuscript and implemented the stated concerns the reviewers have referred to. In my opinion, they also sufficiently improved the text and the scientific discussion to be published as research article in ACP. I only have some last minor things, which need to be addressed before final publication.

- Line 26: change ‘influence’ to ‘influences
- Line 53: change ‘shorter’ to ‘short’
- Line 54 and 56: now you introduced the abbrv. BrC, so you should use it
- Line 60: change ‘automobile’ to ‘vehicle’
- Line 71: again use ‘BrC’ instead of brown carbon from now on
- Line 90: good new discussion paragraph. Maybe you should use a citation for these arguments listed here
- Line 137: point at the end of the sentence is missing
- Line 210: I rather meant that this is common knowledge. So, you can remove this section. However, just write in the result section 3.4.3 that you used the r-value for correlation analysis according to Hauke and Kossowski, 2011.
- Figure 2: Why do you put the Table (f) into the Figure. Rather put it as a stand-alone Table. In this case, you might also be able to enlarge panel (e).
- Line 276: so, Fig. 2f will be Table later
- Fig3: if possible also try to enlarge it. It is your key Figure
- Line 481: Please always write again the whole name in the ‘Conclusion’ section. E.g. for BrC and ATR-FTIR
- Line 483: Do not repeat ‘particles’ after PM2.5 as it is already included in ‘particulate matter’