

Response to the technical corrections

Comment: Thank you for your thorough revision. I am pleased to let you that your manuscript can be published after some technical correction as noted below:

Response: Thanks to the editor for appreciating our effort and recommending it for publication. As suggested, we have done all technical corrections in the abstract as well as in the main text.

Comment: -L32: “DO: 91-104%”

Response: We have corrected it throughout.

Comment: -L37-38: Please specify “removal of DIC” by what process? Did you mean “through mineralization of mangrove-derived organic C”?

Response: We have specified the processes in the abstract as well as corresponding parts in the main text of the revised manuscript.

Comment: -L38: Did you mean “The concentration of DOC in the Hooghly was ~ 40% higher than in the Sundarbans?”

Response: Yes. We have rewritten it accordingly in the abstract as well as corresponding parts in the main text of the revised manuscript.

Comment: -L39: What “biogeochemical processes”?

Response: In the revised manuscript we have specified “DOC-POC interconversion” in the abstract as well as corresponding parts in the main text of the revised manuscript.

Comment: -L45: Please specify “where” or “by what processes” following “modifications”

Response: We have included the responsible process of POC modification in the Sundarbans (i.e., degradation of POC by respiration) in the revised manuscript.

Comment: -L46: Did you mean “decomposition” or “degradation” by respiration?

Response: Yes, we meant that. Following your suggestion, we have revised the sentences.