



Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “A global database of soil respiration data” by B. Bond-Lamberty and A. Thomson

B. Bond-Lamberty and A. Thomson

bondlamberty@pnl.gov

Received and published: 11 May 2010

Comment Response

How are authors going to deal with quality control? At which scales? - Several fields in the database are devoted to quality control; see the new Table 1 and fields described therein. The question of scale is difficult, as most studies do not provide enough information to assess spatial scaling issues; this is noted in the text

What are those histograms? - The histograms (Figure 4) are simply an effort to give readers a sense of annual RS distribution across the data

Discuss methodological errors associated with technique - This issue is now noted in the text

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

Spatial variability and potential biases - The old Figure 5 (which showed what was termed “spatial variability”) was problematic and confusing, and has been deleted. The relevant database field is better explained simply as “reported error” instead of spatial variability per se; it is now described as such in Table 1.

How are authors going to deal with ancillary data collection? - This is now discussed

No discussion about land management effects - The database records (or attempt to record) whether the site is under active management or not, length of time since disturbance, biota, and ecosystem type. We’re unsure what other data could usefully be added to this, that would be applicable across a wide range of studies

Why isn’t RS plotted versus temperature, moisture and/or LAI? - We did not feel such a plot would be a good use of space; a new figure (Figure 3) does, however, show how the SRDB data cover the terrestrial climate space

How were average fluxes calculated? - Fluxes are simply as reported by study authors; we generally do no calculation at all, except when (e.g.) estimating from monthly means

Paragraph 2.1 is confusing - We agree that this sentence was confusing; it has been removed

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 7, 1321, 2010.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

