

Comment on:

“Denitrification, carbon and nitrogen emissions over the Amazonian wetlands”

In an earlier review of this manuscript I expressed the potential relevance of the study albeit my concerns with respect to the lack of clarity on the approach used to reach the conclusions postulated by the authors. Having read the revised version submitted by the authors, it is my opinion that the issues raised (both of content and format) were satisfactorily addressed. Hence, after addressing the technical corrections listed below, I do recommend this manuscript for publication in Biogeosciences.

Technical corrections

Note that these corrections are referred to the file named:

“bg-2020-3-author_response-version1.pdf”

P.1 I.3 “from the denitrification”: delete “the”

P.2 I.41 (...) pointed out that over the Amazonian wetlands disproportionately (...)

P.3 I.59 (...) a priori in situ information (...)

P.6 I.113 Replace “dioxygen” by “oxygen”

P.7 I.144 “(25x25km)”: Add space between the numbers and the unit of measure.

P.7 I.148 Replace “For PCO” by “The” and delete “it” from the sentence “(...) it was considered (...)”

P.11 I.221 “Denitrification as well as the CO₂ and N₂O emissions (...)”

P.11 I.248 “We then ran”: Delete “then”

P.12 I.257 Replace “p.value” by “p-value”

P.16 I.309 Replace “facts” by “fact” and “assesses” by “determines” or similar.

P.16 I.310 Replace “(...) floodplains. Whereas (...)” by “floodplains, whereas”.

P.16 I.314 Replace “are compared” by “were compared”.

P.16 I.322 “accounted for indirectly”

P.17 I.349-350 Consider replacing “Previous study from (...)” by “The study by Viocari et al. (2011) (...)”.

P.19 I.389 Delete “.”

P.19 I.397 “Carbon” and “Nitrogen” should be written as “carbon” and “nitrogen” here

P.19 I.403 “(...) emphasize the importance of (...)”

P.19 I.406 Replace “)” by a comma.