The original comments from Editor are in black, our replies are in blue and the changes in original manuscript are in red.

Dear Dr. Yu and Dr. Michoud,

Thank you very much for submitting your revised manuscript. I appreciate your efforts in augmenting the analysis by including an independent estimate of age for the different air masses that were sampled during the campaign. I believe the other revisions you've made have also successfully addressed the concerns the reviewers and I had raised and have also strengthened the conclusions of the paper. I am happy to accept your paper for publication after the following minor edits are made.

Once again, thank you for resubmitting your paper.
Best,

Roya Bahreini
We thank the editor for reviewing our manuscript, and we have addressed the remaining minor comments accordingly.

Minor edits:
- L 95: This phrase appears twice. Please delete one: "included a ground-based field campaign"

Accept. We have fixed the typo here:

To address these issues, the Atmospheric Chemistry of the Suburban Forest (ACROSS) project (Cantrell and Michoud, 2022) included a ground-based field campaign in a forested suburban site to capture regionally transported air masses arriving in the Paris region.

- L427: change "photo loss" to "photochemical loss"

Accept. We have revised the related description here:

while the photochemical loss of primary pON during the SW period was slower than the other periods.

- In explanation of Fig S10, it's mentioned that "As a result, enhanced monoterpene oxidation below the canopy caused more rapid O3 depletion relative to the above-canopy layer at night." I don't see the direct evidence for it (i.e., there are no diurnal profiles of O3 above/below canopy), so I think it's best to just delete this statement or say that you expect a rapid O3 depletion below the canopy.

We thank the editor for the suggestion. We have removed the related statements in Page 11, Line 337 from the manuscript.