Biogeosciences Discuss., 6, C3655–C3656, 2009
www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/6/C3655/2009/

Biogeosciences Discussions

Interactive comment on "The effect of a reciprocal peat transplant between two contrasting Central European sites on C cycling" *by* M. Novak et al.

G. Wohlfahrt (Editor)

georg.wohlfahrt@uibk.ac.at

Received and published: 21 December 2009

The discussion phase has ended and we have two reviews available to this paper. Both reviewers recommend major revisions will be necessary before the paper becomes acceptable for publication in BG - in particular the reviewers found that the scientific quality of the paper was only fair. However, both reviewers expressed that they believe that provided appropriate changes are made that the paper will become acceptable for publication. I agree with the reviwers and think that they made a number of very useful suggestion for improving the paper which the authors should consider when revising their paper. Any revised submission should be line-numbered and include a point-by-point reply to the reviewer and my (see below) comments.

Editor detailed comments:

p. 10013, l. 2: how were fluxes calculated from dC/dT as from Figs. A1-A4 it seems that very often the concentration changes were non-linear? add appropriate details to methods

p. 10014, l. 15: why were home cores not analysed from the end of the experiment as were the transplanted cores - this 18 month time delay might (theoretically) introduce a bias into the comparison

p. 10015, l. 21-22: remove "... toward the end ..." - this creates the false impression that more measurements were available in time

Table 1: why include S and N throughfall data if both bogs were at open sites?

Fig. 3: here I believe the five replicates are shown, not mean and standard error as indicated in the figure legend

Fig. 4: the way these results are referred to in the text I would show CB and CB=> VJJ in one panel and the other ones in the other panel; why are there no data available below 30 cm from the transplanted cores - add to methods

Figs. A1-A4: here I would use symbols rather than bars and in addition show the calculated flux as appropriate fits to the data

Fig. 5: same as Fig. 4 above

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 6, 10007, 2009.