

## ***Interactive comment on* “Fluvial organic carbon fluxes from oil palm plantations on tropical peatland” *by Sarah Cook et al.***

**Sarah Cook et al.**

sc606@le.ac.uk

Received and published: 9 November 2018

We thank the reviewer for their constructive comments on our manuscript. Here we give our initial response to these comments, and will provide a modified manuscript after the discussion is closed.

General comments: - the percentage of DOC will be indicated in the abstract. A division will be added to Figure 5 (I think that was the graph the reviewer meant) that separates the TOC flux into the relative DOC and POC contribution. An explanation will be added into the Figure 5 caption.

Abstract: -The observation that this study was carried out on a single year and during an El Niño event will be added into Lines 9/10 in the abstract

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Methodology: -The corer type will be specified in Lines 20/21

Results:

The correlation significance between watertable and radiocarbon data will be added into Line 29.

Discussion: - an extra sentence will be added into Line 25 to make it clear that as no carbon content was measured the link between peat bulk density and TOC fluxes cannot be fully established.

Figure 1: -a new figure will be added that shows the location of the sites relative to the island of Borneo and clearer Lat/Long coordinates added.

Table 3: Thank you for highlighting the odd ‘% of water time below -60cm’ data mistake. This data will be reanalysed and changed in Table 3.

References: - Gandois et al., 2014 was mistyped and was supposed to be 2013,. Gandois et al., 2014 will removed from the manuscript and replaced with 2013. Jones et al., 2016 will be added to the references list.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2018-417>, 2018.

**BGD**

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

