Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, C7970–C7972, 2014
www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/10/C7970/2014/


Biogeosciences
Discussions
Open Access

# *Interactive comment on* "Using Moran's I and GIS to study spatial pattern of forest litter carbon density in typical subtropical region, China" *by* W. J. Fu et al.

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 16 January 2014

This paper deals with spatial variation in forest litter carbon in Zhejiang Province, China using 839 samples each one representing an area of 12x6km or 7200 ha. It is an interesting study and gives and overview of the carbon storage in forest litter in the Zhejiang Province. This is a novel approach to obtain an approximate estimate of carbon storage in forest litter in large areas. This approach could be extended to other areas and may help to give more accurate estimates of terrestrial carbon sequestration. There is still the question of the variation within each 7200 ha grid, which is a relatively large area. This could be discussed further in the paper and may be the basis for a future research projects. The practical value of these results and the potential for future research could be discussed in more detail in the paper.



Editor's Manuscript Evaluation 1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of BG? Yes2 2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? Yes 3. Are substantial conclusions reached? Yes 4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? Yes 5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? Yes 6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Yes 7. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? Yes 8. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? Yes 9. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? Yes 10. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? Yes 11. Is the language fluent and precise? Need for some improvement, shown in attached pdf file. 12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? Yes 13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? No 14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? Yes 15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? Yes.

The attached pdf file shows comments on the text using Comment in pdf that relate mainly to improving the English. Unfortunately, this is not anonymous as it did not appear to be possible to do this within the pdf version on the computer.

The paper is suitable for publication with minor improvements.

Hope this meets your requirements. Let me know if you need further help.

Best regards,

Hubert Tunney.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
http://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/10/C7970/2014/bgd-10-C7970-2014-supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 19245, 2013.