

We thank the reviewer for the further comment which helped improve the manuscript. We provide point-to-point responses below in blue, and the revision in the main is in red.

The authors have adequately improved the manuscript. A few minor revisions required before publication, including:

Response: we thank the reviewer for the positive comment.

Line 15: Change "element carbon" to "elemental carbon".

Response: corrected.

Section 3.3: I understand that the authors opted to use RSQ and r to represent model performance. However, there is a need to support this with an error evaluation metric such as RMSE (Root Mean Square error) that measures the average magnitude of the error in the model. Comparing the RMSE of both the MLR and RF models is essential. Please add a section discussing this. Please update the methods section accordingly.

Response: We have now provided RMSE comparison between RF and MLR. We have added more discussion in the revised Sect. 2.2.1.

In the revised Sect. 2.2.1, it now reads, "...the correlation coefficient R and the root mean square error (RMSE) between the time series of measured and predicted pollutants. The performance of Random Forest model was compared to the multilinear regression (MLR) model, in terms of the R value and the RMSE value (Table S1)..." And "...Moreover, the RMSE values are smaller for the Random Forest Model (i.e., 0.27-0.51 (training-testing) $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ and 12.94-29.34 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ for EC and NO_x, respectively) than the MLR (0.96 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ for EC and 47.6 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ for NO_x; Table S1)..."

Table S1. Correlation coefficient R and root mean square error (RMSE in $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$) between predicted and measured NO_x and EC using the random forest model and the multilinear regression model.

R (RMSE)	Random Forest	Multilinear regression
NO _x	0.89-0.98 (12.94-29.34)	0.48 (47.6)
EC	0.90-0.98 (0.27-0.51)	0.45 (0.96)