**Co-Editor Decision: Publish subject to minor revisions (review by editor)**

Comments to the Author:

The study focuses on the impact of soil moisture on stomatal uptake of O3 and related CTM-predicted O3 concentrations. It should be noted that non-stomatal uptake of O3 (by cuticles and underlying soils) typically contributes 50% of the overall uptake. It is not clear if the non-stomatal uptake was treated or not in the model simulations. If it is, this should be made clear and the relative contributions of stomatal and non-stomatal uptake can be briefly discussed. If it is not, then model simulation results may have serious questions.

**Response to Editor:**

**We would like to thank the Editor for the time taken to read and comment on this manuscript. Please find below our clarifications to the above comment.**

**The non-stomatal uptake contributions are included within CHIMERE. In fact, as most of chemistry models, in CHIMERE the dry deposition process is described through a resistance analogy; considering the surface resistance (Rc), it is modeled using a number of different other resistances accounting for both stomatal and non-stomatal fluxes which are dependent on the land use type and season (e.g. Menut et al., 2013 GMD). Thus, the surface resistance in CHIMERE is defines as:**

****

**where:**

* **Rsto is the canopy stomatal resistance**
* **Rm is the mesophyll resistance**
* **Rsoil is the soil resistance**
* **Rinc is the in-canopy aerodynamic resistance**
* **Rext is the canopy cuticle or external leaf resistance**

**In our work we only have modified the stomatal resistance term (i.e. Rsto), for this reason we did not mention in the submitted manuscript the other terms. We have clarified this point in the revised manuscript.**