

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Reviews and syntheses: Greenhouse gas emissions in natural and agricultural lands in sub-Saharan Africa: synthesis of available data and suggestions for further studies” by D.-G. Kim et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 29 January 2016

General Comments

The authors have done a notable job of bringing a lot of data into one article; however the structure at present is not acceptable. Due to the structure of the ‘results and discussion’ section it reads very much like a literature review made up of a list of examples which seem tediously linked. There has not been much actual synthesis, more just reporting on what individual studies have done. It would be far more informative to see more instances of ‘90% papers reviewed showed that. . .’ as opposed to “x found Y, but Z found A”. I would suggest starting this section with the summary of GHG emis-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



sions section then go on to discuss individual findings with more actual synthesis. The authors also make the error of not addressing the massive elephant in the room as to WHY there is so little data from Africa. It's not simply a matter of scientific priorities but a massive socio-economic challenge! Mass poverty, extreme droughts, civil unrest, political instability, scientific funding/priorities etc. etc. are the main reason these data gaps exist. The authors seem to ignore this fact and suggest that it is as simple as someone deploying some cheap technologies such as chambers and IRGAS – noting that IRGAs are NOT a cheap technology! Unfortunately it is not that simple. There is certainly a point to be made that static chambers can be very cheap and require little know how to use but what about the analysis – where and how much will this cost?

Given these two rather large problems I have found with the paper I would find it difficult to accept for publication at this time. I believe there is a need for this paper as summaries are always incredibly useful to researchers but without major revisions it is hard work to read (structure), need more synthesising and the social aspect needs acknowledging.

Please see PDF supplement for specific comments

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/12/C9416/2016/bgd-12-C9416-2016-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, 16479, 2015.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)