

Dear Editor, once again we are grateful for the suggestions to improve the text. All suggestions and corrections have been made and we look forward to continuing with the publication process.

Line 214: you mean 'statistically significant higher..'?

I tweaked the sentence to see if it gets better understood.

Similarly, at the low topography, CO₂ fluxes were statistically significantly higher ($H = 19.912$; $p = 0.046$) in September and February when compared to January and November, and not differing from the other months.

Line 238: you mean 'resulting in a total carbon efflux rate...'?

Yes, thanks for the suggestion: resulting in a total carbon efflux rate of 1.92 g C m⁻² d⁻¹ or 7.00 Mg C ha⁻¹ y⁻¹

Table 1: thank you very much for double checking and clarifying!

I thank you for your insistence on asking to review the table data.

Line 342: do you mean here: this variation could have been related by a La Nina anomaly, or caused by more intense and extreme weather phenomena caused by global climate change?

We have changed the sentence so that it can be understood better: Perhaps this variation is related to the La Niña effects (extreme event), taking into account that the intensification and higher frequency of extreme events result from climate change (Gash et al., 2004).

Line 345: use past tense.

We changed to the past: negative values represented gas consumption

Line 370: use past tense (was insignificant or 'very low' would maybe be better)

This value is was very low compared ...

Line 397: is it important for this comparison to include the numbers of studies here? and please clarify: the 28% are lower in dry compared to wet conditions?

It was clarified and I removed the sampling numbers

Line 534: MO or OM?

In English the correct is OM, thank you.