Thanks for the author's response, I think this paper can be published as is with one extra request: please remove my name from the acknowledgements since I didn't have any constructive contributions to improve this paper. The author can just thank three reviewers together.

Below is my reply to the author's response. Please don't take this as further comments asking for author's extra work, this is just an exchange of opinions.

First, thanks for the cartoon, which is really good to illustrate the process of GENRA. For my first question, it appears to me that "P_d" (Equation 12) alone might be enough for the likelihood with both the measurement and model uncertainties included, and I am still curious about how to calculate (or what is) the value of the "delta function p_l" if it is really needed as described in the implement step 2-(b)-ii-D (section 2.6).

For the second question, my concern is that if the same tests (with larger model uncertainties or the standard GENRA) are applied to the real MISR measurements (not the model simulation with the plane parallel and scalar wind assumptions), is there any possibility that we might get different results since the inputs are very different -- one (the measurements) with the non-plane-parallel and vector wind effects, and another (model simulation) without?

For the Equations 4-7, I am still not sure why the variables to be marginalized out (under the summation operators on the RHS of the equation) still appear on the LHS of the equation? It makes more sense to me that the primed variables (r',f'..) should be marginalized, i.e., $p_m^r(r', r, f, \tau, w) = \sum_{f'} \sum_{\tau'} \sum_{w'} p_o(m)$

I have to admit that my concerns might be totally wrong, and I need to think more about them to get a better understand of this technique. Maybe I can get the answers later when I have a chance to study the code after the paper is published. Please forgive my ignorance if my concerns do not make sense.