

## ***Interactive comment on “Nitrogen impacts on vascular plants in Britain: an analysis of two national observation networks” by P. A. Henrys et al.***

**P. A. Henrys et al.**

pehn@ceh.ac.uk

Received and published: 31 October 2011

We would like to thank the reviewer for their very helpful comments on our manuscript. Comment: I would like to have in the discussion a deeper analysis of the results in particular in term of interpretation of the results. Response: We agree that our discussion was very descriptive and did not include any deep interpretation of the results and the implications that our results could have on the wider ecosystem. We have taken this on board and have included a whole new section in the discussion entitled "Ecosystem effects" that discusses the issues raised by the reviewer, implications of our findings, in particular the effect of species loss, and focuses our results in a much

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

wider context. Comment: Most of common species show different trends. This point is not really discussed but important. Response: We agree that we did not address this sufficiently. It is important to note that it is not the case that common species show different trends merely that most common species have a significant result in one dataset and a non-significant result in the other. This is not uncommon when conducting analyses of multiple datasets as done here. The two datasets may, like all large datasets do, have quirks and nuances that lie deep within their structure and may therefore contain differences. Most importantly, we have also stressed that though the species were recorded in both datasets, the locations of these records may not entirely coincide. Although we would suspect this not to be the case for well visible dominant species, as we would expect their presence absence profile to be very similar, it is possible for rarer, less visible species to have a differing presence absence profile, simply due to sampling. We have included all these points now and made this discussion much clearer. Comment: It would be more readable to combine different line types with different colors. Response: Black and white figures were used for cost implications and also for transferability. Colour figures may be clearer and we will be guided by the editor and typesetters at the proofing stage as to the appropriateness of the current figures.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 8, 7441, 2011.

**BGD**

8, C4055–C4056, 2011

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

