

Interactive comment on “An airborne regional carbon balance for Central Amazonia” by J. Lloyd et al.

J. Lloyd et al.

Received and published: 31 July 2007

Detailed reply to Comments of referees; "An airborne regional carbon balance for Central Amazonia".

1. Dr. R. Leunung.

It is agreed the numbers of days is limited, a point also made by Hr. Prof. Dr. Dolman. But this is of, of course, a general problem with CBL budgetting experiments in the absence of an unlimited financial budget to pay for massive flight hours. I would not, however regard this point as a "deficiency". Just a practicality.

Regarding the minor comments;

1. All minor typographical errors have been rectified

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

P104; What exactly is meant by "vertical variations" is now clarified in the text

P105 (x3) ; Rephrased to make things clearer in accordance with suggestions; fluctuations now explicitly stated in terms of mean gradient.

P106; I think this was already clear from Table 1; though the reader is now specifically referred to the last two columns

P107; Vertical advection is now specifically mentioned

P108; Helen Cleugh's paper is now specifically referenced.

P108L25; "Why no advection"?: this paragraph has been expanded to explain the point a little more clearly

P109; I have deleted a major part of this paragraph as Dr. Leuning was not the only one to not like it much (including some of my co-authors)

P110; As this is also mentioned by Prof. Dolman I have avoided this term now; except for once in inverted commas.

P111; I have removed the bit about detecting river fluxes as it did not clearly relate to the main theme of the paper.

P111; Coarse woody debris now spelt out.

P116; Not my error, but fixed.

2. Prof. H. Dolman

As requested, the paper has been shortened a little; the comments regarding numbers of days of data has already been addressed above.

Uncertainties associated with errors in subsidence velocity results are briefly discussed see at the end of sub-section 3 (just after the start of the discussion). It is also noted some already published papers have not even considered this term(!)

BGD

4, S1022–S1024, 2007

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

We now use "We used" less often, indeed, some obsolete repetition across the end of the Introduction and the beginning of the Materials and Methods has been removed.

Whilst agreeing with the use of m3 in general science, I think in the case of airflows through systems, dm3 is OK

I think the meaning of the standard deviations in Fig 4 must be quite clear as each point clearly applies only to one measurement period and that is "for the two towers" is clearly stated

P12 "Flux loss" term no longer referred to.

P14; This "hard to follow" bit is in a sentence now removed.

P13-14; Unfortunately we experienced no such conditions (of high night time turbulence).

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 4, 99, 2007.

BGD

4, S1022–S1024, 2007

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper