

Interactive comment on “The Measuring Ammonia in Nature (MAN) network in the Netherlands” by D. E. Lolkema et al.

C. Flechard (Referee)

chris.flechard@rennes.inra.fr

Received and published: 19 May 2015

Reviewer’s comments on BGD manuscript "The Measuring Ammonia in Nature (MAN) network in the Netherlands" by D.E Lolkema et al.

This paper presents the methodology deployed in The Netherlands for monitoring atmospheric ammonia (NH₃) concentrations in nature reserves. The authors describe the use of low-cost passive samplers that enable the detection of long-term trends in NH₃ concentrations across a network of measurement sites scattered throughout the country. A specific focus is provided on procedures for calibration, validation, gap-filling and uncertainty analysis for the acquired datasets. The paper is well structured and competently written, and worthy of publication.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

However, in the authors' own words, the paper presents "... the proof of concept of a monitoring network..." and is essentially a good methodological paper, but one that in my opinion does not fit within the scope of Biogeosciences ("...interactions between the biological, chemical, and physical processes in terrestrial or extraterrestrial life with the geosphere, hydrosphere, and atmosphere..."). There is no analysis of the observed long-term trends in NH₃, or of the spatial variations in the NH₃ concentration field in relation to (agricultural) sources and the meteorological and other environmental factors (deposition, chemistry) affecting NH₃ concentrations across the network, which would have been Biogeosciences material.

Unless the authors are prepared to make substantial changes to the paper in order to bring such elements into the results and discussion, I think the paper should be submitted to a more methodological-oriented journal (Atmospheric Measurement Techniques Discussion springs to mind, being another EGU journal, this would minimize the amount of work involved in re-submitting).

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, 6115, 2015.

BGD

12, C2241–C2242, 2015

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C2242

