The following is my review of the paper entitled 'Remote carbon cycle changes are overlooked impacts of land-cover and land management changes' by Guo et al., submitted to Earth Science Dynamics. I had reviewed the previous version of the manuscript. It was extremely difficult to follow the modifications made in the manuscript in response to the previous questions. For example, in response to my previous comment no. 3, the authors changed the text at several places in the manuscript. In their response to this comment, they state that the changes are made in Lines 160-189, whereas the actual changes are made in Lines 153-171 of the revised manuscript. This text was included in Lines 146-164 in the previous version of the manuscript. Such misleading information further complicates reading and reviewing the manuscript. The revised manuscript has been improved, but several aspects are still not clear. I list those below.

Specific comments:

- 1. The response to my previous comment No. 3 is not clear. This question was regarding the spatial scale of the local and non-local effects. In other words, I wanted to know the effects of big areas being considered local and non-local. The authors can either state in in terms of area (km²) or number of pixels or grid points. It is required but not enough to refer to an old study. These need to be explained step-by-step or included in a flowchart.
- 2. My previous comment No. 15: The response of the authors to this query is not clear. Specifically, the authors state that forests exhibit a larger internal natural variability because of their larger biomass content. I am not sure how these two are linked.