The editor comment to the author is

“Dear authors, I decided to accept your publication for publication in ACP. Just one very minor issue. Figure 6 is referenced first after reference 7. I think it is better for readability to swap figure 6 and 7. Also from the contents and information of the figures it seems justified.”

In fact, Figure 6 is a comparison of direct modelling and measurement at the five sites, before any inversion. It therefore belongs to section 2.5. We agree that the figure was not referenced in the proper section, which was a significant mistake and we thank the editor for catching it. We have added a paragraph at the end of section 2.5 to correct this error. The paragraph reads:

« Figure 6 shows a scatter plot of the measured and modelled mole fraction at the five sites together with the statistics of their comparison. The scatter plots confirm the visual impression of Figure 5: There is a significant correlation between the measured and modelled mole fraction, which demonstrates the model skill. There are also significant discrepancies and a large bias, in particular at the EIF station. The smallest errors (both biases and standard deviations) are found at TRN that is the site the furthest from Paris. »

There is no other change from the version that has been accepted by the editor.