

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Dynamics of ammonia exchange with cut grassland: strategy and implementation of the GRAMINAE Integrated Experiment” by M. A. Sutton et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 12 September 2008

The Authors present an introductory overview over an intensive collaborative micrometeorological campaign on NH₃ fluxes within and above a managed grassland site. The manuscript describes the measurement and evaluation strategies, which is useful and necessary to understand the synergisms between individual studies and the project as a whole. A second major objective of the work is describing common background data like site description ancillary information that is used by the individual projects at one place. This information might not be scientifically important per se but presenting it at one place is more comprehensive and shorter than describing it several times in the accompanying research papers (ARP). These two objectives are somewhat untypical for a research paper. To meet requirements for a research paper requires thus strict

S1687

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



focus on general project aspects.

This is not yet achieved in all parts of the manuscript. In some parts the Authors filled the paper (for my taste unnecessarily) with detail, e.g., too detailed lists of objectives (2), detailed theory of sub projects (3.3) and a complete overview on the following papers (6.1 to 6.4), as usually done in a foreword. Part of Chapter 2 reads like a science project proposal rather than a scientific article (e.g. pages 3354 - 3356).

My recommendation is thus to shorten and focus the manuscript in order to emphasize the novel and general aspects of this very valuable experiment as such. A final version would possibly be 30 to 50 % shorter than the actual manuscript without losing relevant general information.

In order to reach that size, the manuscript should simply be scanned for chapters / paragraphs / results that are redundant, because they will be part of the ARPs.

List only those prior activities that are directly related to the experiment design of the campaign (i.e. Chap. 3.1) and not only to individual projects.

Restrict the method description to the background measurements and to those prior measurements and developments that are NOT part of the ARPs. Where you use results from these activities I suggest mentioning the methods very briefly in a methods section and refer to regarding ARPs.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 5, 3347, 2008.

BGD

5, S1687–S1688, 2008

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper