

Review of “Instantaneous radiative forcings due to the first indirect effect linked to warm clouds in the Amazon” by Pugliesi et al. (egusphere-2026-996_R1)

The authors have overall addressed the previous comments carefully and in substantial detail. The revised manuscript is clearer and scientifically better framed, particularly regarding the justification of the two clean reference states, the interpretation of the seasonal reference, the clarification of the Twomey mechanism, and the explicit discussion of methodological limitations in the daily cloud representation. The added revisions in the tracked-changes manuscript are generally responsive and improve both transparency and reproducibility.

I especially appreciate that the authors now treat the comparison with the IPCC estimate more cautiously, clarify that the second clean reference represents the cleanest available regime within the polluted season rather than a pristine baseline, and revise the sensitivity analysis with additional statistical testing. These changes make the manuscript more balanced and technically defensible. I do not see major unresolved concerns at this stage. Before acceptance, I recommend a final minor revision focused on maintaining cautious wording where conclusions extend beyond the immediate study domain, keeping the aerosol-sensitivity interpretation explicitly conditional, and performing a final language/polishing pass.

Minor comments:

These do not appear serious enough to require another major round of revision, but they are worth noting before acceptance.

1. The manuscript should continue using cautious wording wherever site-specific results near T3 are discussed in broader Amazonian terms.
2. The aerosol-sensitivity conclusion should remain clearly conditional, since the revised statistical support appears robust only for 2014.
3. The link for accessing the HALO data set (<https://halo-db.pa.op.dlr.de/mission/5>) as stated in the data availability section did not function as expected. Please double-check and update if necessary.
4. A final language and style pass would still be beneficial, as some awkward phrasing remains in the revised text. Here are some examples:

Figure 3 caption: “The adjustments (hyperbolic arc cosine function) originated the equations shown in the graph’s legend.” — “originated the equations” is unusual phrasing.

L433: “when compared to the most polluted days of 2014 (August and September), the second reference can still be considered relatively clean.” — “can still be considered

relatively clean” is understandable but slightly colloquial; “remains relatively clean” is tighter.

L327: “seasonal contamination due to dynamics on macrophysical characteristics of clouds” — “contamination due to dynamics” is odd; please revise accordingly.

L465: “the second clean-atmosphere reference yielded IRFaci values closer in order of magnitude to the estimate...” — “closer in order of magnitude” is redundant; “closer in magnitude” would suffice.