

Comments on the revised manuscript.

I acknowledge that the authors considered my comments. From my perspective the manuscript did improve very much – methods are better understandable and the discussion is well structured.

Nevertheless, I would appreciate, if the authors would state that the *in situ* measurements of redox potential are unpublished data (add unpublished data in brackets; L467) to avoid confusion between data presented in this study and data that are not shown in the results. Additionally, please, check the manuscript for spelling mistakes and comma placement.

Only a few things that caught my eye:

L2011 (approximately 2 g fresh weight) -> (approximately 2 g fresh weight)

L558, 563, 820, 841 salt water -> saltwater

I am not a native speaker, so I only guess that in a term like “Changes in fresh- and salt-water” (e.g. L182, 186) ‘salt-water’ should be written as ‘saltwater’ as it was done throughout the manuscript, but I can be wrong. To me, it would make more sense to be consistent. Same with fresh-water in L183.

I state that version 4 of the manuscript with the title “Saltwater reduces potential CO₂ and CH₄ production in peat soils from a coastal freshwater forested wetland” (MS No.: bg-2019-174) is acceptable for final publication in BG after addressing the comments above.