

The authors would like to thank the editor for his time and valuable remarks. In light of his remarks, the revisions made in the manuscript are described hereafter.

148-150: “The flux footprint at the site was estimated to vary between 60 m and 120 m for respectively low and strong wind conditions.”What do the authors mean by flux footprint? Cumulative footprint of a certain percentage? Also footprint length should not depend so much on wind speed as on stability. How is it in this case?

In response to the editor’s question, the text has been modified as follows:

Flux footprint, i.e the area of cumulative contribution to flux, was computed (online at <http://www.footprint.kljun.net/>) based on stability conditions, measurement height and roughness length (Kljun et al. 2004). Ninety percent of the along wind footprint was calculated to include an area of 60 m for low turbulence conditions ($u^= 0.2 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ and standard deviation of vertical velocity fluctuations, $\sigma_w=0.5 \text{ m s}^{-1}$) and 120 m for higher turbulence conditions ($u^*= 1.2 \text{ m s}^{-1}$, $\sigma_w=1.4 \text{ m s}^{-1}$).*

179-181: “Both sampling inlets were slightly heated to about 1°C above ambient temperature with a thermocouple type K connected to a 12V power supply in order to prevent water condensation.”

Surely thermocouple was not connected to power supply but to whatever controller was used to control the heating.

We thank the reviewer for pointing out this misleading information. The authors do not have more details on the nature of the controller and believe that is of minor importance. To avoid any confusion we decided to withdraw this part of the sentence: “*connected to a 12V power supply*”. Should the editor believe that more details are needed, we will try to look for the controller’s specifications.

330-331: “The flux of each compound is therefore calculated using a covariance function between the vertical wind speed (w) and the VOC mixing ratio (c).”Not covariance function but covariance. Covariance function generally means covariance as a function of lag-time.

Corrected in the revised manuscript

540-542: “Night-time concentrations were probably affected by remaining emissions from the day, which were mixed over a small volume due to a shallow nocturnal boundary layer.” This sentence is ambiguous. What do you mean by “remaining emissions from the day”? A likely explanation for higher night-time mixing ratios is small monoterpene emission continuing in dark from monoterpene storing plants.

For more clarification, this paragraph has been modified as following:

“At nights, especially when the turbulence was low, a build-up of monoterpenes was observed. Night-time concentrations were probably affected by remaining monoterpenes, emitted on the day before and that have not been entirely consumed by daytime oxidants. Observed nocturnal maximum may also be attributed to nocturnal emissions from monoterpenes storing plants from the understorey vegetation. This nocturnal maximum is emphasised by the shallow nocturnal boundary layer, and the low concentrations of oxidising species, leading to higher monoterpenes concentrations.”

723: “...an isoprene basal emission rate of 7.43 mg m⁻² h⁻¹ is recommended...” Three significant figures seems much too high accuracy considering the uncertainty of this value. I suggest writing 7.4 mg m⁻²h⁻¹. Please reconsider the accuracy of values given also elsewhere.

The suggestion of the editor was taken into account.