We want to thank Dr. Singh for his interest in our work and constructive comments. Below his main arguments/suggestions are in italics, followed by our answer.

The comment was rather lengthy discussing the main argument, which is briefly summarized below: “The main aim of this comment is to clarify findings of the higher absorbing organic content over Kanpur, India which is largely influenced by the emissions from a major coal-fired power plant (Figure 1) located close to Kanpur AERONET site, and not because of the very high biomass burning as suggested by the authors.”

Panki power plant is located south-east from Kanpur AERONET site. Regardless of the season, south-easterly winds are certainly not prevailing. Actually, this wind direction is distinctly unexceptional (see Figure 1 of Ram et al. 2010, JGR in press). Therefore, we do not consider Panki influencing our main conclusions. Although Panki does not have a role as a single source in our retrievals, more generally we have emphasized that also the coal burning for domestic heating is likely a significant factor of OC in newly industrialized countries (based on our retrievals in Kanpur and Beijing).

“Number of data points used in the retrieval of OC for the month of October to December should also be mentioned.”

Now there is a table indicating the data volume. Also, boxplots are drawn with width relative to the data amount.

“Arola et al (2010) may like to consider refractive indices month to month rather than considering averaged seasonal values”.

This is a good point. We have also stressed the need for better constrained imaginary index values, from site-to-site, from season-to-season. Unfortunately, this kind of data are not currently available. We have stressed this and the need for further measurements (in the Conclusions -chapter).