

We appreciate the editor's close reading of the manuscript. We have adopted the suggested changes without exception.

Public justification (visible to the public if the article is accepted and published):

One ACP requirement for the concluding section of the paper is to include "Caveats and limitations: State how these affect confidence in the overall results, and where future work is needed." Some limitations of the laboratory study are discussed in the conclusion section: "While these chamber experiments capture the microphysical response under controlled conditions, they do not fully represent atmospheric cloud dynamics at the spatial and temporal scales of realistic precipitation development".

Given the lengthy discussion with both reviewers on the "inherent uncertainties" associated with inferred LWC from the light scattering instruments, another limitation of this study that should be highlighted in the conclusion section was the lack of LWC measurements based on alternate methods like resistive-heating elements. While hot-wire type LWC sensors have challenges and limitations of their own, they would not likely respond strongly to mineral particles as they do to liquid water, which could provide an independent check on the LWC measurements.

Added "Because of the limitations of the optical particle counters used in this study, our reported liquid water contents are uncertain, especially in the moments directly after injection of the powders. For future investigations, adapting a hot-wire probe for use in the chamber is a promising avenue for verifying LWC without the ambiguity introduced from optical methods, since the hot-wire would not respond to a dry powder."

Some readers may be confused by the wording in the following sentence added in the revised manuscript: "The absolute magnitude of the LWC also has intrinsic uncertainty in the seconds after dispersal of the powder as the scattering signal may be from dry or only partially deliquesced particles as the powder mixes into the chamber"

Perhaps adding the word "reading" or "measurement" after the word "LWC" would clarify that it is the LWC MEASUREMENT that has intrinsic uncertainty (due falsely attributed readings associated with large but relatively dry particles interspersed with the droplets), rather than LWC itself.

Inserted "measured" before LWC in the sentence, as suggested.

Typo on the added text (at line 63) of the revised manuscript:

"Both counters derive sizing information from the scattered light of particles [passing] through the sensing volume."

Corrected.

While Figure 4 was updated at the request of Reviewer 2 so that the point of injection is at $t=0$, the caption still says: "The NaCl and CSNT were introduced into the chamber at 600 seconds, marked by the vertical red line."

Corrected.