

## ***Interactive comment on* “Sensitivity analysis of a wetland methane emission model based on temperate and Arctic wetland sites” by J. van Huissteden et al.**

**J. van Huissteden et al.**

ko.van.huissteden@geo.falw.vu.nl

Received and published: 18 November 2009

### **Response to Anonymous referee 1**

1. Determination of CH<sub>4</sub> flux was made by chamber/gas chromatograph system before May 2004 (Horstermeer and Ruwiel sites). Thereafter CH<sub>4</sub> analysis was performed in the field using an Innova 1312 photoacoustic gas analyzer. Please make sure the CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes determined using these two systems are comparable. Otherwise, it would obscure the sensitivity analysis.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



*Reply:* We checked in May 2004 the comparability of the Innova 1312 and the syringe samples for the Ruwiel site. It proved that there was no significant differences. Besides that, the Innova was carefully calibrated with reference gases once a year by the manufacturer. This will be included in the text.

2. Conclusion section needs to be thoroughly revised. The authors should give a clear statement of the main conclusions of the research, and a clear explanation of their importance and relevance, rather than a summary of the results.

*Reply:* Indeed our conclusions on the model performance and the options for future model improvement are rather diverse and could have been written down in a more comprehensive way. We will revise this paragraph.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 6, 9083, 2009.

**BGD**

6, C3104–C3105, 2009

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

