I am satisfied with the authors' responses to my comments and the revisions they have made to their manuscript.

I recommend publication after the minor comments below have been addressed.

Page 7, lines 1-2: The authors need to also point out that the backscatter Angstrom coefficient determined with their system reflects the wavelength dependence of aerosol backscatter between 355 and 532 nm, which may be different than the wavelength dependence between the on- and offline wavelengths of 287 and 299 nm.

Page 11, line 28: "… compensate for the **lower** signal-to-noise ratio …"

Page 12, line 9: While the authors state on page 7 (see above) that it is challenging to determine the backscatter Angstrom coefficient in regions of low aerosol concentrations, here they state that areas of high aerosol concentrations are also problematic and were therefore screened out. It would be more accurate to state that the largest errors in the aerosol backscatter correction (eq. 2) usually occur near sharp aerosol gradients, (and hence screening out regions with very large aerosol concentrations adjacent to cleaner regions helps). The aerosol extinction correction (eq. 1) is largest and possibly prone to errors in regions of large aerosol loadings regardless whether there are vertical gradients or not.

Page 12, lines 1 and 21, page 13, line 2: Replace "variable" with "temperature dependent".

Page 16, line 9: "… started on 13 November"

Page 17, line 3: "… approximately 100 **m** above ground level …"

Page 17, line 7: "For example, on 7-9 November …"

Page 17, line 9: "… (see Figure 12a)**, typical** of industrial …"

Page 18, line 8: "… determining the **aerosol** type …"

Page 20, line 5: "… while on 8 September **it** ranges …"

Page 20, line 6-7and Fig. 23 c+d and caption: Clarify whether the Angstrom coefficient for extinction or backscatter is shown.

Page 20, line 23: "… ozone profile and **a** typical difference …"

Page 50, Fig. 20: Color bar only shows min and max values, no values at major tick marks.