

Dear Bryan N. Duncan,

we are glad to hear that the revised version of the manuscript adequately addressed the concerns of the reviewers. We are thankful for the comments of Anonymous Referee #1 and think that our resulting modifications further improve the manuscript. Please find in black the original comments of the Anonymous Referee #1 and in red our reply:

1. Section 3. I suggest the authors consider adding a bit more quantitative emissions numbers in this section, instead of only have general terms such as “highest ..., lowest ..., about one third ... less than half ...”. This change, albeit small, will make the paragraph much more informative.

This is a very good point. We agree that adding quantitative emission numbers to this section will increase its value to the manuscript. In the revised version of this manuscript, quantitative emission numbers were thus added to section 3.

2. L236. Change to “et al., 2000; 2009”

Done.

3. Sections 5 and 6: Shouldn't there also be two subsections 5.5 and 6.5 titled “O3”? In this revised version, the discussion on O3 is following the “Radicals” subsection, as if they are part of the radicals.

We added separate ozone subsections to section 5 and 6.

At this point, we would like to thank you for serving as editor of this manuscript. In addition, we would like to thank all referees for their contributions.

Kind regards,  
On behalf of the authors,

Simon Rosanka