

Interactive comment on “Carbon dioxide flux and net primary production of a boreal treed bog: responses to warming and water table manipulations” by T. M. Munir et al.

T. M. Munir et al.

tmmunir@ucalgary.ca

Received and published: 2 December 2014

Anonymous Referee # 2

Specific comments

[Fig. 3] It would be better to revise the bar diagram in order to represent the total amount of biomass of each site. Currently, the height of each bar is the same (of course it is true because your vertical axis is the "% of total"). I suggest to change the vertical axis to "biomass (kgC/m²)."

The total amount of biomass of each site and microform have been given in Table 3. As

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



well, the biomass across the treatments of water level and warming are also presented. If we change the Fig. 3 as suggested, it will become redundant. Therefore, we plan to retain this Fig. 3 as is.

What is the percentage composition of hummock vs. hollow? This is an important information to know, because I would like to know this composition of each site to evaluate the study design and estimate the overall carbon balance of each site (by taking weighted averages of resultant data for hummock and hollow).

Thanks a lot for this inquiry. The percentage composition of hummock : hollow is 56 : 44 at the control, 55 : 45 at the experimental and 52 : 48 at the drained site. The composition hummock vs hollow is given in the caption of existing Table 2, and was considered when calculating total site above-ground and below-ground biomass. Likewise, the composition is also given in the caption of Table 4, and was considered to calculate the total CO-C balance (See Tables 2 and 4).

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 11, 12937, 2014.

BGD

11, C7079–C7080, 2014

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

