

Response to Reviewers' and Editor's comments regarding resubmission of TC-2020-11

Thanks for the clear guidance with respect to the minor revisions of the above re-submission. We removed the emission estimates and thus took the option to “greatly simplify” the Discussion and Conclusion sections. We are always improving our flux estimates and so we are working towards another manuscript to deal with these aspects of our work.

Here's what we did:

- 1) Changed the title to remove the word “emission”
- 2) Removed mention of the emissions from the abstract (last 2 sentences)
- 3) Changed the signposting at the end of the Introduction (last sentence)
- 4) Deleted the three paragraphs from Section 4.3 that dealt with emission quantification and made minor adjustments further down this section. We now use the remaining text to discuss the relevant processes that require consideration before the pingo emissions can be quantified. Note that in the last paragraph of the discussion we indicate that “the outflows Lack quantitative assessment” – thus indirectly indicating why no such emission estimates are given in this paper. We could be more direct, but see little point in explaining at length what the paper doesn't do.
- 5) Deleted the last 2 sentences from the Conclusion in order to remove emission emphasis
- 6) Deleted Table 3.
- 7) Corrected the reference list as a consequence of the changes above

With thanks,

Andy Hodson (on behalf of all co-authors)