

Response to comments from the Editor (Dr. Andreas Richter)

Black: Editor's comments; Blue: Authors' answers; Green: Changes in the manuscript

Dear Mahesh Kumar Sha,

I'm pleased to accept your manuscript "Validation of Methane and Carbon Monoxide from Sentinel-5 Precursor using TCCON and NDACC-IRWG stations" for publication in AMT subject to minor revisions as outlined below.

As you have seen, the two reviewers are satisfied with your changes even though you did not shorten the manuscript as suggested. I'm happy to see even more data and in particular from an important new station and I'm also satisfied with the slight change in tone. I still think that discussing more the why than the what would have made the manuscript even more interesting but it is already a relevant and quite big study as it is.

The only change I would really like to see is a shortening of the abstract by roughly a factor of two - this will really help to give readers a quicker assessment of what are the main points of your study. It would also be good to shorten the summary at the end by removing duplications but the abstract is the most important point for me.

Best regards,

Andreas Richter

Dear Andreas,

Thank you for your comments. We have modified the abstract, which removes some of the duplications and therefore we decided to leave the conclusion chapter as it is. Please find attached the updated version of the manuscript for your evaluation (in track changes mode).

Yours Sincerely
Mahesh