

Review for revised manuscript of "Detection and analysis of cloud boundary in Xi'an, China employing 35GHz cloud radar aided by 1064nm lidar" by Y. Yuan et al.

I believe the authors responded to the review comments in detail and the revised manuscript can be considered for a publication. There are some minor comments that may need to be further considered.

1. Line 64-65: "take" needs to be replaced with "mistake", "underestimated" should be "underestimation".
2. Line 105: Please check "HT101", which is "TH101" in the response.
3. Line 145: What is the full name of "sym" in "sym7"? It should be clarified.
4. Line 153: Please add detailed description of the "baseline 1" and the "baseline 2" in the manuscript, and what is the difference between them?
5. Figure 3: Fig. 3c shows the vertical profile of SNR. However, "S" is marked on the horizontal axis. I'm confused whether it is the abbreviation of SNR and why the unit of S is "N".
6. Line 184-185: "two parts" appears twice in this sentence.
7. Line 203-205: Why you choose reflectivity of 20dBZ, velocity of 0.2m/s and spectra width of 0.3m/s as the thresholds?
8. Line 214: There is no "Fig. 6b" in Figure 6, please check.
9. Line 251: "The microwave radiometer accurately records the rainfall time" is mentioned, but the "similar to the following" is difficult to understand. The specific rainfall time recorded by the microwave radiometer should be illustrated.
10. Line 258: The dotted line in Figure 8 is blue instead of "black". The color bars for a), b) and c) in Fig 8, Fig.10 and Fig.12 should be labeled with unit.
11. Figure 13: In the response version, the authors claim that "because there are a larger number of plotted points, the cloud bottom height around 0 km is appropriate", one should note that the bottom echo signal is not the height of the cloud base for precipitating cloud. If this height is treated as the cloud base, the frequency distribution of cloud base height in the manuscript may not be reasonable.