

## ***Interactive comment on “Filtering artefacts in bacterial community composition can affect the outcome of dissolved organic matter biolability assays” by Joshua F. Dean et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 15 August 2018

Dean et al. present a concise method focused manuscript into the use of different filter (pore) sizes and the consequences of these on DOM degradation. The manuscript is well written and organised and easy to follow. I have the following comments:

#### Methodology

Line 33- What temperature were the samples refrigerated at, would be useful to note? And were the samples cold stored on the journey back from the field to the University.

Was there a reason that only sizes 0.2 and 0.7  $\mu\text{m}$  pore sizes were chosen? As 0.45  $\mu\text{m}$  is also a very common size, particularly in tropical peatland studies.

C1

Just wondered why it took 6 months to analyse the samples for their carbon concentration?

#### Results

Figure 1. There is no indication of the legend to highlight which line/ colour refers to P2, P7 and UF.

Figure 2. Perhaps the marker points could be made a bit smaller, so it is easier to distinguish the individual points.

Include P2, P7 and UF under the Day 0 and Day 14 in Figure 3c.

#### Discussion

It would be good to see more of a discussion concerning the impact of pore size on DOC concentration, and particularly how this may change over time. For example, would any pore size be fine if you are going to analyse the sample quickly?

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2018-282>, 2018.

C2