

## Authors' response to the review comments #2

Title: OMI NO<sub>2</sub> column densities over North American urban cities: The effect of satellite footprint resolution

Authors: Hyun Cheol Kim, Pius Lee, Laura Judd, Li Pan, and Barry Lefer

First of all, the authors express their appreciation to the two reviewers and the editor. We believe that their comments are very productive and substantially contributed to improving the manuscript. We provide replies for the reviewer's two main comments: (1) Why this draft is suited to the GMD's general goal, and (2) why findings and approaches in this draft are valuable for the future scientific model development. We also try to clarify the use of Averaging Kernel (AK) in the draft. Reviews' comments are shown in italics.

(1) The journal choice

***"I consider this study out-of-scope for the aforementioned journal, as the authors have merely used the CMAQ model in their study; the study does not include any aspects of model development."***

We believe that the evaluation of a model is a crucial part of model development. Without proper evaluation with observational evidences, the model's capability to represent the natural phenomena will be seriously limited. The main goal of this study is to discuss how a geoscientific model should be evaluated when its evaluation has likely been systematic biased due to data resolution.

In this draft, we have demonstrated that a direct comparison of the modeled and satellite NO<sub>2</sub> vertical column density (VCD) over urban cities might have serious systematic bias due to differences in the data geospatial resolutions between the model and observation (e.g. satellite). Subsequently we have described an approach to reduce this systematic bias. We have submitted this draft to the *Geoscientific Model Development* because our study addresses the scientific fairness in model evaluation between different geospatial data sets.

Furthermore, the comparison of modeled and satellite NO<sub>2</sub> VCDs is usually used to improve model's emission input (e.g. NO<sub>x</sub> emission) which is one of the most important elements for better atmospheric chemistry modeling system.

(2) Scientific importance and implication

***"The study lacks scientific novelty. Regarding the second point, the fact that measurements of trop. NO<sub>2</sub> over urban areas are not able to capture the high pollution maxima over the emission hot spot due to the spatial smoothing caused by the coarse satellite ground pixel is trivial and has been reported on previously."***

The reviewer commented that this draft is trivial since the underestimation of satellite NO<sub>2</sub> VCD observations over urban cities due to its coarse spatial resolution has already been reported. However, this comment seriously misinterprets our work. The draft did not only report these biases, but also tried to quantify the magnitude of the biases, and tried to suggest approaches to overcome those systematic biases.

