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We greatly appreciate the comments of the reviewer, please find below our response to the issues raised.

Reviewer: A link to a file that includes the updated emission factors is provided; however, it would be useful to include this information in the manuscript (A table would be a useful addition).

Response: We have added the Table with emission factors in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer: Section 4.3 (Page 13, lines 16-22): this section is talking about comparisons of measurements with GFED4 and GFED3 modeled fuel consumptions. It is often unclear which is being compared. For example, line 16 states: Fuel consumption in Savannas and other regions with herbaceous fuels is lower in GFED4. . . lower than measure values? Lower than GFED3? (the next sentence states that it is lower than GFED3 estimates). I just suggest more clearly defining what you are comparing in this section.

Response: in the revised section we have now clearly outlined whether the comparisons were made against GFED3 or against measurements.

Reviewer: Editorial comments: When “which” is used, a comma should preceed it. For example, on page 13, line 30-31

Response: We have added a comma wherever “which” introduced a non-restrictive phrase.

Reviewer: Page 14, line 6: I don’t think it’s necessary to comment that the “C” emissions are now reported in emissions of CO2. This is confusing.

Response: This section was written partly to serve the mitigation community where CO2 mass units are much more frequently used than the carbon units. We therefore added the sentence “Note that in this section we refer to C emissions in CO2 mass units rather than the C mass units used in the rest of the paper.” This was actually done to prevent confusion and we prefer to keep this sentence in the text.