

A peer review to manuscript  
*Diverging responses of high latitude CO<sub>2</sub>  
and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in idealized climate  
change scenarios*

The scientific rigour of the paper is improved upon revision. However, I guess that some technical details in the manuscript are excessive (see below). All my comments are minor:

- - l. 248: The notation ' $z \neq s$ ' is difficult to read. Is it 'not at the surface'?
- ll. 315 and 326: it would be better 'standard deviation of subgrid-scale orography'
- I guess that ll. 414-439 are too technical. What it adds to the scientific results of the paper.
- ll. 437 and 438: if the part of the text indicated in the previous item is still retained of the text, it is better to replace subscript 'pysics' to 'physics'.
- l. 819: insert break between 'CO<sub>2</sub>' and 'concentration'.
- ll. 1116 and 1119: What is the difference between (Zimov, 2006a) and (Zimov, 2006b)?