

Response to Reviewers

Responses are in blue

All my comments have taken into account and the manuscript has improved significantly. I have only some minor technical issues that should be considered before publication:

P11, L405-409: This sentence is very long and somewhat complicated. I would suggest to split it into two sentences.

The sentence has been split and clarified as suggested

P12, L429: add "a" -> based on a

Done as suggested

P12, L447: I would rather write "led to identify" or just "let identify" dependent on what exactly you want to say.

Done as suggested (led to identify)

P13, L487: Inclusion of what exactly? There is something missing after "condensable"?

We added "emissions" so that it now reads as condensable emissions

P13, 488-489: This sentence sounds also a bit incomplete. Please rephrase.

The sentence has been rephrased

P14, L519: add "the" -> " the supplementary material".

Done as suggested

P15, L550: Add "the" and change "do" to "does"-> when the country does

Done as suggested

P15, L551: with "Party" you mean the respective country? I would write here then country once again.

Done as suggested

P16, L568: inventory -> inventories

Done as suggested

P17, L598: add "of" -> a factor of 10

Done as suggested

References: Copernicus requires that in the reference list all authors are listed. Also instead of "&" "and" should be used. Please correct the reference list accordingly.

References have been reviewed, updated where relevant and harmonized to the GMD format