

## ***Interactive comment on “Quantifying wind and pressure effects on trace gas fluxes across the soil–atmosphere interface” by K. R. Redeker et al.***

**D. Obrist (Editor)**

daniel.obrist@dri.edu

Received and published: 29 May 2015

Dr. Redeker,

I am sorry to let you know that I have decided to reject your manuscript entitled “Quantifying wind and pressure effects on trace gas fluxes across the soil-atmosphere interface” for publication in Biogeosciences. In particular one reviewer raised several critical points about the current manuscript, such as methodological issues (such as lack of pressure measurements), needed clarifications of the method and the manuscript in general (such as stating clear hypotheses), as well as a lack of describing the general impact of this work and how it furthers the state of knowledge on soil trace gas exchange. I agree with many of these points raised by the reviewer. I was disappointed to see that most of these critique points were dismissed in your author re-

C2492

sponse, and I think this was a missed chance to clarify the work for the readership of Biogeosciences. I further agree with the reviewer that a key interpretation of the results (“wind speeds are better at predicting trace gas fluxes than pressure differentials”) is highly problematic given that pressures were not measured in this study (neither in the chamber airspace nor in the soils, unless I am still missing this aspect after reading the manuscript and the author’s response several times).

I am sorry that I don’t have better news for you. Should you decide to submit a new manuscript to Biogeosciences, I will assure that a different editor will handle the manuscript to assure an independent assessment of any new manuscript.

With best regards, Daniel Obrist

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, 4801, 2015.