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This paper presents a very interesting comparison of HCHO between two different ground-based measurement techniques: MAX-DOAS and FTIR as well as their comparison with satellite-based (TROPOMI and OMI) data. The research presented in this paper is relevant to the scientific community since in several occasions questions have been raised regarding the differences between both MAX-DOAS and FTIR measurement techniques as well as their comparison with satellite-based measurements. Moreover, this research presents novel results in the Australasian region. For these reasons I recommend the publication of this paper in AMT. A few specific and minor/technical comments are suggested below.

Specific comments/suggestions:

a) Page 8, line 173 and Page 9, lines 182-183: When explaining the criteria to filter satellite-based datasets it is mentioned that cloud-free data was used (cloudy scenes were avoided or excluded from the analysis), was there a threshold value used?

b) Page 21, Figure A4: When comparing ground-based measurements with OMI, which data field was used?, the “ColumnAmount” or the “ReferenceSectorCorrectedVertical-Column”?

c) Page 18, line 376: Would it be possible to please clarify the phrase “This would begin to address the current Northern-Hemispheric bias in satellite validation studies.”, Is this in reference to the representativeness or the amount of monitoring stations used for satellite validations in both hemispheres?

Minor/technical comments:

Page 2, line 37: please review the phrase “Photolysis and reaction with OH and photolysis”

Page 6, Figure 3a: a parenthesis is missing on the “y” axis of Figure 3a.

Page 18, line 371: please review the phrase “will be critical tool”