

We sincerely thank you for your positive assessment of our responses to the reviewers and for your careful evaluation of the revised manuscript. We greatly appreciate your helpful comments regarding the precision and statistical reporting of the numerical results. Following your suggestions, we have carefully reviewed the entire manuscript and Supplement, standardized the rounding and reporting of numerical values, and added median values for the principal atmospheric and aerosol variables. Our point-by-point response is provided below.

Comment:

The authors have addressed the reviewers' comments in an acceptable and satisfactory manner. However, before the manuscript proceeds further, they are requested to review, correct and standardise the rounding and reporting of numerical values throughout the manuscript. At present, several quantities, including atmospheric concentrations, are reported with an unnecessarily high number of significant digits (e.g. $2294.4 \pm 1512.7 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ in line 26), which is not supported by the underlying measurement characteristics. For example, the value above could be more appropriately expressed as $(2.3 \pm 1.5) \times 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ or an equivalent rounded form. Similar revisions should be applied systematically to all reported quantities.

In addition, many atmospheric variables are known to exhibit lognormal distributions rather than normal distributions. The authors are therefore encouraged to provide median values in addition to the (arithmetic) mean and standard deviation. This would provide a more informative description of the datasets and facilitate better comparison with other similar studies.

Response:

Thank you for this helpful comment. We agree that several numerical values in the previous version were reported with more significant digits than justified by the measurement characteristics and that providing median values in addition to the arithmetic mean and standard deviation offers a more informative description of the datasets.

We have therefore systematically reviewed and standardized the rounding and reporting of numerical values throughout the revised manuscript and Supplement. Atmospheric pollutant concentrations, particle number concentrations, particle diameters, formation rates, growth rates, condensation sinks, coagulation sinks, and estimated CCN concentrations are now reported with appropriate precision. Large particle number and estimated CCN concentrations are consistently expressed in scientific notation.

For example, the estimated CCN concentration on NPF days, previously reported as $2294.4 \pm 1512.7 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, is now reported as an arithmetic mean $\pm$ standard deviation of $(2.3 \pm 1.5) \times 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, with a median of $1.9 \times 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. The corresponding arithmetic mean $\pm$ standard deviation and median concentrations are $(0.9 \pm 0.4) \times 10^3$ and $0.81 \times 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ on Undefined days, and $(1.3 \pm 0.7) \times 10^3$ and $1.1 \times 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ on Non-Event days, respectively.

Following the reviewer's suggestion, we have also added median values for the principal atmospheric and aerosol variables reported in Sects. 3.1–3.4. Interquartile ranges are additionally reported where they provide useful information about the distributions. For example, during the autumn observation period, the median estimated CCN concentration was $2.4 \times 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, with an interquartile range of $(1.5\text{--}3.8) \times 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ and an arithmetic mean $\pm$ standard deviation of $(2.8 \pm 1.7) \times$

10^3 cm^{-3} . During the spring observation period, the corresponding values were $0.96 \times 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, $(0.70\text{--}1.5) \times 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, and $(1.2 \pm 0.6) \times 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, respectively.

Median values have also been added to the comparisons of gaseous pollutants. During the autumn observation period, the arithmetic mean $\pm$ standard deviation SO_2 mixing ratios were 1.9 ± 2.0 ppb on NPF days and 0.7 ± 0.7 ppb on non-NPF days, with corresponding medians of 0.9 and 0.5 ppb. The corresponding NO_2 mixing ratios were 7.2 ± 4.9 and 4.6 ± 3.9 ppb, with medians of 5.9 and 3.2 ppb, respectively.

The Supplement has been revised consistently with the main manuscript. In particular, the numerical precision and units in Table S1 have been standardized. Particle number concentrations are now reported in units of 10^3 cm^{-3} with one decimal place, and candidate particle growth rates are reported with consistent precision.

These revisions provide a more informative description of the datasets and improve the consistency of numerical reporting throughout the manuscript and Supplement. We thank you for this suggestion, which has substantially improved the clarity and reliability of the reported results.