

Assessment of Responses to Reviewer's Comments

Pg 5 –Gilman et al., 2015 measured pentadienes and cyclopentene, and they totaled about 20% of isoprene.

Pg 28. Your response to the comment that asked about the phrase “largely conserved” was not very helpful. Use another term or just say “the diel profiles were similar”. The next few lines in the revised paper (Pg 19, lines 29-30) say emissions due to brick kilns pick up, but in this response and elsewhere you say brick kilns operate around the clock. You need to be consistent.

Pg 38. It is trivial to eliminate O_3 as an important oxidant, but NO_3 needs to be considered, especially for Acetaldehyde and DMS, since NO_3 can be several tens of pptv, the product $k_{NO_3}[NO_3]$ is of similar magnitude or larger than $k_{OH}[OH]$ for DMS. The broader point the reviewer is making is that the system could be NOx sensitive, in which case VOC controls would not solve the problem. I think the reviewer is just looking for one or two sentences acknowledging this.

Comments on Revised Manuscript

Pg. 11, lines 8-25. You made a nice point in your response that absolute humidity didn't change much, but you didn't explain that here.

Pg 15, line 1, 'comprised' should be 'composed'

Pg. 17, line 14. This should be Figure 5.

Pg. 24, line 19. 'quarters'

Pg. 26. Lines 27-32. You should consider loss of both acetaldehyde and DMS due to NO_3 reactions as a reason for similar diel profiles, with low values at night.

Pg. 27. Line 17. 'pyrolysis'

References

Gilman, J.B., et al., *Atmos Chem Phys.*, **15**, 13915, 2015.