

Response to reviewer's comments (ACP-2018-108)

Reviewer#1

Submitted on 13 Aug 2018

Anonymous Referee #2

Anonymous during peer-review: Yes No

Anonymous in acknowledgements of published article: Yes No

Recommendation to the editor

1) Scientific significance

Excellent **Good** Fair Poor

Does the manuscript represent a substantial contribution to scientific progress within the scope of this journal (substantial new concepts, ideas, methods, or data)?

2) Scientific quality

Excellent **Good** Fair Poor

Are the scientific approach and applied methods valid?
Are the results discussed in an appropriate and balanced way (consideration of related work, including appropriate references)?

3) Presentation quality

Excellent **Good** Fair Poor

Are the scientific results and conclusions presented in a clear, concise, and well structured way (number and quality of figures/tables, appropriate use of English language)?

For final publication, the manuscript should be

accepted as is

accepted subject to technical corrections

accepted subject to **minor revisions**

reconsidered after **major revisions**

I would be willing to review the revised paper, if the editor considers it necessary.

I am **not** willing to review the revised paper.

rejected

Suggestions for revision or reasons for rejection (will be published if the paper is accepted for final publication)

I would like to thank the authors for the additional analysis done. In my opinion the manuscript has improved significantly and can be accepted for publication. There are still some minor language issues (e.g. line 378 “CO concentration up to 160 ppb” should be “CO concentration higher than 160 ppb”), but I trust copy editing will take care of that.

Authors response:

We have corrected some minor language mistakes and checked the language through the whole paper.