The authors put careful work into the revision of the manuscript, which improves the scope of the paper. I therefore support the publication of the manuscript as it is.

Two final remarks for clarification:

- Line 385 – 386, first submission: I agree, that we have to be mindful about foliage age when we evaluate e.g. foliar Hg concentrations. Just for the net Hg(0) flux (e.g. to one forest site over one growing season) foliage age might not be as relevant because the foliage Hg uptake rates normalized over time are not so different between old and young foliage (Fig. 4b first submission) and the mass of younger foliage is often much higher than the mass of older foliage at the same tree (compare e.g. masses of spruce needles current season to six year old needles). I just think we have to carefully differentiate in wording between concentrations and fluxes so they do not get confused.
- Even though SLA values of coniferous needles and broad leaves are usually quite distinct, I agree that there is a large SLA variation within these categories and sometimes we observe inbetween SLA values (e.g. by Larix). My suggestion to separate needles and leaves is more born out of their different metabolic strategies and structure, which might impact Hg uptake. I am excited for further insights into the similarities between uptake mechanisms of needles and leaves. Whatever the direction, SLA seems to be a functional trait of interest in this context.