Dear Prof. Stoy,

We are grateful for your estimation of our paper and hope that some our ideas will help the scientific community to improve its understanding of methane cycle in lakes, especially small boreal lakes. In this round of corrections we fixed several grammar mistakes, corrected references and figure 2 (introducing Photosynthesis into water column as was described in a paper text) and tried to clarify parts of each section of the document through changes in sentence structure and word choice. In response to your suggestion:

I question the distinction of 'strong' and 'faint' correlations based on R2 thresholds as these distinctions seem to be chosen at random and one would expect few 'strong' (R2>0.5) relationships in the case of measuring multiple small lakes.

We do not want to overrate our findings in these points. The initial idea was to point out that the correlations we found are not very clear and pronounced. Of course, this classification is not objective. So we removed these categories from the paper text. Actually, as all the necessary information about the correlations is given in the respective brackets, readers can see for themselves how strong or weak each correlation is. Thank you for this suggestion.

Yours sincerely