This is a paper analysing data on host seeking activity of *Ixodes ricinus* from 6 locations in France from 2014 to 2021 based on monthly sampling. Such extensive field data are clearly valuable, in particular since they derive from areas with markedly different climates. There are several aspects of the analysis that could to be improved, as some of the patterns reported appear to be based on visually looking at residuals in figures. There is quite extensive overlap with an earlier published paper on the same data.

Main comments

1. The same data have earlier been analysed and published in Scientific Reports (Wongnak et al. 2022). It is really hard to see what the current analysis adds relative to the Wongnak paper? In Wognak, 3 patterns of phenology is presented (Figure 6), and it is analysed relative to weather variables. A lot of info is repeated.

2. Analysis.

Why use a log-transformation, rather than a negative binomial distribution usually fitting such data very well?

Line 196-197. You do not test for different seasonality between years – why not?

Line 216. It appear that you infer whether a year is good or not just by looking at residuals visually. We then do not know if this is by chance, or significantly different for a given year.

Figure 4 and 5. You estimate the peak abundance a given year. That is new compared to Wognak, as far as I could judge. If this is the main new thing, you need to focus your paper to a much larger degree. Also, table I present the same datapoints as in figure 4. You can also add data points from figure 5 to the table I; possibly also data on abundance (reported in fig. 6). In figure 6, add a regression line. I think you should consider doing a similar analysis for the peaks.

Details

Line 66-71. Not so relevant. Can be deleted.

Line 115. “controlled population”. What does this mean? Fenced?

Line 123. Be explicit on how many sampling occasions were missing.

Line 179. What is meant by an “important decrease in AIC”?

Line 302. There are several other paper having flagged year round. E.g.

J. Alonso-Carné, A. García-Martín, and A. Estrada-Peña. Modelling the phenological relationships of questing immature *Ixodes Ricinus* (Ixodidae) using temperature and NDVI data. *Zoonoses Public Health* 63 (1):40-52, 2015.

K. Vollack, S. Sodoudi, P. Névir, K. Müller, and D. Richter. Influence of meteorological parameters during the preceding fall and winter on the questing activity of nymphal *Ixodes ricinus* ticks. *Int J Biometeorol* 61:1787-1795, 2017.

L. Qviller, L. Grøva, H. Viljugrein, I. Klingen, and A. Mysterud. Temporal pattern of questing tick *Ixodes ricinus* density at differing elevations in the coastal region of western Norway. *Parasite Vector* 7:179, 2014.

J. J. Sormunen, T. Klemola, E. J. Vesterinen, I. Vuorinen, J. Hytönen, J. Hänninen, K. Ruohomäki, I. E. Sääksjärvi, E. Tonteri, and R. Penttinen. Assessing the abundance, seasonal questing activity, and *Borrelia* and tick-borne encephalitis virus (TBEV) prevalence of *Ixodes ricinus* ticks in a Lyme borreliosis endemic area in Southwest Finland. *Ticks Tick Borne Dis* 7 (1):208-215, 2016.