Responses to the comments and suggestions of an anonymous reviewer

96: is this annual production?	Probably, in this form it will be more clear what refers to the stock of leaf litter biomass, and what to its input during the year: « …the litter mass is estimated to be 6×10^{16} g C (Bolin, 1983; Zlotin and Bazilevich, 1993) and the global estimate of litter production is in the range $(9–10) \times 10^{16}$ g yr^{-1} dry matter (Matthews, 1997)Ю
115: can it be said with certainty what is and is not common in this case?	Unfortunately, it is currently impossible to answer this with certainty, since comparisons of the content of terpenes in fresh and aging leaves are of a single nature.
121 and elsewhere: the dot to signify multiplication is not needed in my opinion	Agree, corrections will be made in the final version
159: tropical forests should be mentioned as well, if not only for completeness e.g. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-018-04658-y	Indeed, tropical forests deserve a lot of attention, but data on emissions from the bottom of these forests are very limited (Table 5 shows the results of the only study known to us). We hope that this review will serve as an incentive to study emissions from the bottom of these forests.
167: this paragraph is unnecessary. There's enough justification of litter mass and perhaps these points can be integrated elsewhere.	We cannot agree that what is said in this paragraph is not necessary. Not everyone is aware of the differences in litter biomass in forest and meadow ecosystems. In addition, a significant disproportion is observed in the litter biomass in forest clearings and in the surrounding forest stands. We will make an appropriate addition to this paragraph in the final version of the manuscript.
205: is Zimmer et al. the relevant reference here?	Why not? The work of these authors is devoted to the role of invertebrate organisms colonizing leaf litter, which is discussed in the same paragraph.
211: Trowbridge et al. covered this topic for the case of soil fungi: https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1029/2019JG005479	Thank you, we will add a link to this work that has fallen out of our sight.
239: does photodegredation result in VOC flux from litter? The photodegredation wection was a bit long and speculative and distracted from the main theme. It would be better shortened.	We agree with this remark and will exclude lines 239-249 from the final version of the manuscript.
for section II, subsections IIa and IIb for abiotic then biotic controls could help the reader navigate all of this material.	We also agree with this remark.
445 and a number of paragraphs afterward focus mostly on decomposition over time, which is interesting of course but it is	We will think about it when preparing the final version of the manuscript.

unclear how this entire section contributes to a review of VOC emissions which remain largely uninvestigated as noted on line 485. Shortening this section to focus briefly on microbial changes during the decomposition process would help focus on the topic of the review.	
Section V is great and makes key points about global representativeness.	Thanks a lot