Biogeosciences
Discussions

Open Access

EGU

Interactive comment on "Basic and extensible post-processing of eddy covariance flux data with REddyProc" *by* Thomas Wutzler et al.

T. Wutzler

twutz@bgc-jena.mpg.de

Received and published: 7 March 2018

We thank referee #1 for his constructive comments.

The main focus of the manuscript is the method comparison to existing tools. Most technical details have been moved to appendices, that we want to keep in order to support the readers in their applications. We will experiment with moving more detail to appendices and shortening or moving current appendices to online supplements. However, most of the left detail is required to understand the differences in results between methods. Moreover, the manuscript should serve as a reference for the methods and therefore we strive to state the details.

The length of the manuscript results also from the fact, that essentially three different

issues are explored, and all of them are compared to existing methods: 1) filtering, i.e. uStar threshold estimation 2) gap-filling, and 3) flux-partitioning. When splitting the manuscript into three papers, big parts, e.g. in the introduction, will be be redundant.

While the suggested alternative journals maybe fit the content slightly better, we want to target an audience of researchers who use EC flux data in their studies. We argue that Biogeosciences is the best open access journal to reach this audience.

We will tackle the issue of "dependency hell" by providing a Docker image that already includes all required system libraries and R-packages.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2018-56, 2018.