

Associated Editor's comments on the Authors' answers to the reviewers' comments on the AMT-Manuscript amt-2018-456, entitled:

'Benefit of ozone observations from Sentinel-5P and future Sentinel-4 missions on tropospheric composition'

by Samuel Quesada-Ruiz et al.

In general: The authors give satisfactory answers to the reviewers' comments and I strongly recommend submission of a revised version of the manuscript. I should, however, like to stress the following points, which are all about changes to the manuscript that are very advisable in my opinion, but are not specified in the authors' answers to the two reviewers' comments:

1) Editor's comments on the authors' answers to reviewer #1 (amt-2018-456-AC1)

Here changes to the manuscript in response to the general concern of reviewer #1 are required, i.e. the dependence of the usefulness on the choice of inversion package (DISAMAR) and assumption of parameters like assumed uncertainties?

2) Editor's comments on the authors' answers to reviewer #2 (amt-2018-456-AC2)

1/ If I understand this right the authors state here that their choice of a constant error covariance matrix is a conservative one. This needs to be explained.

Also: There should be a comment in the text of the revised manuscript stating that this choice was made and why.

3/ Do the authors mean that the bias constitutes 10 to 18% of the tropospheric ozone level? This needs to be mentioned in the revised version of the manuscript (page 5).

4/ What are the planned changes to the manuscript in response to this question of the reviewer?