

Interactive comment on “Surtsey and Mount St. Helens: a comparison of early succession rates” by R. del Moral and B. Magnússon

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 4 February 2014

The manuscript "Surtsey and Mount St. Helens: a comparison of early succession rates" is highly interesting and of good quality. Therefore, only minor comments and suggestions for improvement are given below.

P. 3, lines 9-13: What did you expect to find? And/or which questions did you ask? P. 3, line 21: In which year had erosion diminished Surtsey to about 1.4 km²? P. 5, line 13: "At least one plot from each habitat..." . Please describe in more detail how this one plot was selected. Why was there only one plot from each habitat highlighted? P. 5, lines 15-16: "The nine plots on sandy sheet lava that lack seabird impacts were floristically distinct, with much lower richness and cover". This is not description of the sampling method. Should rather be in the result chapter. P. 10, line 4: Please spell out HC. P. 11, lines 21-22: why do you write the genus name of Honckenya and Cerastium

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

but the species name for *Poa annua*?

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 19409, 2013.

BGD

10, C8473–C8474, 2014

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C8474

