

Response to Associate Editor

Peters et al., Evaluating uncertainty in sensor networks for urban air pollution insights (AMT-2021-210)

In addition to our revisions detailed in the previous Response to Reviewers document, we have made the following changes in response to the Associate Editor's comments to the author:

1) Please write in Section 2.3.1 explicitly that the network calibration method and its performance will be addressed in detail in a separate study (Popoola et al., in preparation).

We appreciate this suggestion and have added such a statement (Lines 163-164):

"The method and its performance will be addressed in more detail in a separate study (Popoola et al., in preparation)."

2) In Section 2.6 it should be explained more clearly in the first sentence what exactly the ADMS model was used for. This becomes only clear towards the end of the section with the sentence "To calculate the modelled difference between BL and reference network means for the year 2019 ..".

ADMS was obviously used as a kind of transfer-standard between the two networks.

We thank the Editor for this clarification and have added a clause to the first sentence of Section 2.6 explaining the purpose of using the ADMS model (Lines 210-212):

"The ADMS-Urban air pollution dispersion model was used to simulate 2019 hourly NO₂ concentrations at BL and reference network monitoring locations in order to estimate the expected difference in NO₂ pollution levels between the two networks (McHugh et al., 1997)."