

21 June 2015

## **Response to Anonymous Referee #2**

We thank the reviewer for their comments on our manuscript “Thermokarst-lake methanogenesis along a complete talik profile.” Based on their comments and suggestions, we have revised our manuscript in an effort to improve it and address their concerns. Below is our response to each of their comments (reproduced in bold).

**Something for the authors to think of is if parts of the method can be written shorter? For example; the measurements of the magnetic susceptibility is very detailed (and rather long) described. It is however not clear to the reader why these measurements are important. It is mentioned in the results, but the discussion is not based on this data and no conclusions are drawn from these results?**

We have simplified the methods section by removing our descriptions of calculating wet bulk density using magnetic susceptibility and repeated details for our computing software in the statistics section.

**What is the role of allochthonous vs. autochthonous C sources (briefly discussed on L8 – p4881)? Fig. 6 show that CH<sub>4</sub> production normalized per unit Corg also is the highest in the surface sediments (which consists of both allochthonous vs. autochthonous C). Is this only due to that recently deposited is more labile to methanogens and/or is there also a priming/fertilizing effect? What would for example happen if for example autochthonous C was mixed into the incubations of permafrost soils? The authors further touch this at L16-24 (p4884) where they discuss if the high CH<sub>4</sub> potentials in Vault Lake is due that the sediment is a mix of biolabile OM, Holocene aged OC and in lake primary produced C.**

We thank the referee for bringing up the interesting question as to whether autochthonous C may provide a priming or fertilizing effect to decomposition of allochthonous C. We are presently conducting additional incubation experiments exploring this hypothesis and will present results in a follow-up manuscript. In the mean time, we have added to our revised manuscript's Discussion section, this hypothesis of a potential priming effect whereby the autochthonous C inputs to sediments stimulate co-metabolism of more recalcitrant allochthonous C.

**L9 p4876: Mean depth is not a result of this study and already mentioned in section 2.1**

The sentence describing the independent bathymetric mapping has been removed from the results section and the unpublished data have been cited in reference to the maximum and mean lake depth in section 2.1.

**L25 p4878: Maybe put brackets around “R”?**

Brackets have been added around “R” as suggested by the referee.

**L25 p4884: This section is hard to follow, especially since it refers to the next section.**

We thank the referee for pointing this out and have edited this paragraph to improve clarity.

We thank the reviewer for the time and thought they put into their comments, which have helped us improve our manuscript. We hope that our revised manuscript will be considered suitable for publication in *Biogeosciences*.