

The authors have carefully considered the reviewer's comments and the manuscript has significantly improved. I suggest to pay attention on the few comments below, in particular the comment 7.

#### Detailed comments

1. L. 16-17. The canopy heat storage is not the only reason for the departure of the EBR from unity. The current study was investigating the impact of low-frequency flux loss as one of the reasons; there are also potential other reasons such as impact of advection and others. In general, the incomplete energy balance closure is a well known problem (as acknowledged also by the authors in the manuscript) and is not definitely uniquely attributed to the heat storage.
2. L. 22, the reported values of the WUE during different periods are defined by the average number  $\pm$  variation range. It is not self-explaining what these values after  $\pm$  mean. I raised the same question earlier in the first revision in relation to reported climatic average temperatures (section 2.1). The authors responded that it is a common practice in statistics to represent the mean  $\pm$  standard deviation. I argue that it is not uniquely clear: it is a common practice to represent experimental results mean $\pm$ -error, which frequently means the standard error of the mean. Or, it could be also the confidence intervals of the mean at some significance level. Therefore, to be clear, I always prefer that it is specified what variation range is presented.
3. L. 135, presumably the  $\pm$  values represent here the inter-annual variability (standard deviation) of the summer and winter seasons mean temperatures over a range of years. Again, it is not self-explaining. Also, the  $\pm$  values do not provide here additional information and could be omitted.
4. L. 168 and the averaging periods: it was explained that the co-ordinate rotation was performed over the same time interval as the averaging period. Presumably 1 minute is in general too short time period to define a "stable" co-ordinate system. The authors should admit that such a short averaging period introduces significant random uncertainty due also due to co-ordinate rotation bound to the same period.
5. L. 326-328, the sentence is difficult to understand. Could it be something like "We did not observe variation of optimal averaging time with wind speed and direction, hence".
6. Fig. 8: Please specify in the figure title that the circle size represents the correlation magnitude. And the colour scale the sign? Did you observe also negative correlations? If not, it would be more clear to represent the colour scale from 0 to 1. If there are negative correlations on the average, then how do you interpret those?
7. L. 448-450: if I understand the fig 8c correctly, then it is not true that a poor correlation was observed between any two averaging periods. The correlation between the periods 15 min and 45 mins looks close to 1. Also, the correlation between 1 min and 30 min averaging is fairly high. It is natural that the correlation of WUE (which is the ratio of the two fluxes with both having their random uncertainty) values for different averaging periods is lower. However, it is counter intuitive that the correlation between 15 min and 45 min averaging periods is high, but for 15 mins vs 30 mins (which are more close averaging periods) is completely lost. If such behaviour results from uncertainty in single WUE values (or possibly correlations being impacted by "outliers"), then Fig. 8c does not serve

as useful information providing insights into WUE dynamics and should be omitted.