

Dear Editor,

Thank you for inviting me to review the manuscript which has been reviewed and revised previously. The authors exemplified the organic carbon characteristics from of two types of glacial fjords at high latitudes, and discussed their organic carbon sources, burial rates and the possible controlling factors. I, personally, think the authors provide good examples to give readers ideas that glacial types at high latitudes do not determine organic carbon sources and burial rates which are controlled by multiple complex factors such as primary productivity, degradation, preservation, transport, geomorphology..., although such information is not novel. Nevertheless, I only have a few comments/suggestions which I hope could to some degree improve the manuscript after reading the previous comments.

Line 73: There are limited data not “is”

Line 79: What are “high Arctic fjords?”, is something is missing here?

Lines 197-205: It seems that the authors did not indicate the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ end-member value of terrestrial organic carbon. Furthermore, the referred $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ end-member value of marine organic carbon lacks an uncertainty, which may lead to overestimate/underestimate the calculated results. It is suggestive of considering uncertainties for the organic carbon source apportionment calculation.

For the unit this study used for TOC and TN, I think it should be weight percent (wt.%) rather than %. Please give more information about this.

Table 2 For the SAR, based on this study, it seems indicative of sedimentation rate.

Figures A2-A3 are not properly cited in the text.

Sincerely,