

**Re: Submission of Replies to referee comments (MS No.: egosphere-2023-789) "Ideas and Perspectives: Sensing Energy and Matter fluxes in a biota dominated Patagonian landscape through environmental seismology – Introducing the Pumalín Critical Zone Observatory"**

Dear Editorial Team of Biogeosciences,

Please find below our replies to the referee comments as requested. For your convenience, you'll find the replies in the corresponding lines below the respective comment. We thank you for considering our manuscript for publication in Biogeosciences. We particularly thank the Associate Editor Christoffer Still for handling our manuscript with so much care.

First of all, we want to express our thanks to the handling editor Christoffer Still, Susan Brantley and an anonymous referee for their time spent in providing constructive reviews and assessments. We highly appreciate all these efforts. In the following, we reply to the comments.

First, while both reviews are positive, both referees suggest some changes that we cannot meet all suggestions raised. For example, referee #1 suggested to include more information on 'framing our site within the CZOs' in our work, while Susan Brantley asked for a more condensed version. Nevertheless, we try to balance both reviews as good as possible of course.

Review #2: Susan Brantley

This is a beautiful description of a new CZO site and its scientific goals. The site is of great interest from an ecological point of view and from the point of view of interactions between geomorphology and trees. The authors present the site, describe their measurements and installations, and discuss the topics they will be studying. The paper is written clearly and coherently and was a pleasure to read. There are a few typos or mis-prints, but there are fewer mistakes than most published papers! My one small quibble is that the paper is quite long. I wonder if the authors might be able to condense the paper and put some of the information into tables and/or figures to lower the word count. Several of the figures are multi-panel and they already perform the function of summarizing the story, but perhaps a few tables might be used instead of lists of instrumentation or sites. Anything the authors can do to tighten up the paper would be good (if they can do it).

*A: Dear Susan Brantley, thank you very much for the positive assessment of our submission. We will try to further minimize the typos and mis-prints in the follow-up version. We also thank you for your suggestion to condense the paper in order to lower the word count. We agree that we can cut down redundant statements in the main text in favor of the figures. In accordance with referee #1 we will also prepare a table with information about the CZO that could be then taken out from the main text.*

The authors are to be applauded at putting together this study on such an interesting site in a location where we need a CZO.

*A: Thank you very much for these nice words.*