Biogeosciences Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2018-66-EC1, 2018


Biogeosciences Discussions

# *Interactive comment on* "Grazing elevates litter decomposition but slows nitrogen release in an alpine meadow" *by* Yi Sun et al.

**J.-A. Subke (Editor)**

jens-arne.subke@stir.ac.uk

Received and published: 3 May 2018

Dear Professor Hou and co-authors,

This manuscript is generally well written, but I agree with referee 1 that a native or otherwise proficient English speaker should proofread it as part of your revision. Both referees raise a number of detailed queries, which you should address in detail. I would like to add here some additional points to ensure that the objective and approach of your study are presented as clearly as possible. This concerns mainly how you introduce the aims of your study. These should be much more clearly identified and presented in form of hypotheses. Please see my specific comments below on this, and I am happy to elaborate in case you are unsure about how to implement these



changes.

36-39: Delete sentence starting "We carried out. . .". The introduction should present the broad background and significance underlying this research. Focus on your experiment only at the end of the introduction when presenting your hypotheses.

77-81: Also here, rather than outlining the detail of the experimental design, focus on the hypotheses you want to test, The subsequent sentences give your aims, but they should be more focused (see comments by referee 1). For example, you refer to "improved soil properties" in line 84. It is not clear what this actually means. Be specific which properties you hypothesise to be affected by grazing. Rather than using words such as "improve", make clear which characteristics you test in your approach, and whether you hypothesise an increase or decrease.

571-585: All of the figure captions should have treatments and parameters explained. So avoid referring to GP, GEP, TN, LSD etc. without explaining it here.

Figures 3 and 4: These results are already presented in form of k-values in Table 2. If you think that presenting these data in graph form is at all valuable, I suggest you reduce this to one panel per figure, with all treatments shown as separate lines in the same graph.

Jens-Arne Subke

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2018-66, 2018.