

Author Response

Reviewer #3:

I think now the section about the 2m heights is perhaps over-explained (end of Section 2.5). Is it possible to more concisely state the problem – that 2 meters may lie within the canopy for WRF-ACASA, although it never does for WRF-NOAH, and the measurements may be made at different heights and likely not within the canopy – is this an accurate summary of the issue?

The section has made more concise according to reviewer's suggestion.

A minor comment on the Abstract: the second sentence is confusing, it might be better to reword: "... the land surface schemes available in WRF (such as the popular NOAH model) are simple and lack the capability to simulate carbon dioxide."

The abstract is modified according to reviewer's suggestion.

Line 473: Remove "very" from "WRF-NOAH is very slightly better"

The sentence is modified.

There are a few typos and grammatical errors throughout so I recommend additional proofreading and editing by the authors.

Extra effort is made in improving the level of English in the entire paper.