The revision of the manuscript has been made suitable for publication through the major revision. This study developed a geoscientific model that calculates global BVOC emissions by connecting ONEMIS and MEGAN in EMAC modules to LPJ-GUESS, and tested the sensitivity of emissions through CO2 doubling experiments.

I think that the experimental results of this study alone are scientifically meaningful findings and numbers. Here are some suggestions for minor fixes.

1. Please consider rephrasing sentences from Forrest et al., 2020, GMD
   - L90~91 and L105~108
   - If there are more sentences, ...

2. Table 1 is hard to read. How about arranging it in one or two sentences?

3. Other minor comments are below:

@ abstract

- emissions from terrestrial vegetation, which represents
  > emissions from terrestrial vegetation, which represent

- Please consider rephrasing this sentence:
  and atmospheric chemistry is a recommended tool to address the fate of
  > and atmospheric chemistry is recommended to address the fate of

- were found to be > were (delete "found to be")

- conclude that the proposed model setup is a useful tool for
  > conclude that the proposed model setup is useful for

@L35

- the main precursor > the primary precursor

@L166

- ecosytem > ecosystem

@L199

- long-wave > longwave

@L265

- climatologcial > climatological

@L340

- water stress from higher surface temperatures result
  > water stress from higher surface temperatures results

@L355

- where increased foliage drastically enhance isoprene emissions.
  > enhances

@L420

- wrting > writing

@L586

- meteorology > Meteorology