Response to Anonymous Referee #1:

**General comments:** I find that the authors argue well in response to these comments and provide valid answers to the reviewer’s concerns, however these responses seem to be mainly only in the response and have not been sufficiently incorporated into the article. Particularly the response to the second general comment does not mention any point at which this information has been incorporated into the article; the response to the first general comment has resulted in some but insufficient changes. Please incorporate all important points presented in the response into the revised article.

**Page 7193 L13:** As with the response to the second general comment on a similar point – the response presents information which should be included in the revised manuscript in sufficient detail to convince the reader of the measurement time selection protocol and the potential local influences at PON.

Response to Anonymous Referee #2:

**2.2.1 Flask sampling, page 7179:** It should be mentioned in the revised article that the magnesium perchlorate drier has been tested for compound losses. The points made in response to the next two comments (P7180 L2-4 and L6) should also be incorporated into the revised manuscript.

**Conclusions, page 7203 L7-9:** Perhaps the article title should also be moderated in response to this valid comment?

Response to Anonymous Referee #3:

**Point 6:** It seems that this is a very important point made by the reviewer; the authors have provided significant answers to the reviewer’s query in the response but there are very little changes made in the article. Please ensure all important points from the response are reflected in changes to the article.

**Point 7:** This point was also raised by the other reviewers and I found it was addressed well in the response but insufficiently in changes to the manuscript – given it is brought up numerous times by the reviewers, ensure it is very well covered in changes to the manuscript.

**Page 7174 L11:** Is this information now presented in the article?