

Response to Editor's comments – manuscript BG-2020-364

Forest-atmosphere exchange of reactive nitrogen in a remote region – Part I: Measuring temporal dynamics

We sincerely thank the editor for thoroughly handling the review process and for her comments to the last remaining points.

Attached to this document, our responses to the technical corrections are given. Comments range from R1.1 to R1.3. Line numbers in the answers, where new information was added to the manuscript, refer to the last revised version. The text which is enclosed by “...” is implemented in the manuscript.

Response to Editor's comments:

Comments to the manuscript:

Comment R1.1: *Section heading 3.4: ...dry deposition sums on micrometeorological variables*

Response to R1.1: We changed the section title.

Comment R1.2: *Line: 639-641: The low correlations of the ΣN_r fluxes to micrometeorological variables could be related to time-shifts between exchange processes and micrometeorological changes. (→ please use variations instead of changes)*

I do not fully agree with this sentence. It could also be related to multiple interactions and feedback mechanisms, which are hard to quantify.

Response to R1.2: We agree that time-shifts are not the main reason for the low correlations. We replaced variations by changes and rephrased the sentence as follows: “The low correlations of the ΣN_r fluxes to micrometeorological variables could be related to, for example, time-shifts between exchange processes and micrometeorological variations, multiple (chemical) interactions between the N_r compounds, and feedback mechanisms, which are difficult to quantify.”

Comment R1.3: *Line 785: In a follow-up paper, a comparison of ...*

Response to R1.3: We changed the beginning of the sentence.