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I have a few specific questions and comments:

Page 4807 and figure 3 Comparison of NOz from chemiluminescence NOz and LIF NOz. There is a correlation value, (R or R²), which is correct, the plot or the text? What was fitting method used? Did the fit account for uncertainties in both measurements? Why were medians compared and not means? It would really nice to plot a time series
of these two measures of NOz. The scatter plot indicates large differences between the two measurements. There are times when NOz Chem is measuring 300 ppt and the LIF techniques measures near zero and times where the reverse, nearly 200 ppt in the LIF and near zero in the Chem. NOz. Does the comparative time series tell us the reason for these differences? For example, does one instrument over-measure relative the other during particular circumstances? The reason given on page 4807 does not seem to me to be sufficient and the discussion would benefit from a comparison of the time-series and a discussion of the pros and cons of both techniques in particular configuration in which they were operated in the tropical forest, for example:

How well does the chem. NOz instrument measure HNO3? Were there inlet losses along a long humid inlet?

How does the failure to measure HONO, NO3 and HNO3 account for the time periods where the LIF instrument measures more than the Chem. NOz?

If HNO3 was 25% of the NOy and the LIF did not measure it, why is there not a gradient larger than one in the comparison fit?

The abstract and the conclusions state that the model reproduced the $\Sigma$PNs well, but the plot of the comparison shows a disagreement for 6 out of the 10 hours. What is the definition of good agreement? Does the model get it right for the wrong reason in the middle of the day or wrong for the right reason at either end of the day?

It does not seem to me that there is any improvement in the fit between the model and the experiment for the alkyl nitrates by adjusting yields and recycling. It gets better in parts and worse in others. The whole shape of the diurnal is not particularly similar suggesting that the model is not simulating the situation well and therefore the statement regarding the recycling and yield is not supported by this data.

I find figure 4 very difficult to read.

These are interesting measurements in a location which is rarely studied and it would
be of benefit to explore the measurements in themselves in greater detail before using a box model to draw conclusions about particular specific mechanisms in model systems.