

In the manuscript “Lifecycle of Updrafts and Mass Flux in Isolated Deep Convection over the Amazon Rainforest: Insights from Cell Tracking”, Gupta et al. present clear and insightful findings regarding the behaviour of Amazonian convection across seasons, in particular regarding the mass flux of observed convective cores which is a variable of great importance for wider studies of convection. I am fully satisfied with the authors’ response and revisions to the previous round of review, and my remaining comments are all very minor. As a result, I recommend that the manuscript be accepted for publication subject to technical corrections.

I would also encourage the authors to continue the research originally presented in section 3.4 of the manuscript, along with the research pathways mentioned in the response to reviewers, as I believe that these would also result in good publications.

Minor comments:

Line 178: Suggestion: refer to fig. 1c-e specifically (rather than just “fig. 1”)

Line 210: Correction *table S3* -> *table S1*

Line 214: The description of the heatmaps could be rephrased for clarity, e.g. “heatmaps of the latitude and longitude of detected cells”

Line 229: Correction: “...while 20% of *features* were...” -> “...while 20% of *cells* were...”