

1) Your response to the following referee comments was quite detailed. However, it might be worthwhile adding some of this information to the manuscript.

Original referee comment:

Line 318 In addition to there being a possibility cuticular adsorption accounts for extra NO₂ deposition you might also note that stomatal enclosure might not be complete.

Discussion about whether stomatal conductance goes to zero shows up mostly in discussions seeking to explain sap flow or water flux that doesn't go to zero at night. It might not be as much of an issue for daytime periods, but could be noted just for completeness.

2) l. 398ff and Eq.-1: For the calculations using Eq-1, you assume a single-sided leaf area. How does the fact that aspen leaves might have stomata on both sides may affect results based on this assumption? Do the findings as described in l. 440 possibly point to the same phenomenon?

Technical comments

All equations: Add units to all parameters, either in the equations or in the text where the parameters are defined

l. 13: there seems to be a word missing (compensation point of ...?)

l. 43, 44; 58, 62, 89, 249ff; l. 487 (and possibly at other places): check all chemical formulae and correct indices where necessary

l. 102 folia → foliar

l. 124: replace 'see below' by reference to specific section

l. 179: 'conversion' misspelled

l. 234: appears → appear

l. 277: add 'for' (accounting for...)

l. 315; l. 330: refer to specific subsections in the discussion section

l. 317: Reword 'the same slope is 0.4'

l. 333: Reword 'the stomatal conductance of each data point...'

l. 393: 'Biological features' sounds very general. Can you be more specific?