

***Interactive comment on* “The relevance of
particulate organic carbon (POC) for
carbon composition in the pore water of drained
and rewetted fens of the “Donauried”
(South-Germany)” by S. Fiedler et al.**

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 1 August 2008

General comments.

The study should be published following major revision as I believe it is correct that it is the only study of POC in peat porewater. However, there is a lack of scientific rigour in the paper and style and format are often poor. General points:

- line numbering really helps reviewers
- paragraphs should be either indented or given a line break

S1328

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



- personal pronouns should not be used in scientific writing

Specific points

Page 4, line 7. This sentence is not true as porewater carbon has been used in carbon budgets of peatlands.

Page 4, line 8 – Most POC moving from peatlands is sourced due to erosion of exposed peat and may not be coming from leaching, the authors seem unaware of the literature on peat erosion.

Page 4, line 18 – sentence does not make sense in English.

Page 6, line 7 – do the authors really mean “introduced”

Page 6, line 18 – sentence does not make sense in English.

Page 7, line 1 – sentence is very poor style.

Page 7, line 7 – there are unexplained acronyms in this sentence – please detail.

Page 7, line 8 – ppm is shorthand and should be removed and mg/l used if that is what is meant.

Results section – remove acronyms in bold and make sure headings are consistently formatted.

Page 9, line 9 – is this effect significant? There are too many statements made without any idea whether the observations are significant or just believed to exist by the authors.

Page 9, lines 12-13 – is there a new paragraph here?

Page 9, line 25 – inser the word “individual” before POC.

Page 10, line 1 – sentences should be merged.

BGD

5, S1328–S1331, 2008

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Page 10, line 6 – this sentence does not make sense in English.

Page 10, line 10 – is GWL defined as an acronym elsewhere?

Page 11, lines 13-15 – brackets are poorly positioned and make the sentences difficult to understand.

Page 11, line 20 – sentence does not make sense in English. Further, what does “tendency” mean here?

Page 11, line 23 – what does “most” mean here, again this is an example of lack of rigour – what proportion are we talking about? Was it a significant proportion?

Discussion section – inconsistent use of headings please format consistently.

Page 12, lines 12-15 – terrible style and also not true. In scientific writing what is a “take home message”? What are conclusions doing in the discussion? Equally, none of these are actually conclusions from this study – they are implications or proposals from this study.

Page 13, line 18 – sentences needs re-writing.

Page 14, second paragraph – the authors make a lot of there not being a difference between POC and DOC but one they fail to discuss is that DOC can be truly colloidal while POC is suspended the cut off point between the two is then not arbitrary.

Page 15, line 25 – inconsistent table reference.

Page 16, line 17 – the reason that most of the values in the literature the authors cite are lower than those reported in this study is that most of these studies do not correct for in-stream losses and so will be artificially low, if the comparison is made with studies that correct for these losses the differences are not great and reported ranges overlap.

Conclusions section – the authors must be rigorous and only state conclusions.

Page 17, line 24 – how can you state assumptions in the conclusions, the authors are

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

assuming POC and DOC are the same but that is not a finding of the study.

Page 18, line 3 – also not a conclusion but a note!

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 5, 2049, 2008.

BGD

5, S1328–S1331, 2008

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

S1331

