Second Review of Ward et al. 2018.
David K. Adams (dave.k.adams@gmail.com)

Recommendation: The paper is essentially publishable as is. Below, I have made some grammar and style corrections that should be made.

Abstract

Write “spectrum to retrieve water vapor with a random uncertainty **of** less than 1%.”

Page 2
Line 10
“it may be underestimated”, this is a bit unclear. Are you referring to predicted amplification of precipitation or to predicted increases in water vapor?

Page 3
Line 12 Write “In recognition of the strengths and weaknesses of GPS RO and radiance measurements **as well as** the need for better...”

Line 24 Write “from near the surface **to** well into the mesosphere.”

Page 6
Line 6 Write “At still higher cloud and rain opacities**,** such as...”

Line 14 Write “Finally, in Section 7**,** ...”

Page 7 Line 1. Am I confused or should this be “ **less ambiguous**.”

Page 8 and Page Line 25-30 to Line 5 Can you join these ideas into one paragraph? It´s not very smooth reading.

Page 9 Line 28 and 34. You have italicized *Kursinski et al. (2009)*

Page 12
On Line you use “completed every **48.8 s.”** And then on line 11 you use **48.8 seconds.** I guess you should probably use one or the other.

Line 13 Write “four times 50 ms**,** or 200 ms.”

Page 13

Line 12 Remove one of the periods, “ described in Section 5.”
Line 15 Write “The **path-averaged** vapor pressure varied
Line 19, Write “In Section 6**,** we ...”

Page 15
Line 2. You capitalize “First Reference period” above, but not “second reference period”

Page 19
Line 13 Maybe better showers instead of shower.

Page 20
Line 18 Write “ ...the well-mixed, dry adiabatic,...”

Page 25

Line 2 Write “ path without interfering with **the** signal itself.”