

**Review of AMTD-manuscript entitled “Local comparisons of tropospheric ozone: Vertical soundings at two neighbouring stations in Southern Bavaria” by Thomas Trickl et al.**

General remarks:

The content of the manuscript has already been well described by the previous three referees who had reviewed the first version of the manuscript, such that I will constrain my review mostly to the major and minor revisions demanded by referee #2. Regarding the minor revisions, the authors have responded and revised the manuscript appropriately, however, the new manuscript still lacks in the way the comparisons between lidar and ozonesondes were made. The major critics of referee#2 was that in multiple figures and descriptions in the text bias corrections to the ozonesonde data were applied without given the reason/cause for that. Therefore, it would be more interesting to properly describe the bias and show profiles of the actual differences. I fully share these demands of referee#2. Unfortunately, in the revised manuscript the authors did not revise the text and figures adequately, neither replied in a satisfying way to these major critics made by referee#2, which I fully underline. In the revised manuscript the authors still follow their original methodology to do unexplained bias corrections to the ozone data. When doing such corrections then solid arguments have to be given, which are still missing. At present, the reader easily gets the impression that the bias corrections are just artificial “corrections” to adjust the comparisons to get a better agreement of the Lidar with the sondes, however, this would finally not improve the trust in the Lidar data, but just do the opposite. The last is certainly not in the authors their own interests, and therefore I strongly recommend to going for a second revision of the manuscript, but now follow the major comments given by referee#2 more strictly.