

Interactive comment on “Microbial dormancy and its impacts on Arctic terrestrial ecosystem carbon budget” by Junrong Zha and Qianlai Zhuang

Junrong Zha and Qianlai Zhuang

jzha@purdue.edu

Received and published: 15 January 2020

We thank the Associate Editor and two referees for their providing constructive comments to this manuscript. Below we detail how we have revised the manuscript following their suggestions. 1. The authors almost completely ignored in their discussion previous efforts to include microbial dormancy in soil biogeochemistry models. It would be interesting, for example, to know what is the contribution of this work to those previous efforts; and what are the consistencies/inconsistencies of their findings in comparison with results from other “dormancy models”. Response: Thanks for the comments. We have strengthened the discussion by comparing our results with previous ones in the revised manuscript. 2. The language. There are so many small language issues that make the reading of this manuscript hard. The authors jump between active and pas-

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



sive voice, and between past and present tense. They explain abbreviations over and over again (RH was defined four times!). They show some data in the results and then show it again in the discussion. I added many small comments that in my opinion could help to address these and other similar issues. Response: Thanks for the comments. We have carefully revised the language according to your comments one by one.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2019-72>, 2019.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

