

Interactive comment on “The contribution of trees and grasses to productivity of an Australian tropical savanna” by C. E. Moore et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 8 March 2016

This paper describes the use of an under-story eddy flux system to partition ecosystem fluxes between under-story and over-story components in a savanna. This study addresses an interesting, important, and novel question. The paper would benefit from a separate result section and a separate discussion section instead of a combined Result and Discussion section. This section also includes additional methodology (for example page 19321, row 3-8) which decreases clarity. The Result & Discussion section is also very long and includes a lot of numbers which occasionally make the section less readable. Can some of this be replaced/complemented by/with illustrations? Minor Comments below:

Page 19317, row 24-27: “We assumed OR to be the difference between ER and UR”. Please provide additional support for this assumption. When the flux of CO₂ is from

C10128

the soil and biosphere to the atmosphere could not then the same CO₂ be measure by both sensors?

Page 19326 row 5 says Annual GPP = 2267, wheres table 3 says 2187. A typo?

1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of BG? Yes. 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? 6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? I hope so, bu t not easily repeated. 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? OK. 10. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? could be better. 11. Is the language fluent and precise? Yes. 12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? yes. 13. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? OK

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, 19307, 2015.

C10129