

Interactive comment on “Impacts of Nitrogen Addition on Nitrous Oxide Emission: Model-Data Comparison” by Yujin Zhang et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 14 May 2018

While the topic is relevant and within scope of the journal, the work itself is a combination of either sketchily presented or just plain poorly conducted and I recommend rejection. Some (but by no means all points) include: - The soil description is in no way sufficient for the work to be replicated (as is the scientific standard) - 120 kg N /ha /yr of atmospheric deposition? And if 0 kg N /ha /yr was a treatment level of N input then what was the control? - The presentation of the data handling was vastly inadequate such that a proper review was not possible - No information on model set up, how differences in basic assumptions about soils, input parameters etc. between models were handled - How were the forest systems set up in each model? How were they initialised and/or spin up? - Figures presented such that there were no uncertainties on the data given and it is not practically possible to differentiate the measurements from

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



the modelled outputs in the figures I see little prospect of this work being improved to the point that it would be publishable and recommend rejection from this journal.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2018-126>, 2018.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

