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#### Abstract
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Specific and technical comments
p. 1463: Accurate measurements of atmospheric CO2 do not, by themselves, provide an objective basis for verifying reported emissions. We need models to make that connection.
p. 1464: Regarding the statement that the typical sampling footprint is $1 / 10$ th the area of the contiguous U.S., other studies (Lauvaux et al. 2008; Gerbig et al. 2009) emphasis the importance of the near field.
p. 1465: "Background values of CO2 are relatively high (currently $\sim 390 \mathrm{ppm}$ ) and vary with latitude, altitude, and time, so signals from individual sources are rapidly diluted, becoming faint." I don't see the connection in this sentence.
p. 1469: Please explain why the Reynolds number is relevant here. Also could use just the average value, since the exact number is not important and the repeated parenthe-
ses are awkward.
p. 1484: "Leaks within the field laboratory" ... missing word.
p. 1482: "Recent studies have shown that Picarro measurements of CO 2 and CH 4 can reliably be corrected for water vapor effects." True, if you want to characterize each instrument individually and re-check periodically. Otherwise, there are problems at high water vapor values.
p. 1491: "It's uncertainty is $\sim 0.7 \mathrm{ppm}$." Too casual, plus there should be no apostrophe in any case.
p. 1491: "14 cylinders had absolute differences > 0.1 ppm." How much larger than 0.1 ppm?
p. 1514: "fantastic resource" reword
p. 1515: "We recommend deploying any analyzer with two or more additional cylinders than required to generate a calibration curve."
Table 2: This table is very specific and could be removed or put in the supplement. Also I'm not sure why (CO2, $\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{CH} 4$ ) follows "Water content of the sample flow".
Figure 2: Is there any way to combine Figures 1 and 2a-e into one figure? That would take up less space and eliminate repeated legends. Also consider writing out "sample" instead of abbreviating as "sam".
Figure 4: no a or $b$ in the figures. In a) this is the CO2 compared to the reference cell? Units are ppm? In b) what are the units? Seems high for CO in ppb?

Figure 6: In a) the baseline is compared to the reference cell?
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