

Interactive comment on “Lifestyle dependent occurrence of airborne fungi” by Daniel A. Pickersgill et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 7 December 2017

The manuscript presents a new analysis of data published earlier by one of the authors (Fröhlich-Nowoisky et al., 2009). It intends to structure the occurrence of airborne fungi, observed in a suburb over the course of a year, by the lifestyle rather than the taxonomic proximity of identified fungi. The idea is great, but its execution is poor. I had a hard time reading through the seven pages of Results & Discussion, which are largely an unstructured string of data interspersed with attempts to explain observed details. It looks like the manuscript had been submitted earlier to another journal with a different referencing style and has now been hastily submitted Biogeosciences (two references in the text are indicated as numbers (“(33)”, page 7, line 23; (“24 and references therein”), page 12, line 1) .

At this stage, it is the responsibility of the senior authors to put effort into turning the

C1

manuscript into a readable form, i.e. by structuring and giving a direction to the seemingly endless Results & Discussion section. My job as a reviewer starts at a later stage in the process.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2017-452, 2017>.

C2