

Dear Referee #3,

We really appreciate your effort and valuable although critical comments regarding to manuscript No. acp-2017-1005. We have prepared completely new version of manuscript that considered most of your comments. Please find enclosed supplement including our reply to principal problems.

On behalf of all co-authors, yours faithfully, Svetlana Bičárová

Review of Referee #3 includes comments in separate paragraphs on pages C1-C2. In the following, problems or questions with answers for each paragraph are shortly described.

**C1, lines 4–6**

Problem: Misleading title

Answer: We have changed the title and prepare completely new version of manuscript.

**C1, line 6 – C2, line 7**

Problem: French site

Answer: Due to many methodological weaknesses, in new revised manuscript we have completely excluded French study site as well as sites that do not have whole year data.

**C2, line 7**

Problem: Methodology

Answer: We improved the description of phenological function; now it is described in chapter 3.1 Ozone metrics. Phenological function was set to 1,  $f_{temp}$  was used instead as was recommended by Mills et al. (2011).

**C2, line 10**

Problem: Dose-response relationship

Answer: In the new version of manuscript there we added values of  $POD_0$  to the ozone visible injury chart. Dose-response relationship was approved by showing both trend lines; ozone visible injury and  $POD_0$  as well (Fig. 7). Conclusions resulted from this issue we have integrated to chapters 4 Results, 4.4 Visible ozone injury and 5 Discussion.