

The following comments have been addressed.

(1) The optical depth 0.2 was applied to all the studied spectral wavelengths in the paper. Authors may want to clarify this doesn't consider the spectral dependence of optical depth of atmospheric aerosols.

Response: added in L304-305"

“, and it doesn't consider the spectral dependence of optical depth of atmospheric aerosols”

(2) Figure 2: The use of Nfour in the plot title to represent N_Fourier is misleading. Please use a different term.

Response: changed Nfour to N_FOURIER to make it consistent with Table 1.

(3) Figure 3 and Figure 5: please swap the columnar panels in either Figure 3 or Figure 5 to make them consistent, i.e, 'with aerosol' and 'no aerosols' are current on different sides.

Response: Figure 3 was replotted by swap two panels, and changed the title in the right panel. Figure 5 was replotted by changing the title “with aerosol to ‘Aerosol ($\tau=0.2$)’ in the right panel.

(4) Same as above, but for Figure 4 and Figure 6-7.

Response: Figure 4 was replotted by changing the title “with aerosol to ‘Aerosol ($\tau=0.2$)’ in the lower panel, and it is consistent with Figures 6-7 now.

(5) Figure 3 to figure 8, please use a consistent annotation for aerosols with optical depth of 0.2. For instance, Figure 6 and 7 currently use 'Aerosol ($\tau=0.2$)', Figure 8 uses 'aerosol(0.2)', whereas other figures simply use 'With Aerosol'.

Response: All were changed as requested. In Figure 8, we still used no aerosol and with aerosol, and in the Figure caption we add “For aerosol, the optical depth is set to 0.2.”