Comments on the revised version of Climate-469995.

Most of my comments have been addressed in the revised version and the revised manuscript has been improved to some extent. The manuscript is thus suggested to be accepted for publication after the following comments are addressed appropriately, especially for Comment 1 below.

Comments:

1. Now almost one full page is presented in the revised version to describe the dry deposition and its parameterization. However, no any discuss is presented in the Section 3 of “Results and Discussion” on the impact of the implemented dry deposition scheme on the O3 prediction. If this is the case, how can readers be convinced that the implementation of dry deposition scheme in the LES is helpful and necessary to improve O3 prediction?
2. L73-75: The statement seem to repeat the one presented in L36-38.
3. L122: Where are the R9 and R13 located? Please add table information here.
4. L137: All the parameters or variables used in Equation 1 should be written in a form of italics for a consistency with them presented in the manuscript.
5. Figures 7 and 8: “AGL (km)” should be “Height (km, AGL)”?
6. Figure 8: I don’t think that “m-2·s-1” is a correct unit for ozone turbulence flux. Please have a double check. In addition, are the profiles presented in Figure calculated with Formula (5) or (6)?
7. This manuscript is focused on the diurnal variation of the CBL. It will be better to add an information on the difference between UTC and LST (local standard time) in a right place of the manuscript.
8. Overall the English writing is good. However, some places need a further improvement. For instance, “100 m” (see L88) should be “100m away”; “running” should be “run” (Lines 265 and 272); L355: Is “misrepresent” more appropriate than “miss” used here? The authors are recommended to do a careful check.