608: what is the difference between a model-observation integration and an empirical study?

588: is this somewhat inherently in the LAI product?

587: do the authors mean the simulation year for the 30% testing?

586: v_d

583: what does low baseline v_d actually mean?

of the Ducker dataset that I am missing?

536: do the authors actually show that the four parameterizations differ most in leafy parts of the world? if not, i

that made them.

528: what do the authors mean by reported? do they mean in the peer reviewed literature? there are many reasons why people

527: "constrain"; why all of a sudden call it gaseous dry deposition?

526: a vague reference to an effort in asia doesn't do much to help the reader

495-6: whether IAV in v_d at Blodgett is caused by chemistry is unknown

478: soil moisture data?

455: "complex"

452: assuming that ozone dry deposition should be a strong function of LAI

439: or it may decrease as plants acclimate or as nutrients become limiting

423-4: but they are small or nonsignificant per the first line of the paragraph?

reader needs to at least have some concept of what the method used is

415: how is the annual change in v_d estimated? is it using the Theil-Sen method? this part needs better explanation; the

briefly describe this method such as the limitations/strengths of it

409: not sure what the point of this paragraph is. what is the hypothesis being investigated?

385: "shifts from the south to the north relative to July"

382-4: i suggest a semi colon connecting these two sentences

their current approach? (see comment below for line 404)

353: "is not desiccated"?

317-320: not sure what the point of this paragraph is. what is the hypothesis being investigated?

315: sampling biases meaning that the authors are not evaluating most locations on earth, right? the authors are sampling

suggest that we need to be paying attention to nonstomatal deposition estimates too.

288: if the authors are implying ambient chemistry is happening then they should just say it

282: what does N=5 mean? 5 sites? 5 data points?

270-1: Not sure what the point of this sentence is

265: Fractional coverage of what? (please spell out in text) Why are these figures shown? they are not very useful for the

reader

249: what is the baseline simulation?

243-246: discussing about dry deposition of other species and impacts on ozone requires introducing some concepts (or

examining this)

217: i think the authors need to articulate here or in the introduction the various effects that high CO2 may have on ozone dry deposition. the various effects of high CO2 on ozone are discussed in the version 4

parameterizations

198: what's z0?

188-9: has this model been evaluated? or used previously?

182-183: It's fine not to test Ra and Rb, but i suggest that the authors do not use this qualifier. This isn't well

calculated.

180: Given that GEOS Chem doesn't have a land surface model, I think the authors need to clarify how exactly Anet is

implemented. A quick google search finds that implementing it required personal communication with Zhiyong and Leiming.

175: It doesn't quite make sense to me that the authors say the Zhang parameterization is "open source" in one sentence and

also I suggest changing "demonstrating" to "suggesting"

articulated better

77-80: this has yet to be shown… these formulations can be variable across models …

yet to be shown in the literature

66: "account for" is vague; in general this sentence implies canopy column models are better than big-leaf ones, which has

strength of the model evaluation (that not any one parameterization is best or worst) and model intercomparison.

4) The UKCA parameterization

Wong et al. do.

145: I find the placement/existence of this sentence strange. the authors don't investigate the same parameterizations that

125: "unable" seems harsh; it doesn't seem Clifton et al. even tried to do this

also I suggest changing "demonstrating" to "suggesting"

articulated better

77-80: this has yet to be shown… these formulations can be variable across models …

yet to be shown in the literature

66: "account for" is vague; in general this sentence implies canopy column models are better than big-leaf ones, which has

strength of the model evaluation (that not any one parameterization is best or worst) and model intercomparison.

4) The UKCA parameterization

Wong et al. do.

145: I find the placement/existence of this sentence strange. the authors don't investigate the same parameterizations that

125: "unable" seems harsh; it doesn't seem Clifton et al. even tried to do this

also I suggest changing "demonstrating" to "suggesting"

articulated better

77-80: this has yet to be shown… these formulations can be variable across models …

yet to be shown in the literature

66: "account for" is vague; in general this sentence implies canopy column models are better than big-leaf ones, which has

strength of the model evaluation (that not any one parameterization is best or worst) and model intercomparison.

4) The UKCA parameterization

Wong et al. do.

145: I find the placement/existence of this sentence strange. the authors don't investigate the same parameterizations that

125: "unable" seems harsh; it doesn't seem Clifton et al. even tried to do this

also I suggest changing "demonstrating" to "suggesting"

articulated better

77-80: this has yet to be shown… these formulations can be variable across models …

yet to be shown in the literature

66: "account for" is vague; in general this sentence implies canopy column models are better than big-leaf ones, which has

strength of the model evaluation (that not any one parameterization is best or worst) and model intercomparison.

4) The UKCA parameterization

Wong et al. do.

145: I find the placement/existence of this sentence strange. the authors don't investigate the same parameterizations that

125: "unable" seems harsh; it doesn't seem Clifton et al. even tried to do this

also I suggest changing "demonstrating" to "suggesting"

articulated better

77-80: this has yet to be shown… these formulations can be variable across models …

yet to be shown in the literature

66: "account for" is vague; in general this sentence implies canopy column models are better than big-leaf ones, which has

strength of the model evaluation (that not any one parameterization is best or worst) and model intercomparison.

4) The UKCA parameterization

Wong et al. do.

145: I find the placement/existence of this sentence strange. the authors don't investigate the same parameterizations that

125: "unable" seems harsh; it doesn't seem Clifton et al. even tried to do this

also I suggest changing "demonstrating" to "suggesting"

articulated better

77-80: this has yet to be shown… these formulations can be variable across models …

yet to be shown in the literature

66: "account for" is vague; in general this sentence implies canopy column models are better than big-leaf ones, which has

strength of the model evaluation (that not any one parameterization is best or worst) and model intercomparison.

4) The UKCA parameterization

Wong et al. do.