

Response to the comments of the editor:

Comment: The discussion in the last paragraph of pg. 12 is misleading: “As already discussed, missing reactivity was higher during the first part of the campaign, so that a regression analysis yields a higher slope of 1.7 with an intercept of $-4.2s$ ” A negative intercept is not physically reasonable. I suggest that the regression be redone with the intercept forced to zero. The slope would then give a more realistic measure of the missing reactivity. If you wish, both regression analyses can be discussed, or simply the discuss the regression with the slope forced to zero.

Response: We change the fit procedure to force the line to zero and cancel the discussion of an intercept.

Comment: The sentence on lines 402-404 is not clear; please rewrite.

Response: We rephrased the sentence: “In addition, unmeasured oxidation products may still have contributed to the OH reactivity within the combined uncertainties of OH reactivity measurements and calculations from OH reactant measurements.