

## Response to Associate Editor Decision: Publish subject to technical corrections (18 Feb 2018)

Comments to the Author:

In the second revised version, the authors have addressed all editor comments. However the checking of the corrections was very cumbersome due to the lack of a manuscript version with track changes.

**Sorry for that- I did not see the request for a separate pdf so did not do one. This journal has processed the ms. very differently and I was confused more than once. You however have done a great job of improving the ms. Thank You.**

The manuscript is now ready for publication subject to the following (technical) corrections:

- 1) Page 8, line 7: old units  $\mu\text{L/L}$  still need to be changed. **Done**
- 2) Page 9, line 10: This newly introduced sentence is very similar to the one two lines below (line 12/13) and thus can be omitted. **Deleted**
- 3) Page 10, line 16: Correct to "of both  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  and ..."; Correct to "... boundary layer in 22% and ..."  
**Corrected**
- 4) Page 10, line 17-20: In this revised statement it should be clearly specified, whether the four listed effects lead to physically high diffusive fluxes or erroneously overestimated diffusive fluxes.  
**Rephrased to explain factors. Z-less flow rephrased and statement moved to pg 6 under Eq. 2 discussion.**
- 5) Page 10, line 23: Correct to "(Figs. 7, 8)" **Done**
- 6) Page 10, line 31: Was the indicated average calculated over all chamber fluxes (for the differently fertilised fields) including 'no N' fluxes? Please specify. **I have clarified in text.**
- 7) Table 5: Do the average chamber fluxes presented in Table 5 include all chamber measurements including the measurements on the non-fertilised ("no N") fields? Please specify in the Table caption.  
**Added in header.**
- 8) Fig.1: some of the labels in panel (b) are too small (e.g. "Met station" etc.) and need to be enlarged. Increase font some. **Hard to increase a lot since I cannot control the location of the label relative to the symbol. Did increase font some.**
- 9) Fig.7&8: The legend labels "North fld", "South fld" for the chamber measurements are not informative. It would be more relevant to relate the chamber flux data to the field labels (fertiliser regimes) displayed in Fig. 1. **Clarified.**