

Authors' response to the Referee 3 and the Editor comment on manuscript titled “*Versatile Aerosol Concentration Enrichment System (VACES) operating as a Cloud Condensation Nuclei (CCN) concentrator. Development and laboratory characterization.*” submitted to AMT 25th February 2019.

Our response is given in blue after the comment, which is shown in bold characters. In the revised MS, changes concerning the reviewer's comment are indicated in red. The colour code in Figure 4 was corrected (the colours of the data points and the fitted curves had been the wrong way round).

I agree with the Authors with most of the replies, but disagree in one certain point. The lack of "error bars" in different figures was raised up, and I'm not happy with the answer "As the temperature difference between the curves is relative small errors bars were omitted in order to show the curves more clearly." Especially in the case when the differences are small the uncertainty should be presented in a way or another. Without any statistics presented the conclusions made on the observations can be too optimistic. I'm not asking it to be added to every single plot, but at least one with some discussion.

In the revised MS error bars were added to Figures 3 – 6. As each data point actually corresponds to ca. 300 individual measurement points, the error bars correspond to the standard error of the mean.