

Dear Editor,

We thank you for your evaluation and recommendations. We also thank the reviewers for their analysis and advises.

We have addressed three points, covering the Editor and Reviewer minor revision recommendations :

From the two recommendations of the Editor :

1. We have completed the discussions on background studies, in order to include earlier works and present some of the historical context. Especially, we have cited Shields et al (2013), with complementary references of historical works. Consistently with the structure of the paper though, we included those discussions at different places of the manuscript : in the Introduction for the historical context of sky camera applications, in section 2.2 about the different technologies, and in section 3.1 / table 2 when considering the different cloud cover retrieval techniques. Note that we restricted our background analysis in 3.1 to visible sky cameras, as initially.

Corresponding modifications :

*Introduction, Page 2, lines 5-8 : added references to historical references, and reviews.
Section 2.2, Page 4, lines 10-17, 24-27, 29 : Added discussions on historical developements.
Section 3.1, Page 6, line 8 : Added references.
Section 3.1, Page 7, lines 4-5 and Table 2 :Added references.*

2. For the second point of the editor (and of Reviewer #2), we have added a discussion on our RBR thresholds relatively to the link between the AOD and the cloud-free RBR determined by Ghonima et al 2012 with a TSI camera. We also included references to climatological studies of observed AOD over the world.

Since this discussion was quite long, we did not find appropriate to include it in the conclusion. Instead, we found this discussion to fit better into section 3.3, about the adaptation of the algorithm to different sky cameras. We have revised the Conclusion accordingly.

Corresponding modifications :

*Section 3.3, Page 15-line 23 to Page 16-line 15 : Added discussion.
Conclusion, Page 20, line 20-21 : Revised comment on prospectives, and simplification of the conclusion.*

Finally, we considered the first point of Reviewer #2 by adding a sentence at the beginning of section 3.2, which clearly states the limited innovation of ELIFAN.

Corresponding modifications :

Section 3.2, Page 8, lines 3-4 : Added comment.

Point 2 of Reviewer#2 joins point 2 of the Editor.

With those three points, we hope that we have covered all recommendations.