The manuscript underwent an impressive revision from both a stylistic and technical perspective.

As already said, the length of the dataset would normally deserve publication. However, I am concerned about the quality of some results, most notably:

1. the spectral dependency of the AOD cannot be reliably assessed, in my opinion, using a single-monochromator Brewer. For example, the method used by Arola and Koskela (2004) for roughly estimating the effect of the straylight on AOD at the shortest wavelengths, was employed by Peter Hrabčák to correct the measurements, which I think it is not in the intent of the authors of the original paper (the straylight primarily depends on the ozone slant path column, not on the solar zenith angle). Also, the author does not mention what are the conditions for which he calculated the correction for the light scattered within the instrumental field of view (forward scattering peak should be relevant for larger particles, but how large were the simulated aerosol particles?).

I think that the main outcome of the paper (reduction of the AOD and its contribution to the total optical depth) would not be compromised if the AOD for only the 320 nm wavelength, which is the most reliable measurement, were presented;

2. it is not very clear how the uncertainty of the annual averages (and thus, the resulting uncertainty/significance of the trend) is calculated. It is said that the error bars in Fig. 10 are obtained by changing the ETC within the range of its standard deviation. However, how is natural variability taken into account for the assessment of the significance of the trend? Moreover, using this method, the fewer ETC determinations for each year there are, the narrower is the uncertainty, which is probably not the desired behaviour of the method;

3. are the results of the standard lamp (SL) test used to recalculate ozone? This could maybe help in further improving the quality of the measurements, especially in periods when the Brewer is unstable.

From a stylistic point of view, I recommend a revision of the structure of the paper: Sect. 2.4 should be shortened (perhaps moving the most technical parts to the Appendix) and Sect. 3.3 should be anticipated before the results.

A complete list of the technical corrections will be provided once the final publication of the paper is foreseen.