Responses to Reviewer

We thank you for the thorough comments and changes suggested in your review of our manuscript. Our point-to-point responses are developed hereafter, along with an indication of changes made in the revised version of the text.

Comments to the author :
Please take into consideration the suggested technical corrections by the reviewer before publication.

Technical corrections :
- Line 377 : the reference to Figure 7 is wrong. The reference should be Figure 8.

Corrected.

- Table 2 on page 28 : The parameters for RAD (STL) are visibility and RG (visibility and CBH). RAD and STL in column 1 must be swapped.

Swap confirmed. Fixed!

- Figure 5 on page 34 : the gray box is hardly visible.

We believe your are referring to Figure 5 panel b and aerosol hydration box. This is true. Unfortunately we cannot do better in this case of thin fog event and low hydration at ground level. If we increase the resolution of the box/line, the figure will become difficult to read during a thick fog event with a developed hydrated layer. We are aware of this, but it constitutes the « best » compromise today.