I thank the authors for the revision of the manuscript, which improved the readability of the text and of the figures. The authors replied satisfactorily to most of my previous suggestions. I just have few more technical comments.

Technical corrections

P4, l132: What does the reference to Hubert et al. 2016 refer to? Is a reference for that sentence needed at all?

P5, l151: Considering the term $\delta_i = \frac{SAGEIII_i(z) - corr_i(z)}{ref_i(z)}$ in Eq. 1, it seems to me, if I am not wrong, that the same term δ should appear in Eq. 3, which means: $\sum_{i=1}^{N(z)} [(\frac{SAGEIII_i(z) - corr_i(z)}{ref_i(z)} - \Delta(z))]^2$, in order to compute the standard deviation of the distribution of the relative differences.

P6, l178: Could you move the sentence about the vertical spread of the comparisons to Fig. 2, which is the first plot where this vertical gray bar appear?

P8, 197: The coincident ozone concentration between the SAGE III-ISS and ... $\rightarrow$ The coincident ozone concentration between SAGE III-ISS and ...

P8, l202-203: I would rewrite the sentence as: "Coincident events are located in the Northern Hemisphere mostly at mid- and high-latitudes ...'

P8, l206 : Referring to the error bars in Fig. 7 panels a, c, e, g: I don't understand the term 'standard deviation of their uncertainties'. Or better, why should you plot the std of the uncertainties of the single profiles? Didn't you plot the standard error of the profiles as done in the previous figures?

P8, l209-212: I would move these 2 sentences to the caption of Fig. 7.

P9, l222-224: I would also move this sentence at the beginning of the section 3.3, as it refers to Fig. 6d and collocations, which are introduced at the beginning of the section.

P12, Fig.11: The vertical gray bar is here missing.