

## Message to the handling editor

We thank you and the referee for your continued effort to review our manuscript. We believe your feedback has improved the manuscript, making it a better contribution to your journal and to the scientific community at large.

We have accepted all of the referee's comments, which should be reflected in the revised manuscript.

Responses to referees' comments on the submitted manuscript, "CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from standing dead trees in a northern conifer forest"

Referee #1

Specific Comments:

L42: Adding a quick reference to the sorts of disturbances that could lead to a snag-rich forest (e.g., disease/pests, drought) would help reinforce the importance of this work. Such mortality events will likely become more common in the future.

*Response: We agree and have added three references and lines in the introduction, discussion, and conclusions related to increased forest disturbance and hence snag abundance. This will help to clarify the scope and importance of our results.*

Conclusions: To me, the conclusions largely show that CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes from snags behave similarly to those from soils. This makes sense, as snags are carbon-rich substrates just like soils (even more carbon rich). But, the authors do not mention these similarities here, which was confusing to me. I also feel that the authors could note potential knowledge gaps and avenues for future research here as well.

*Response: We agree and have modified the Conclusions section to include a comment on similarity to soils, as well as knowledge gaps and avenues for future research.*