



Interactive comment on “Cushion bog plant community responses to passive warming in southern Patagonia” by Verónica Pancotto et al.

Gerald Jurasinski (Referee)

gerald.jurasinski@uni-rostock.de

Received and published: 21 March 2021

Dear Authors,

thank you very much for this well structured and well written manuscript. Please apologise my delayed review. I should have checked in early than I would have known, that this is an easy one. Along most of the manuscript it is a very interesting read that is strongly rooted in references and addresses an interesting and timely issue (change in C turnover in a warming world) with a comparably easy to implemented approach (open side chambers). In some parts of the methods and the results section it gets a bit lengthy but most of the provided information is interesting anyway (but sometimes maybe not necessary). The striving for providing the completest possible picture is also

C1

reflected in a huge number of supplemental materials and without suggesting explicitly to skip this or that I would suggest the authors discuss among themselves which of the materials are really worth reporting here.

I made comments and suggestions on a pdf that you find attached. Apart from minor comments and/or suggestion regarding phrasing and wording or very few typos or grammar issues I suggest mainly slight edits or request some more information in the method section regarding the open side chamber approach and ask you to provide a little bit more information on the timing issue (e.g., not all measurements were carried out at the same time, why some measurements were spread across three months in the starting year but later not anymore, how do you think may the measuring on control and treatment plots in differently timed campaigns (at least partially) have influenced your findings). An illustration that explains the sampling design in a graphical manner, especially telling what was measured when would be great.

Further, I am missing a subsection of the discussion section on "limitations" (although there are some aspects n this regard intermingled in the discussion) in which you could for instance discuss the last point mentioned in the parentheses above. Finally, I would like to see a paragraph in the conclusion that discusses what your results mean for these peatlands, the world, future studies. Instead the conclusion is bloated with summary stuff that doesn't need to be there since its a conclusion not a summary.

I do not address all single issues here since you can find them in the commented pdf.

After all, in my opinion, this is a very interesting and well developed contribution that only needs some editing before it can be finally published in Biogeosciences.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://bg.copernicus.org/preprints/bg-2020-440/bg-2020-440-RC2-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-440>, 2020.

C2