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General comments:
In general the figures are very blurry. They need to be redone with higher resolution and larger fontsize and marker size. Somehow I would have liked to have more details in the section 3.1.3 where the difference in the R6 values are small. Other than that I find the depth of the paper sufficient. There are still quite a few spelling and grammar errors to be corrected.

More specific comments:
line 26: here investigated -> investigated here
line 30 from Brewer -> from a Brewer
line 37 Brewer spectrophotometry -> Brewer spectrophotometers
line 66 one sentence paragraph, attach to earlier paragraph?
line 76 as well as -> or
line 108 you cannot use a method as a light source -> rephrase
line 117 unnecessary paragraph change
line 175 unnecessary paragraph change
line 200 unnecessary paragraph change
line 214 will be not adjusted -> will not be adjusted
line 227 The application of the ETC correction is done -> The ETC correction is applied when...
line 228 a certain value -> a predefined value
line 291 remove .TOC. ?
line 316 start a new paragraph from "Two algorithms..."
line 352 We applied the same methodology... -> We applied the methodology...
line 399 minimum larger than maximum?
figure 6 BPS seems to follow the R6 spikes. Why does it not follow the ones in december 2007 and december 2008?
figure 7 was easier to read in the previous version of the manuscript
line 467 subtracting to -> subtracting from ?
line 487 was to 3000 -> was set to 3000?
line 535 and figure 11 Would be nice to know on what basis the BPS discards these measurements because most of them are within the minimum-maximum -limits.
line 546 Would all the data not belong to one of the groups above? (1. R6smooth higher than R6bps 2. R6bps higher than R6smooth 3. R6smooth similar to R6bps?)
line 552 which above conditions? When the difference in R6 corrections was small?
figure 15 So is R6 the individual standard lamp tests or daily averages or from PBS or O3Brewer? Seems like EUBRWNET creates spikes in the data itself.
line 568 I dont see this. Only place where it deviates more is at Aosta close to 250 DU.
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line 640 confusing sentence, maybe "It is clear from Table 6 that there are no significant differences in the trends among the three codes, when data affected by rapid changes in R6 were removed"
line 657 ... to a higher value, which is useful when a large R6 drift is experienced
line 663 is experienced -> are experienced
line 670 less than 1% or about 1%?
line 676 I understand what you are trying to say but this needs to be rephrased somehow. "different codes, do not seem to be affected when ..."