

Point-by-point response to the issues raised by Referee #1

We would like to thank Referee#1 for reevaluating our manuscript and proposing it for final publication.

The authors did an excellent job at responding to my review and it is now a nice well balanced manuscript that reflects well the various uncertainties regarding the interpretation of the trends and the CO2 response of trees.

I suggest to accept this ms with a few last, very minor corrections.

Corrections:

Line 388 (of version with tracked changes): reword this sentence. The wording "suggests" make it sound as if this emerges for the data while it simply emerges from the artificial trends imposed. Thus say instead: "The use of this correction factor is amongst the strongest in literature for trees growing in low elevation environments and would constitute a strong CO2 response... "

Authors: Sentence has been revised (line 364 and 365).

line 397: change annual nitrate rates to "nitrogen deposition"

Authors: Change applied (line 373).

line 106: the RATE OF photosynthesis

Authors: Change applied (line 105).

Specify still the equation 4. It is still unclear in the ms what eq 4 refers to.

Authors: To clarify the content, we have added further description in the equation (line 288, Eq. 4).

line 529: preform = performs?

Authors: Change applied (line 483).

line 426 remove "are"

Authors: Change applied (line 400).