Biogeosciences Discuss., 6, S1156–S1157, 2009 www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/6/S1156/2009/© Author(s) 2009. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



BGD

6, S1156-S1157, 2009

Interactive Comment

Interactive comment on "Measurement and modelling ozone fluxes over a cut and fertilized grassland" by R. Mészáros et al.

M. Sutton (Editor)

ms@ceh.ac.uk

Received and published: 12 June 2009

I have now re-read the reviewers comments and the reply of the authors. In addition, I had the advantage of reading the revised manuscript prepared by the authors, which does not seem to have been uploaded to the BGD site.

In the published reply, the authors work through comprehensively the concerns of the reviewers, though in many cases the answers are rather too brief. It would have been helpful for the authors to provide a longer reply which also included in quotation marks proposed new text for the manuscript. This would show more clearly what changes have been made.

Key points:

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Criticism by Referee 1 that the Vd would have expected to change after the cut. This is not clearly addressed in the reply by the authors published on the BGD site, but is more clearly addressed in the revised paper itself (which I have seen, though it is not uploaded).

Criticisms by Referee 2 and Referee 4 on the model used. Major changes have now been made to the paper following an established model.

Criticisms by referee 5. The revised paper shows more detailed changes made, including comparison with the Rs(bulk) inferred from latent heat fluxes and removal of data where the reference O3 monitor did not correlate closely with the fast response sensor. A clear case for not applying the WPL temperature correction is now given.

Many small comments have now been attended to.

It is my conclusion that the authors have worked hard to make the revised paper a substantial improvement on the originally submitted version. However, as the scale of changes is rather large, and it is only possible to judge these from the revised manuscript, it is necessary for the referees to be able to have access to this revised paper.

The authors should therefore now submit the revised paper, to ensure that the referees are happy that the necessary changes have been made.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 6, 1069, 2009.

BGD

6, S1156-S1157, 2009

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

