

Interactive comment on “Reviews and syntheses: Greenhouse gas exchange data from drained organic forest soils – a review of current approaches and recommendations for future research” by Jyrki Jauhiainen et al.

Kees Jan van Groenigen (Referee)

kj.vangroenigen@exeter.ac.uk

Received and published: 25 September 2019

I would like to echo the comments made by reviewer 1: this is a useful, detailed review on the current state of GHG flux estimates from drained organic forest soils. The authors discuss the limitations of several methods, knowledge gaps, and the data required to make GHG flux estimates suitable for extrapolation and data-synthesis efforts. My main concern is that parts of the manuscript are quite difficult to read. That is, the text is fairly dense, many sentences and some paragraphs are overly long. Starting at paragraph 5.4, the readability of the manuscript drastically improves. I encourage the

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



authors to adopt a similar writing style for the rest of the manuscript; it will probably reach a wider audience that way.

Some minor editorial suggestions:

L58: insert a comma after "Below the WT" L157: This title is not very clear. "Applicable" to what? To my mind, this section of the manuscript also doesn't really present a framework, as is suggested in the title. The first paragraph of the section is about challenges in CO₂ flux measurements, the second paragraph is a comparison of different methods to estimate CO₂ fluxes, the third paragraph is about the role of vegetation in determining CH₄ and N₂O fluxes etc. etc. L261: I wonder if this is a typo. What is "temperate region a"? L284: "Modelling" would be a good place to start a new paragraph. L308: "combine typically" = "typically combine" L333: Start a new sentence after "the estimates" L341: You could start a new paragraph after "In Tier 1.." L349: "...N₂O emissions from ditches at..." L365: "carbon" = "C" L452: I assume you wrote "at least" because this statement might not be true for N₂O and CH₄, but this is not entirely clear.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2019-261>, 2019.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

