The major concern is as follows: line 200 states that a 0.003 (or 1.02%) difference is caused by calibration, with a reference to Figure 1, although this does not seem to be directly supported by the contents of Figure 1.
The suggestion is to add some statistics to the panels of Figure 1 (and Figure 2 as well). For example, mean offset, RMSE, and fit coefficients (i.e. y=ax+b). Presumably b will come out to 0 and a will come out to 1.0102 or close, or the mean bias will be around 0.003, which will then support your argument. (Or possibly the other direction dependent on whether Aqua or NPP is taken as the reference.) If not, then further discussion or amending the statement is required.

We did provide the radiance and flux statistics in our paper in Table 1, which summarized the mean radiances and fluxes from CERES-NPP and CERES-Aqua, and the radiance and flux RMS errors as well. To make the sentence on Line 200 more clear we referenced to both Figures 1a and Table 1 in the revised version. We also added that the radiance and flux statistics are provided in Table 1 in the captions of Figure 1 and Figure 2.

Minor comments:
line 1: please expand NPP, first use of the acronym
Expanded NPP as National Polar-orbiting Partnership.

line 25: "...when compared..."
Modified.

line 41: "...data product crucial to..."
Modified.

line 147: " … 2 degrees and 3 degrees respectively. ..."
Modified.

line 188: " … for April 2013. Insolation for NPP..."
Modified.

line 189: "… is greater than..."
Modified.

line 192: strike “solar”. The word insolation means “solar radiation”. You shouldn’t double up.
Change all solar insolation to insolation.

Line 196: “… We then compare...”
Changed.

line 212: “ … mainly affect cloud detections...”
Modified.

line 187, 213, 532, and everywhere else: remove “solar” when referring to “insolation”
Changed.

Fig 3. caption: should read “… mean insolation…”
Modified.