

Interactive comment on “Coordination of physiological and structural traits in Amazon forest trees” by S. Patiño et al.

S. Patiño et al.

jon.lloyd@jcu.edu.au

Received and published: 5 September 2011

Firstly, we note with great sadness and regret, that this manuscript's lead author, Sandra Patiño died during the review process. This response is contributed by Jon Lloyd on behalf of all the authors

We start by thanking both referees for their constructive comments and in what follows, we address the general points raised by both of them. Our detailed responses regarding specific (technical) comments will accompany the submission of a revised version of the manuscript a few days time.

C2856

1 Manuscript length

Although the manuscript is certainly much longer than the usual brevity associated with the millandboonisation of the modern day scientific literature, we are glad that both authors do not seem to have a critical problem with that. Nevertheless, we accept that there are several areas; in particular the introduction where some shortening of the length and breaking up into subsections could occur. In the revision we will pay close attention to where the reviewers have made specific suggestions for increased brevity and/or clarify, and with the removal of what have been regarded as superfluous graphs to the SI.

2 Seed size and H_{\max}

Some cautionary notes were already included within the original text, but we agree this can be improved upon. We will thus discuss the issue of the low precision of these data and possible implications for the analysis in more detail in both the Materials and Methods and the Results sections.

3 Within species variability

This point has been raised by CB and it is, indeed, an interesting question (except amongst those who, almost by necessity now choose to ignore it). Some of this is, of course, included in the analysis of environmental effects in the current paper (and it should also be noted that some of the graphs in a previous paper by Sandra Patiño were really just another way of showing this). The way we have analysed things here, the intra-species variability forms part of the residual variance which, as well as in-

C2857

cluding any measurement error, also potentially includes systematic errors deriving from the genotype + environment model fit. As requested, we will now mention this issue a little bit more. But we are hesitant about drawing any conclusions about this from the dataset as we feel this is a question better addressed by targetted studies within individual stands and with other potential sources of within-stand variation (eg. light microclimate and soils) carefully controlled for.

4 Conclusions

Although neither referee had any serious issues with the science, many defects in the manuscript itself have been pointed out and there is a mutual concern at it's Tolstoyian length. We anticipate the revised version will be much improved following the incorporation of the referee's comments and we again thank both referees for their careful and thoughtful reviews, particularly in terms of ways to improve the manuscript's focus. The comments of Ref 1 on wood density variations were especially well appreciated.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 8, 5083, 2011.