Suggestions #1

Authors have addressed most of my concerns in the revised version of the manuscript and improved it very much. I would think that it is now acceptable. I have just a few comments below for the final version of the manuscript.  
1. Title: Although the authors discussed both POC and DOC in the text, only POC is mentioned in the title. I would suggest to reconsider the title to fit to the context of the manuscript

The title is now changed to: Organic carbon flux and particulate organic matter composition in Arctic valley glaciers: Examples from the Bayelva River and adjacent Kongsfjorden

2. P.20 L22-24 It would be worth to mention the possible reasons to differentiate the DOC flux between Svalbard and Alaska.

Thanks for the suggestion. The much lower temperature in Svalbard relative to Alaska should be one of the basic reasons. The annual temperature ranges of Juneau (in the southeast Alaska close to the glaciers) and Longyearbyen (Svalbard) are -5 °C to 18.3 °C and -20 °C to 7 °C, respectively ([www.wikipedia.org](http://www.wikipedia.org)). Also, soil organic matter content and other factors may impact the DOC in the glacier meltwater. In the manuscript, we added one sentence after P20, L22-24, which is “The possible reasons include different temperature and drainage basin organic matter background between the two glacier systems.”. As this is not the focus of the study so we don’t want to explore and spend too much words on this point.

3. P.21 L21 “are contained” instead of “content”

This sentence is “Whether the meltwater flows through supra-, en- or sub-glacial channels would have great impact on the nutrients, TSM and further organic matter content in the glacier meltwater.” and we mean to say that the way of the meltwater flow through the glacier would impact the nutrients, as well as TSM and organic matter in the glacier meltwaters. We deleted “content” in the new version to make the sentence clearer.

Suggestions #2

The authors well revised the manuscript according to my comments. Thus, I don’t have major comments, but I have minor suggestions for the revised manuscript.

In Discussion the authors mentioned,

(1) “at two other two marine sites (BATS and HOTS)”: Awkward. Please rephrase it.

It is now changed to “at two other marine sites (BATS and HOTS)”

(2) “The bacterial contribution to POC was slightly lower (13%) in the Bayelva River.” Comparing with what? Please specify it.

We revised the sentence into “The bacterial contribution to POC was slightly lower (13%) in the Bayelva River than that in the fjord (i.e., 19%).”