

Dear Dr Erika Buscaro,

We are pleased to submit the corrected version of our manuscript.

We answer to your comments and the comments of Referee #2 below.

Sincerely

Sumonta Kumar Paul

Editor comments

I have made some corrections and comments in the attached document. I suggest that you thoroughly revise the language and the use of the terminology 'upland' vs. 'wetland'.

Thank you for the time you spent on our manuscript. We proofread the manuscript again to fix language issues as much as we could.

We were also not satisfied with the terminology "upland". We agree with your suggestion: "non-waterlogged" and made all appropriate changes, or deleted "upland", depending on the context.

Basal area is a very common metrics for vegetation density in forest because, unlike stems of grass and herbaceous dicots that have quite similar diameter, the diameter of trees, particularly in unmanaged forests, shows a large range of diameter variation (from few centimeters to more than 1 meter in our case). Basal area reflects better land coverage and resource use than the number of trees.

Please also revise all figure legends and table captions to be stand-alone so that they can be understood without recourse to the main text (What? Where? Why?).

We have added details to the captions of the figures and tables.

Referee #2

l18-19: this sentence reads a bit awkwardly in the middle of results in the abstract. Please consider revising the sentence.

We deleted this sentence

l88-90: this sentence is out of place here. Consider deleting or revising.

We moved this sentence to the materials and methods section

l117: "accuracy less than": is this written correctly? Should it be "accuracy higher than"?

Yes, we edited the sentence "accurate to a radius of 5 m or less"

l131: saga should be SAGA

Corrected

l258: how did you calculate R2? There are multiple ways for calculating it.

R^2 was calculated as the square of the correlation between observed and cross-validated predicted fluxes, as implemented in the "caret" package (lines 248-250)

l264-266: please delete the sentence. Inclusion of spatially uniform variables would make sense only if you would include all the measurement dates into one model.

We deleted this sentence

l423-424: this does not read well in the beginning of discussion. Please revise the start of the section with a more general summary of results.

We moved this sentence to the end of the sub-section

l428: in this line, you first write SWI and then TWI. Should you use only SWI?

Thank you, we corrected the mistake

l466: overestimated->overestimate

Corrected

l470: was->were

Corrected

l552 and 580: landscape-scaled->landscape-scale

Corrected everywhere

In addition to these corrections, please make another round of proof-reading as there seem to be some small grammatical or other errors here and there.

We proofread the manuscript again to fix language issues as much as we could.