We thank the reviewer for the additional comments. Below we have written the comments in black and our replies in red.

Thanks to the authors for addressing many reviewer comments and suggestions. Two final suggestions to strengthen the paper:

(1) The new figure showing the measurement site is very helpful, but since many questions are about inlet heights, it would be great if you could also add a "side view" with inlet heights on the mast / containers for the relevant instruments shown, as well as the height of the trees relative to those inlets. This can't easily be seen via the top down image.

A side view has been added to the supplementary information.

(2) Please use your box model to predict the formation of OH from O3 + BVOC to check whether it is consistent with the nighttime measurements and comment on this clearly, alongside the 25% uncertainty. This remains surprising and it seems it would be possible in your model to check this. Thank you!

While we understand the reviewers concern about high OH levels at nighttime, a rerun of our model with unconstrained OH is unlikely to either prove or disprove the quality of the OH measurements. Problems which the MCM mechanism has in predicting OH levels in the presence of biogenic VOCs is documented (see eg. a recent publication in ACP: https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-22-8497-2022). The research group who took the OH measurements are presently examining sensitivities to various parameters such as eg. NO which controls efficiency of OH recycling and its levels both day and night. This requires substantial modification of our MCM code which is beyond the scope of the present manuscript. We thus prefer to trust the measurements and expect that a future publication dealing with model-measurement comparison of HOx will shed light on the high OH levels observed.