The authors have addressed my comments sufficiently and I only have a few wording notes below. I think removing the urban emissions estimation was a good idea.

Minor wording edits:
Line numbers refer to the document with tracked changes.

L132. "All 1 Hz data was interpolated".-- from what to what? Was most of the native acquisition rate lower than 1Hz (is the Picarro at 5 seconds and then was interpolated down to 1 Hz?). What about the other instruments?

L149- given the rest of the paragraph is in present tense, first sentence could be changed to "are calculated".

L216 should be "These observations were conducted over only a few days out of the year, which could lead to bias..."

L219- Not sure other observations are "more reliable". Maybe data gaps in other observations? I think your observations are reliable, just not continuous!

L221 should "concentrations" be "emissions"? If other studies haven't shown it in emissions, then keep concentrations - just wondering.

L369 - "which is that they are mostly caused by differences in the top-down and bottom-up methods for estimation"...? Seems more clear that it's a methods issue? (if that is what was intended).