

Authors' response

To acp-2021-527 Editor decision: Publish subject to technical corrections (20 Sep 2021): Thank you Jens-Uwe for your smooth handling of the review process and your useful comments. We really appreciated it.

We have addressed the issues as follows.

- You use the term "divergence" (fig 4, lines 194, 205) which is correct by language. As this term is also used in analysis you may think of replacing it by "deviation". But I leave this up to you. Thank you for pointing this out. We have replaced the term accordingly.
- You use $[O_3]$ throughout the manuscript for the description of the ozone mixing ratio (in ppb). Normally, in the chemistry literature $[X]$ refers to the concentration of a species X (in molecules per cm^3), not the mixing ratio. I should have noted that in the first round. It may be rather complicated to change this throughout the manuscript and figures (preferred), but at least I would ask you to explain this writing style once in the beginning. It is indeed difficult to replace all labels through out the manuscript at this stage. We add a short explanation in Section 1 after its first occurrence: "Here, $[O_3]$ refers to the concentration as volume mixing ratio (VMR) of ozone in ppb."