Editor report:

From my reading of your revised MS, I am pleased to accept your paper for publication in Biogeosciences. Before publication, please consider the following two points: P3L16 you mention a “global net ecosystem production” of 2 PgC yr-1. What you mean here is not clear and the cited references are not appropriate. In fact you probably refer to the net land-atmosphere flux based on atmospheric inversion models and forest inventories. Please rephrase. P12L12 How can a correlation be “negligible”. I would say that, by definition, a correlation exists or not. When it exists it can be strong of weak.

Author replies:

Dear Editor, dear Gwen,

Thank you for your positive final evaluation of our manuscript.

We corrected both issues raised in the editor report:

P3L16: this number indeed refers to the net uptake of CO2 by terrestrial systems by the atmosphere, this has been rephrased and we refer to Ciais et al. (2013 – IPCC report) for this as in the previous version. The other references we meant to support the numbers cited earlier on in the sentence regarding the inputs of terrestrial C to aquatic systems; we have now moved these references to the initial part of the sentence and added a more recent synthesis (Drake et al. 2017, Limnology & Oceanography Letters, reference added to the reference list). Thus, this section was rephrased to:

“Given that recent reports assert a similar order of magnitude to the lateral C input to inland waters (~2.3 up to 5.1 Pg C yr−1; Cole et al., 2007; Battin et al., 2009; Drake et al., 2017) as that for global net ecosystem production (~2 Pg C yr−1; Ciais et al., 2013), the scarcity of the biogeochemistry database for some regional inland waters is key to our inability to adequately resolve the role of this biosphere domain within broader regional and global C budgets (Raymond et al., 2013; Regnier et al., 2013).”

P12L12; this was modified to “[…] and was not correlated with discharge”.