

Interactive comment on “Biochar carrying hydrocarbon decomposers promotes degradation during the early stage of bioremediation” by P. Galitskaya et al.

M. Romantschuk

martin.romantschuk@helsinki.fi

Received and published: 24 August 2016

The response by the authors to my initial comment was adequate. Now I continue with reviewing the paper in more detail:

line 33. "low efficiency of bioaugmentation" could be reworded to something like "no additional benefit from bioaugmentation" since the assumption is that biostimulation is required anyway.

line 153. Was the viability of the immobilized strains/cells confirmed? Figure 4 points to that, but was some other method used?

Lines 160-163 are unclear (the % seem to jump up and down), and seem not to agree

C1

with fig 2.

lines 165 - 166. "transformed into recalcitrant" but cant it be rather that among the compounds present, the easy ones are degraded rapidly and the recalcitrant are left behind, or are perhaps degraded eventually.

lines 180-181. Biochar may also adsorb PAHs stongly so that they become unbioavailable, but apparently still extractable.

lines 291-295. Complicated sentence.

The discussion is rather long and puts quite much weight on the data about the microflora. I would suggest a little bit more cautious tone in this part of the discussion and conclusion.

In general the paper is good and contains quite much solid and novel data. So if/when the authors can meet the above comments (and comments by others) I recommend acceptance.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., doi:10.5194/bg-2016-292, 2016.