

Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., referee comment RC2  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2021-796-RC2>, 2022  
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## Reply on AC1

Anonymous Referee #2

---

Referee comment on "A decadal assessment of the climatology of aerosol and cloud properties over South Africa" by Abdulaziz Tunde Yakubu and Naven Chetty, Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2021-796-RC2>, 2022

---

I think Reviewer #3 meant that the structure (not necessarily the grammar) needs to be revised. Your sentence and paragraph structures make it hard to read the article and review it. For example, I find that paragraphs tend to be excessively long and likewise sentences. It would be good to try to split paragraphs into smaller ones to convey one main idea per paragraph.

- For example, the introduction appears to be one single paragraph running from Line 15 to Line 75. In fact, each section and subsection has only one paragraph. Please feel free to split them all.

- Another aspect of this paper that may need revising is the naming of keywords --- could you please make sure to use the correct terminology throughout? For example, is "climatology of aerosol properties" correct? I also think we often refer to aerosol--cloud interactions (in the plural). I could be wrong, so just double check and make a call on these phrases.

- Can you make the figures clearer and bigger?

Also, since you responded to only one reviewer, could you upload the revised manuscript in your response? I still think this is a sound manuscript, almost ready for publication. My main concerns are related to the presentation and readability at this point.

I would like to review this again focusing on the scientific quality, which I think is good, but obscured by the busy presentation and long paragraphs. You could make the reviewers' lives easier by making it easier to read and follow your manuscript. Looking forward to reading this again :)