

Interactive comment on “Methanol and other VOC fluxes from a Danish beech forest during springtime” by G. W. Schade et al.

G. W. Schade et al.

Received and published: 11 January 2009

reviewer comment in italic :

GENERAL COMMENTS The authors present experimental data on the biosphere-atmosphere exchange of VOC. They are seemingly aware of the difficulties that come along with OVOC measurements. To some extent they acknowledge the problems that arise with small data sets and potential artefacts but that awareness is not reflected in the general lines of arguments. In several cases the argumentation shows evidence that conclusions are drawn based on what results were expected rather than base on the data shown. Some of the experimental problems are completely ignored. A detailed discussion of the paper is given in the SPECIFIC COMMENTS (two parts). The questions/comments are in order of appearance in the paper. Secondary literature used by the authors is cited accordingly (without bibliography); other work is cited in

detail. On several occasions the authors comment on "previous" work without further specification/citation and the context does not always allow to follow the authors' arguments. The authors report "insignificant fluxes/evidence" - it might well be a result that fluxes were (at times) not significantly above detection limit - insignificant results per se do not add to the knowledge of a scientific field. The authors use "filling words" such as however and archaic terms (e.g. wherefore) that do not add to the readability of the text. The manuscript of the discussion paper in the presented form is not recommended for publication in Biogeoscience because of substantial shortcomings in their argumentations, data reduction and conclusions drawn from the small data-set. The authors need to revise their lines of arguments where conclusions are not substantiated by or inconsistent with their data or literature. The authors might want to substantiate their arguments with further data (if available), more tests and/or secondary literature. After major changes the revised work would be substantially different from the current manuscript as regards content and quality and would need to go through a full review process.

We are grateful to reviewer one for his/her detailed and frank analysis of our manuscript. The revision process based on these comments has, we think, much improved the manuscript. We agree with the reviewer on most of his/her comments. Accordingly, we have revised the manuscript substantially, in particular regarding:

- explanation of measurement issues
- presentation and interpretation of the results
- conclusions that can be drawn from the limited data set

We note that our detailed rebuttal below also addresses the majority of comments by reviewers 2 and 3, and we have therefore kept our replies to their comments shorter.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 5, 4315, 2008.