

The reply to the anonymous referee #3 (RC2)

We are thankful to the referee for the comments. We appreciate all the comments; we took them into account while preparing the revised version of the manuscript.

Below, the actual comments of the referee are given in **bold courier font and blue colour**. The text added to the revised version of the manuscript is marked by **red colour**.

This paper is in the vein of similar studies comparing SEVERI derived LWP estimates with ground-based radiometer LWP measurements. However, this study concerns measurements in a very different and interesting region of Europe. The author's appear to have performed a thorough and careful analysis and the results should be of interest to the broader community.

We are grateful to the referee for the positive assessment of our study.

I am in favour of publication with one broad caveat. Namely, the quality of the writing is quite uneven and must be addressed. The lack of indentations or spaces between paragraphs makes the manuscript harder to read than it should be. More seriously, the English usage in certain parts of the submission needs improvement. I do not have time edit the paper, here I will point out some examples (I assume issues of this nature can be addressed during the revision process with the aid of a copy editor)

We completely agree with the referee that the lack of indentations and spaces between paragraphs can be annoying. However we prepared the manuscript in strict accordance with the template provided by the Journal. In the revised version we slightly violated the rules of the template and the spaces between paragraphs are present now. As far as the general comment about the language is concerned, we can say that we checked the text and did our best to improve the language of the revised version of the paper.

Line 7: **"..cycle in Arctic.." ==> "cycle in the Arctic"**

Corrected.

Line 25: **"The interest to studies of the atmosphere in the sub-Arctic region is caused by the so-called "arctic amplification" effect that means the enhanced response of the arctic climate system to anthropogenic and natural impacts if compared to the response on the planetary average scale."**

should be rewritten to something like:

"The interest of studying the sub-Arctic atmosphere is enhanced due to the so-called "arctic amplification" effect. This feedback effect is expected to enhance the response of the arctic climate system to both anthropogenic and natural forcing compared to the planet as a whole."

Corrected.

Line 31: **"...particularly loss of.." ==> "..particularly the loss of ..."
etc..**

Corrected.