

Associate Editor decision: Publish subject to minor revisions (review by editor)

by Zamin A. KanjiComments to the author

Lines and pages refer to revised manuscript with track changes (yellow highlights).

Abstract Line 12-14: The authors mention that the method suggested in this paper could be used as potential standardised validation method. Indeed if this is the case, I would strongly suggest the authors include a schematic how their experimental validation set up looked like. This would be important and would likely help future readers the community to adapt the method herein as a standardised validation method.

Answer: An additional figure (fig.1) with the schematic was added to the manuscript.

Based on the reviewer comments the authors have included the last service dates of the instruments used. However these additions bear no meaning if the dates of when the measurements were conducted are not give. I would suggest to include this, so there is a reference point as to how long before the measurements did the instruments receive their service. Suggestion to include the measurement date in Section 2.1

Answer: We added that, but if the editor agrees we would like to add it into the introduction (line 45) instead of section 2.1 as suggested.

Section 2.4.1 line 133: Her it was not clear to me when the authors state "The average area from both images is then ..." at this point I do not follow wha both refers to. Since you are still discussing only the first method. Can you please clarify.

Answer: For the first method, both available holographic images were used. The text should now be clearer.

Reviewer 2 asks for the number of measurements conducted. In page 6 line 152-153 you mention that the measurement sequence lasted for 20 minutes. But I see this as not answering the question. How many of the 20 minute sequences were conducted? Was it just one? In which case you should clarify on the sufficiency of just one measurement. i.e. if the instruments are single particle instruments, then in the 20 minutes you have likely sampled many particles, which would be one reason I can think of why not at least 3 or more of the 20 minute sequences were not conducted.

Answer: I modified the text and I hope this is better explained now. There where continuous measurements during 20 minutes, and thus up to several hundreds of particles per minute where measured one by one. Guessing that this would not be the requested answer we tried to better explain how the measurements were performed. (We computed 1-minute concentrations, which results into 20 values to compare between DUT and reference OPC. I hope this is clear in the text)

Reviewer 1 suggested removing the "%" sign from the y-axis of Fig. 2. I support this edit, however, if you want to keep the sign, then I suggest only labelling the y-axis every 20% (i.e. 0%, 20%, 40%) because the figure y-axis appears quite crowded in its current format.

Answer: We implemented both of your suggestions: removing "%" and introducing larger step sizes (20%)

Once the above revisions (or responses) are done, I would be happy to accept the publication.

Answer: Thanks for your remarks and suggestions, we think that the manuscript gained in quality once more.