

Somme comments for the reply to reviewer 2.

Regarding to my first question, I think the authors' response is incorrect, because the comment was referred to use more measurements collected during ICARTT observations, as the authors show in the new Figure 4, not in figure 7.

Regarding to my fourth comment, authors have added a new figure, (figure 7) in the new version, not figure 8 related to the boundary layer height.

GENERAL COMMENT: When you submit a revised article to a reviewer, you should include a set of detailed responses to all points, and clearly show how you have revised the text in each instant.

Despite your incorrect or not detailed responses, I think the manuscript provides a good contribution to the knowledge of the air quality dynamics in coastal areas, and I consider that it should be accepted for publication.