

Responses to Anonymous Referee #2

I thank the reviewer for his/her constructive comments that I address below point by point (responses are in italic).

I support publication. This technical note collects and organizes a variety of topics necessary to evaluate the pore condensation freezing mechanism in a wide array of circumstances. I have a few suggestions that might improve the paper around the edges, but the paper could be published "as-is" and still be a solid contribution to the literature.

There are a lot of parameterizations in this paper, and many of them are excruciatingly sensitive. For example, Equation 18 has a term in it with six significant figures. It's very easy to leave a digit out or transpose a couple when entering expressions like this into code. It would be quite helpful if a table of one or two pair of representative values from equations like this were included in the text. As an example of something like this, see appendix C in Murphy and Koop, QJRM, 2005, "Review of the vapor pressures..." Equations A1, B15, and B16 are other examples that I think would benefit from something like this. (That's not an exhaustive list.)

I added Appendix D to the revised manuscript with Table D1 listing values of the density parameterization given in Appendix A and Table D2 giving values of the pressure dependent CNT parameterizations described in Appendix B. I did not include a table listing values of Eq. 18 as this parameterization is taken from Murphy and Koop (2005) and values are given therein.

Minor comments

Line 24: "Cirrus may form through different mechanisms." This sentence seems redundant, considering the fact that the previous sentence was a description of various mechanisms by which cirrus can form.

I agree. I removed this sentence in the revised manuscript.

line 13: "...pore with thickness $t = 0.38 - 0.6$ nm" That dash looks like a minus sign at first glance. Perhaps replace with "...pore with thickness of 0.38 to 0.6 nm"

I changed the manuscript accordingly.