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We are very thankful for your constructive comments and feedback on the manuscript submitted. We accepted all the comments provided and amended them accordingly.

Concerning the language and clarity in several statements were revised and improved. A native English speaker checked the manuscript and helped in improving the form. In regards to the phenology of leaf dynamics, it has been indicated that the collected samples were merged from three different years and merged for analysis. In addition the physiology has been more integrated in the text but of course more detailed work can be made separately to focus on this aspect.

Line 21-22: It is corrected.

Line 22: It is corrected.

Line 27: It is corrected by “It is noteworthy that olive fruits also have low Hg concentration (~7-11 ng/g).”

Line 30: It is corrected by “This may draw an adequate baseline for Eastern Mediterranean and region with similar climate inventories on Hg vegetation uptake and new studies on olive trees in the Mediterranean to reconstruct regional Hg pollution concentrations in the past and present.”

Line 38: It is corrected by “Mercury (Hg) is among the most widely distributed heavy metals polluting the Earth (Briffa et al. 2020).”

Line 51: It is corrected by “Forests are known to act as a sink of atmospheric Hg in the ecosystem.”

Line 52: It is corrected by “Plant foliage take up of Hg deposited on leaf surfaces through the stomata and leaf cuticles”.

Line 54-55: It is corrected by “where it accumulates with minimal mobility and small portions released back into the atmosphere or transferred to other plant organs”

Line 60: It is replaced from “is said” by “has been estimated”.

It is replaced from “earth” by “terrestrial”.

Soil can release Hg to the atmosphere (Luo et al., 2016; Yang et al., 2018a; Assad, 2017; Schneider et al., 2019; Gworek et al., 2020; Pleijel et al., 2021) and also behave as a source of Hg to the plants.”

Trees are hence considered as important drivers of Hg exchange between the atmosphere and the soil (Yang et al. 2018).

Trees are hence considered as important drivers of Hg exchange between the atmosphere and the soil (Yang et al. 2018).

Hence, the atmospheric deposition of Hg is expected to be a significant source of Hg to the soil (Yang et al. 2018). Trees are hence considered as important drivers of Hg exchange between the atmosphere and the soil (Yang et al. 2018).

It is corrected by “an air pollution emission area.”

Outcomes and consumed? Not clear. It is replaced by “for consumption.”

The objectives are amended as per the feedback received. “In this study two sites, known for their century-old olive groves and located at two different altitudes in Lebanon, were selected to assess the Hg contents. In these remote areas, no direct sources of mercury contamination are reported and hence we expect very low Hg concentrations. However, due to atmospheric transport of Hg, deposition can be expected in remote areas (Grigal, 2003). The main objectives of this study are to examine and compare Hg levels in foliage, stems, fruits, litter and soil measured in each of these two olive groves, which we monitored monthly for 18 months. The second objective is to analyze the relative importance of Hg uptake from the soil to the foliage in comparison with the assimilation of atmospheric Hg by the leaves. Is the uptake of Hg from soil to foliage low in sites without local Hg contamination? Since the distribution of Hg pollution is by nature geographically widespread, and given the extent of Hg pollution in the Mediterranean and the transfer of pollution by wind and the Mediterranean Sea, long-distance contamination occurs over large areas. This study will fill the data gap on Hg pollution in the Eastern Mediterranean and may draw an adequate baseline for Eastern Mediterranean and region of similar climates inventories on Hg vegetation uptake and new studies on olive trees in the Mediterranean to reconstruct regional Hg pollution concentrations in the past and present.”

To our knowledge no direct Hg pollution is reported at Chekka and Selaata sites.

Carbon monoxide.

For the statistical analysis we used the R 4.1.0 program. Our data are not normally distributed, so for the effect of tissue type on Hg concentration, Wilcoxon test was used with the tissue type (foliage and stems) as the main effect.

Why is not the concentrations of fruits included in these comparisons? The fruits are added.

A seasonal effect on foliage and stems was registered.

3.3. Tree comparison

In the upper terrace of BC grove, the foliage average Hg concentration of BCO4 and BCO1 varied between 42.4 ± 11.5 ng/g and 44.6 ± 13.3 ng/g respectively showing no
significant difference \( (p-value = 0.8225) \). In the lower terrace of the same site, foliage average Hg concentrations of trees BCO12 and BCO9 were found to vary from 45.6 ± 12.7 ng/g to 60.7 ± 12.7 ng/g respectively) (Figure 2a,c). Significant differences are shown between foliage of the tree BCO9 and BCO1 \( (p-value= 0.0019) \), BCO4 and BCO12, \( p-value=0.00047 \) respectively).

In the upper terrace of BC grove, the stems average Hg concentration of BCO4 and BCO1 varied between 7.0 ± 2.8 ng/g and 7.1 ± 2.9 ng/g respectively showing no significant difference \( (p-value= 0.94) \). In the lower terrace, stems average Hg concentrations of BCO12 and BCO9 are 6.4 ± 2.2 ng/g and 11.2 ± 5.2 ng/g respectively showing a significant difference of \( p-value= 0.0054 \) (Figure 2a,c). For BCO1 and BCO12 there was no significance difference registered with \( p-Value= 0.5725 \), the same goea for BCO4 and BCO12 no significance difference was registered with \( p-value= 0.523 \).

The average concentration per tree in foliage and stems were 32.4 ± 12.2 ng/g and 8.5 ± 4.0 ng/g respectively for KWO1, 32.8 ± 14.7 ng/g and 8.9 ± 6.0 ng/g for KWO2, 37.6 ± 14.0 ng/g and 9.3 ± 6.7 ng/g for KWO3 and 37.7 ± 13.6 ng/g and 9.6 ± 4.0 ng/g for KWO4 (Figure 2b,d). In KW grove, comparison of the foliage Hg concentration between the four studied trees shows no significant difference \( (0.22< p-value<1) \) so did the stems \( (0.21< p-value<0.96) \).

In BC grove, the trees located on the lower terrace recorded higher Hg concentration values than those of the upper terrace especially tree BCO9. While KW grove had similar Hg concentration among all four trees.

Line 298: It is corrected and values of foliage and stems are separated.

Line 343: It is amended by "In parallel, the litter showed higher Hg concentration than that in foliage in both BC (62.9 ± 17.8 ng/g) and KW (75.7 ± 20.3 ng/g) (Table 1) likely explained by the process of the Hg input into the litter through foliage shedding its oldest foliage to the forest floor which have accumulated Hg during the longest period of time and thus have higher Hg concentrations than the remaining foliage have on average since they consist of both younger and older foliage (Rea et al. 1996; Pleijel et al. 2021)."

Line 353: It is corrected by "accumulation in leaves after stomatal uptake."

Line 440: since the distribution of Hg pollution is by nature geographically very widespread, long-distance contamination occurs and it may be better to say “In sites without local contamination” instead of “In uncontaminated sites”. Similarly on line 452 it would be appropriate to say “locally uncontaminated” rather than “non-contaminated”. It is corrected,

Why are some references in capitals, e.g., lines 512-513, lines 521-523, lines 712-715. Pleijel et al and Wohlgemuth et al are no longer preprints. Those references are corrected.

Font size in figures should be increased to improve readability. It is amended.