

General Comments:

This paper has been hugely improved through this revising processes. Now, I found this paper to be well written an organized, and the scientific relevance clearly indicated so I would like to give a minor comment prior to publication.

Minor comments

→ In Figure 10, why the comparison altitude ranges between (a) and (b) is different?

Page 9 Line 6 : “, that” → eliminating “,” or changing to “, which” might be better

Page 12 line 8: a correct description of the aerosol scattering is particularly important.

→ Please better edit.

Page 13, line 12 Please better revise based on has been used, which was improved in aspect to stray light treatment and pointing corrections in comparison to the previous version.

Page 14, line 8: → doublet and triplet methods, respectively

Page 14, line 14 → Please better revise, it is hard to understand for “With values that follow an approximate linear decrease along the orbit”

Page 15, line 2: at these altitudes the ozone concentration and, thus → the ozone concentration gets very low??

Pape 22, line 19: Please edit “ was detected, unexpected”

Page 22: why do you note such like “sonde dataset **were retrieved on** YYYYMMDD” ?