

Author response to interactive comment RC1 submitted on Jul 02, 2021

In the document below, the reviewer comments have been copied from the original review and are shown in black font, while the author comments have been added in blue.

General comments

The authors describe the effects of a manipulation of grazing herbivores density in a continuous permafrost tundra ecosystem on carbon fluxes during the growing season and some of its predictors. The core data is an extensive set of NEE and Reco measurements obtained over two weeks at peak growing season over three replicates of the high grazing density system and two replicates of the low grazing density system, and is accompanied by meteorological variables. Overall, gross fluxes GPP and Reco were increased in the high grazing density plots, concomitant with an increase air and soil temperature and a decreased soil moisture content, while NEE was largely unaffected. CH₄ fluxes were lower in the high grazing density plots but with high variability between plots. The flux measurement dataset is valuable, and my main concerns lie in the choice of an unbalanced design which hampers statistical evaluation of the results, and that too few details are provided to justify the fact that initial conditions were comparable and throughout the Methods section. I would therefore recommend that these aspects be thoroughly improved before publication and try to provide suggestions for such improvements.

As discussed in more detail in the replies to minor comments below, and also in the discussion before the Discussion paper was accepted for publication, there is no conclusive data material available that allows to demonstrate the status of the grazed ecosystem before the start of the Pleistocene Park experiment in the 1990s. We believe that this has been adequately treated in the discussions section of this manuscript; however, to highlight the shortcoming more prominently, we added a statement to the concluding sentences of the abstract:

“Our results indicate that grazing of large herbivores may promote topsoil warming and drying, this way effectively accelerating CO₂ turnover while decreasing methane emissions in the summer months of peak ecosystem activity. Since we lack quantitative information on the pre-treatment status of the grazed ecosystem, however, these findings need to be considered qualitative trends for the peak growing season, while absolute differences between treatments are subject to elevated uncertainty. Moreover, our experiment did not include autumn and winter fluxes, and thus no inferences can be made for the annual NEE and CH₄ budgets at tundra ecosystems.”


The only documentation on pre-treatment status we can offer is the set of photographs that was presented in our previous reply. As discussed also below, we would prefer not to include it as part of the revised manuscript, but if the editor actually recommends it we could add this material as a new part of the Appendix.

We would like to mention again at this point that many studies covering novel, uncharted scientific territory in regard to method and/or location may be associated with a large uncertainty. From all possible forms of scientific inquiry, our abductive method is therefore speculative, but we strove to provide and include all information at our disposal in support of our results and claims. We believe that the information added allows for a detailed discussion of the shortcomings.

I appreciate that, since initial submission, further information has been added regarding the choice of the two replicates in the UGR site, but still think that beyond the choice of these particular plots, the decision of having only two control plots should at least be better motivated and the limitations it implies better discussed. Overall, that does not entirely appease my concerns regarding the unbalanced study design. On the contrary, by choosing two sites that are close to the average within that transect, rather than e.g. at random, the mean value is preserved but the variance is artificially deflated, possibly biasing comparisons. While this may or may not affect Reco dynamics so much, as the differences are marked and variability seems limited, the differences observed in other variables and in particular CH₄ fluxes could be artefactual for this reason. In addition, UGR-2 is described as standing out on several aspects, from the lower soil temperature to the higher time lag of soil vs air temperature, to having only half as many flux measurements as the other plots (so that there is, in total, twice as much flux data for GR than UGR plots), which explains in part the poor measured vs modelled fit of GPP for UGR-2.

The decision to work with only two reference sites (UGR) plots at the Ambolikha site was based on practical considerations. In principle, we could have used up to 10 sampling locations which had been established in earlier experiments. However, plots were spaced 25m apart, meaning that the observation system has to be moved between sites when switching locations, as opposed to the GR sites, which were co-located within a narrow radius. Spending time for moving the system implies less time for actual measurements, which is why we wanted to reduce it. Therefore, the choice was made to only sample two sites.

We realized that the description in the submitted version of the manuscript chosen to justify the UGR site selection was somewhat misleading. While fluxes at the two selected were actually indeed close to the mean fluxes across the transect, our choice was rather motivated by the ecosystem structure. While we cannot give more precise information on the GR sites before grazing started, we know from personal communication that the managed area used to be a water-logged tussock tundra. Out of the 10 plots that were available at the UGR site, six are dominated by cotton grasses (*Eriophorum*), with few or no tussocks present (see Figure 8 from Kwon et al. (2016), copied below). Two more sites (IDs 4 and 5) were placed on a small ridge, and were therefore significantly drier, and dominated by shrubs. We therefore selected the only two locations, IDs 0 and 2 in the control section, featuring the desired vegetation structure for investigating the effects of grazing. Studies with a different scope may have enabled a random site selection to improve estimates of uncertainty due to site-specific bias.



The respective description will be adjusted in the revised version of the manuscript text: “At UGR, spatial variability of carbon fluxes and environmental conditions was analyzed in detail along a transect of ten flux chamber plots in a previous study (Kwon et al., 2016), including a description of vegetation community structure and hydrologic status at each plot. Based on these findings, we selected two positions for the presented study (IDs 2-0, 2-2) which best represent the vegetation composition of a water-logged tussock tundra that dominated the grazed site before the Pleistocene Park experiment was started in the 1990s.”

I do not see a simple way to solve this issue, but perhaps simulating data based on flux measurements from Kwon et al 2016, using the relationship between the fluxes in the current study and those in Kwon et al 2016, could allow to carry out a sensitivity analysis to determine whether the choice of these 2 replicates affected the findings.

As demonstrated in Figure 8 from Kwon et al. (2016), which is copied above, there is some spatial variability in CO_2 flux rates along the control transect, so obviously our flux result from the UGR site would have been affected if we had chosen 2 different sites from the set of ten. However, as already outlined above, it was our scope to work with these two sites chosen as references for our study, since they featured the required ecological characteristics, i.e. vegetation community structure and water level status. Only a different scope would have enabled a random site selection since there were more sites to choose from. We agree that revisiting plots across studies is very desirable for intercomparison and to trace ecosystem behavior through time. However, any of the remaining 8 sites would have either been dominated by cotton grasses, or would have featured dry conditions on an elevated ridge. Therefore, a random choice of two

plots out of the 10 available positions would not provide an appropriate approach to find the most suitable references for the scope of the presented study.

Comparing the “grazed” and “ungrazed” treatments is central to this manuscript, but their identity prior to the experiment is unclear from the information currently provided. For instance, as it is now GR sites are described as a wet lowland tundra that gets flooded every year, while UGR sites are a wet tussock tundra floodplain, it is unclear whether the distinction between the two is intended to avoid repetition or to convey a more fundamental difference between the sites. Beyond the more detailed comments below requesting that more detailed data on initial conditions should be presented if available, I would suggest reorganizing the part of the Methods section where the sites are described. In addition to the general geographic and climatic information about the area, it could be easier to follow if the authors would first describe the similarities between the two sites prior to manipulation (e.g. flooding, vegetation, etc.) before delving into what makes them distinct.

The landscape description the reviewer refers to was indeed intended to avoid repetition. In the revised manuscript version, we will emphasize that both sites are/were actually wet tussock tundra ecosystems. We also extended the paragraph that introduces the two selected study sites to emphasize their similarities in terms of the general landscape setting:

“In the context of this study, we compared carbon fluxes and ecosystem characteristics between two measurement sites in the Chersky region. Both sites are wetland ecosystems situated within the Kolyma lowlands region that are waterlogged for the largest part of the growing season, affected by the flooding regime of the Kolyma River that leads to high water levels around snow melt in early summer. Our undisturbed reference ecosystem is a tussock tundra site situated about 15km south of Chersky on the floodplain of the Kolyma River. Due to the very low natural abundance of grazing herbivores in the region, the influence of grazing disturbance on this dataset can be considered negligible. Situated about 15km further south at the margins of the floodplain, the Pleistocene Park site, hosting a variety of herbivores (sheep, yaks, cows, horses, bison, muskoxen, reindeer), was used to study the effects of grazing on permafrost ecosystems.”

Specific comments

L30: Might be worth citing the recent review by Mekkonen et al 2021 found here: <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abf28b>

We will add the suggested reference to the list of papers cited here.

L53-56: It's not clear how Pleistocene Park and the measurements presented here address non-growing season carbon cycling, in fact the abstract (L14-15) explicitly states that those are not addressed. I suggest reformulating or removing the reference to nongrowing season fluxes from this section altogether.

We agree that the sentence is misleading, since our own study does not provide new information on off-season fluxes. We will therefore remove this sentence from the introduction.

L58-63: It's perhaps more a question of personal taste, but I find it a bit confusing to present hypotheses that are not tested in the current study (e.g. above-belowground partitioning of GPP, decrease in respiration from colder permafrost in the winter). I would think these wider considerations about the aims of Pleistocene Park itself would fit better in the discussion, or presented differently than a list of hypotheses near the end of the introduction, as that might give the reader the wrong impression that those are the hypotheses addressed in this study.

We agree that not all hypotheses listed here can be tested against the dataset provided by this study, and therefore the list may be confusing the reader. We will therefore rephrase the beginning of the sentence to 'Some of the underlying hypotheses related to the Pleistocene Park project are ..', and omit the former 2nd hypothesis that referred to a decrease in year-round temperatures, and related effects on e.g. respiration.

L83-86: Can you provide more precise information on that site, such as for how long the density of grazing herbivores has been increased, and by how much compared to the "ungrazed" site which arguably hosts large grazing herbivores in lower densities such as the rest of the Arctic, unless the site is too wet and not visited by grazers?

Particularly in the open landscape in close vicinity of Chersky, hunting pressure prevents the establishment of larger herds of wild animals. Accordingly, due to the very low natural abundance of grazing herbivores in the region, the influence of grazing disturbance on the reference ecosystem can be considered negligible. The Pleistocene Park core domain, which was sampled in the context of this study, has been influenced by grazing management since the establishment of the park in 1996, i.e. for about 25 years now. This information will be added to the methods text.

L91-93 and 101-103: Can you provide more precise information on e.g. vegetation composition and soil conditions prior to the onset of manipulating density of grazing herbivores? Something similar to Table 2 in Kwon et al 2016 would be a good start to support the central assumption that the sites were initially similar.

Unfortunately, there is no precise quantitative description of vegetation community structure for the Pleistocene Park area at the beginning of the landscape experiment in the 1990s. So we cannot provide information beyond the personal communication by our Russian project partners.

L103-104: For future reference, it would be good to mention to which plot numbers in Kwon et al 2016 the UGR-1 and UGR-2 sites in this study refer to. 2-0 and 2-2 are mentioned further in the discussion (L300) and should be mentioned here instead, but do not appear directly relatable to the denomination in Kwon et al 2016: does that mean Control-0 and Control-2?

Yes, the two sites selected for the presented study correspond to the sites labeled 'control-0' (UGR-1) and 'control-2' (UGR-2). This information will be added to the indicated text passage.

L108-112: Please clarify how many probes were used and where. From the phrasing I would have expected one probe per plot for temperature, and three probes per site for moisture, but from Fig.1 and the corresponding Results section it seems like there was only one probe in one of the GR plots and two in

UGR. Please also clarify what was considered 0cm depth in the water-logged tussock tundra (e.g. water-table, top of the tussocks, between tussocks), I assume it is the soil surface between tussocks but I shouldn't have to make assumptions in the Methods section. Please also mention the logging interval and the procedure used for producing the interpolated data presented in Fig.1.

It is correct that both UGR-1 and UGR-2 were equipped with soil temperature probes, while a single probe was used for all three GR-sites, due to their spatial proximity. The inter-tussock surface was considered as the reference height. All data was recorded at 1Hz during times of flux measurements. This information, including details on interpolation procedures, will be added to the modified version of the specified text passage.

L113-115: Please clarify what is meant by plausibility limits, which offsets were corrected and how. Please also provide further detail on the interpolation of soil temperature data: which variables other than air temperature and incoming radiation were used, and how. In addition, indicating the date and value of individual measurements in Fig. 1 would be helpful.

The soil moisture probes used in this experiment showed periods of enhanced signal fluctuation, which clearly could not be associated with a physical process. Accordingly, such periods were considered as low-quality data. Subsequently, noisy data in the observed soil moistures in 7.5cm, 15cm and 30cm depth was cleaned by selecting continuous intervals of low fluctuations as 'trustworthy'. Data points above and below visually determined plausibility limits around these intervals were removed from further analysis.

We considered this information to be of little relevance for the presented results, and accordingly decided to exclude it from the text to improve readability. The total number of individual observations, and days with flux measurements, corresponds to the number of flux measurements given in Table 1. We believe Figure 1 would be overloaded with information if such details would be added. Information on the flux interpolation procedures will be added (see also comment above).

L123-124: Please clarify whether a single relationship was used (if so, which one) or whether incoming radiation-PAR relationships were adjusted by incoming radiation classes.

We used a uniform conversion factor of 0.4730369 to convert between shortwave incoming radiation and PAR. This factor represents the average across the radiation bins presented in the cited reference, and was provided as a function within the R-package LakeMetabolizer (Winslow et al., 2016) that we used to perform this conversion. This respective information will be added to the manuscript text.

L139-140: I assume that not all measurements were 2 minutes long since that time is mentioned as a maximum. I would expect an arbitrary threshold in change in CO₂ concentration was used to limit non-linearities from excessive CO₂ buildup or uptake within the chamber, but could not find that value here or in Kwon et al 2016. Could you please clarify that part?

We did not define a threshold for maximum absolute change in greenhouse gas mixing ratios, temperatures or humidity within the chambers as a termination

criterion for a flux measurements. Based on previous field work experience with this chamber setup in the given environment, a target of two minutes was a practical compromise between collecting sufficient amounts of data, and avoiding biases due to non-linearities. Filtering out potential non-linear effects was included in the subsequent data processing, i.e. identification of periods with stable gradients in mixing ratios over time. The passage will be rephrased to clarify this issue.

L149-152: Is it correct to assume that these slopes were linear fits? If so, perhaps mention it at L150 instead of “steady”, if not please clarify. In addition, a duration criteria must have been used for selecting the periods with a steady increase, please mention how long these periods had to be in order to be considered.

Yes, we assigned linear fits. We will change ‘steady’ to ‘linear’ as suggested by the reviewer to avoid confusion about this setting. The minimum duration of a linear period to be considered for gradient fitting was 40 seconds. This information will also be added to the text.

L152-155: I assume this is the reason for the uneven number of “utilizable” measurements in the different plots, if so please move the reference to Table 1 after this section instead of at L147. Please clarify in Table 1 what “utilizable” refers to. Please also mention somewhere why so few measurements were utilizable in UGR-2.

The reference to Table 1 will be moved as suggested, and the caption of Table 1 will be adjusted, including an explanation why UGR-2 is featuring less data than the other sites.

Appendix A: In line with my earlier comment about the number of probes used and their location, please clarify where the moisture / temperature data used for modelling comes from. Were GR-1, GR-2 and GR-3 models based on the same temperature data from the probe in GR-1? If so, was the data averaged between UGR-1 and UGR-2 or did these plots benefit from a distinct processing where they each had their own supporting data for the modelling?

As mentioned above, and already clarified in the text, both UGR-sites had their own soil temperature probe, since they were spaced approximately 50m apart, and were subject to different soil moisture regimes. For this reason, information measured directly next to the chamber frame was used for the modeling, and no averaging between the two sites took place. The GR-sites were clustered within a radius of approximately 6 meters, in seemingly homogeneous terrain. Therefore, additional soil monitoring did not seem necessary. This setup will also be clarified in the revised version of the Appendix.

L200: One of the assumptions of the Mann-Whitney test is that the observations are independent, but for both Ts and fluxes the data are time-series and are therefore not independent.

Motivated by the comment, we decided to adjust the statistical tests used for this purpose. In the revised manuscript version, instead of Mann-Whitney tests, a repeated measures ANOVA will be conducted prior to post-hoc pairwise t-tests and a correction of p-values with the Holm–Bonferroni method. In this way, we will provide evidence that the measurements are independent between days, and

correct the results of the pairwise comparisons for multiplicity problems. This approach will be used for fluxes, soil temperatures and radiation measurements.

L199-201 and throughout the text: The statistical tests results mostly present P values. I could not find precise guidelines of in-house rules regarding the presentation of statistical results in Biogeosciences, but I would suggest the test statistic to be presented as well, and the degrees of freedom. If this burdens the text too much, please consider a supplementary table.

Test statistics (Degrees of freedom, F-values, p-values for repeated measures Anova; corrected p-values for pairwise comparisons) will be provided in a new supplementary table, and will be referred to in the text.

L201: default t-test may not be appropriate with unequal variances, particularly so with unequal sample sizes as well. Please mention whether the assumptions for using a t-test were checked and met.

Statistics will be adjusted, and will be displayed as explained in the previous comments.

L207 and throughout the text: When presenting mean values, please provide associated uncertainties in the form of SD, SEM or CI.

Standard deviations will be provided when presenting mean values.

L223-224: Is there any data on this difference in air temperatures before the onset of the experiment? I.e. does this reflect initial differences or an effect of altered vegetation and soil conditions?

Unfortunately, there are no observations from the Pleistocene Park area before the onset of the grazing disturbance in the 1990s. Accordingly, there is no data-based proof that the differences in daily temperature amplitudes are an effect of grazing management. This, however, is not claimed in the manuscript.

L229-234: There is no mention in the Methods section of how these values were computed and it is unclear what the P values presented refer to, please clarify.

These results are related to the interpolation procedures for soil temperature data. We made tests with varying setups of input parameters, and also considered ranges for averaging intervals and time lags between air and soil temperatures, resp. As already explained above, we would like to exclude details on these procedures from the paper, since we consider this level of detail would compromised the readability. Therefore, we will also adjust this text passage, and remove most details referring to time lags.

L236: "clearly" is strong phrasing considering the absence of replication. Given the 100h lag at 15cm depth, effects of the change in weather pattern should only be visible in the last couple of days, at best, but one would expect deeper layers to have higher thermal inertia and therefore not to see an effect of the change in overall weather pattern by the end of the study period. In that respect, I do not think it is justified to carry out separate tests for the two weeks at this depth.

We agree with the reviewer that the data base is too slim to warrant such comparisons in the deeper soil layers. We will remove the word 'clearly', and also the last sentence that presents a statistical comparison of differences in the 2nd week.

L249-248: There is no mention in the Methods section of how or when thaw depths were measured or inferred from temperature data, please correct this.

Thanks for pointing out this oversight. A description of the measurement approach will be added to the methods section.

L252-277 and Figure 2: Judging by L199-200, the pairwise comparisons presented as letters in Figure 2 were computed by running 10 different Mann-Whitney tests per variable, plus one for the averaged values. If that is not the case, please describe this in the Statistics section, if that is the case, please clarify it in the Statistics section as well. In both cases, please indicate (how) were the P values adjusted for multiple comparisons. Beyond concerns about the Mann-Whitney test assumption of independence of observations expressed above, I would advise running an omnibus test prior to post-hoc pairwise comparisons. With a balanced design, a repeated-measures ANOVA could be a correct way to account for dependent observations within a plot. Considering the central role of flux data in this manuscript, their statistical treatment should be improved.

The previous tests based on Mann-Whitney have been replaced by an alternative approach. Please see the above comment for details.

L256-258: It is unclear what “flux rates” refers to in the first part of this sentence: NEE, Reco?

The statement was completely referring to GPP rates. The passage will be re-formulated to clarify this issue.

L286-287: When were the collars installed at the GR site? Presumably after setting up the wooden fences to prevent trampling by the herbivores, but please mention this here or in the Methods section.

The collars at the GR sites were indeed installed only days before starting the field experiment in 2019. This will be added to the discussion section.

L293-295: Why not mention tussock-forming plants here? As far as small-scale heterogeneity is concerned it seems odd not to mention one of the main ecosystem engineers of these systems.

As suggested by the reviewer, tussock-forming plants will be added to the list of factors contributing to fine-scale structuring of ecosystems.

L308-309: It might be good to remind here that when comparing CVs of GR and UGR one should keep in mind GR having 50% more plots and ~100% more measurement points.

A statement referencing this imbalance in the GR vs. UGR datasets will be added to the end of the paragraph.

L324: See above at L108-112, this is not a reminder and this information should be stated more explicitly in the Methods section.

Since the methods section will be extended according to the remarks by the reviewer listed above, the text passage referred to here is now actually a ‘reminder’ to the methods, and therefore will be kept as is.

L329: I assume “the actual measured values” refer to Reco, but please clarify.

This statement will be removed from the manuscript text.

L351-355: It would be good to mention examples of which such operations might be confounded with the effects attributed to the increased grazing herbivore density.

Examples of management operations will be added to this sentence.

L357-359: See my earlier comment about L91-93 101-103, in absence of more detailed data such photographs may be an interesting supplementary display item.

We have shown such photos already in our response to reviewers' comments when updating the manuscript that was ultimately accepted as a Discussions paper. While these photographs give a qualitative impression how the Pleistocene Park grasslands have changed over the past 20 years or so, it is still hard to draw conclusions since even pictures taken from exactly the same perspective (such as the one shown for the park) suffer from differences in season, and incoming light. We would therefore prefer NOT to show such pictures in the appendix of our manuscript; however, since the picture material is obviously available, we would leave this decision to the editor.

L394: "mostly likely" should be "most likely", but the phrasing is a bit strong for an hypothetical future development, which to date is in contradiction with the observations as shown in Fig 1. While I understand the hypothesis of a cooling of the soil and grazing-induced protection of permafrost in Pleistocene Park, it is hard to ignore that Fig 1 shows an almost twice as deep active layer thickness in the grazed site. Either the hypothesis is correct but the sites differed drastically in active layer thickness prior to the experiment, or the effects observed after 22 years of manipulation contradict the expected consequences of the hypothesis. A transient regime is possible but less parsimonious, and "most probably" or "most likely" are too strong for that to my taste.

We agree that future trajectories can only be speculated upon, and that the statement therefore should be toned down. We will change 'most likely' to 'potentially'.

L404-406: Liquid water has a fairly high thermal conductivity, a comparison between values for a compacted soil and a water-logged soil could be useful information here.

A statement on the comparison of thermal conductivity between soil minerals and water will be added to this phrase.

L408-410: It is hard to say for 25cm depth since the data is not shown, but for 35cm it would be good to remind that the observed difference in soil temperature is lower or similar to the observed difference in air temperature.

We are not sure how to interpret this statement. It is obvious that dynamics in soil temperatures are muted in comparison to those in the atmosphere. This also applies to differences observed between sites. We currently do not see how we could include this into the discussion at the referenced section. We would certainly be interested in incorporating this comment into the revisions, but the reviewer would need to provide more details on what s/he has in mind.

L414-415: In line with the previous comment, this sentence could be complemented by starting it with “Barring differences prior to the onset of the experiment”.

The suggested statement will be added to the beginning of the last sentence of this paragraph.

L416-419: Considering that no difference was observed in growing season NEE and that in presence of grazers, a larger fraction of NPP is removed by herbivory, this argument should be substantiated with above- and below-ground plant biomass measurements or a complete C budget. In their absence, it is speculative and because this is not central to the reasoning, I would suggest removing it.

We agree that our current result cannot support the given statement, and therefore will remove it from the revised manuscript.

L419-420: See above at L394, this is speculative and in direct contradiction with data presented in Fig. 1.

The statement will be removed.

L453 and 456-457: This is speculative, please use less strong phrasing.

All statements will be toned down as the reviewer suggested.

Technical corrections

L27: change sentence order

We will change the sentence structure.

L57: facilitates -> allows

The word will be exchanged accordingly.

L116-119: I would suggest using GR and UGR rather than Pleistocene Park and Ambolikha for consistency.

We will add GR and UGR, resp., to the site description for consistency.

L165-166 and L200: Rstudio is only a GUI software to R and does not do calculations. Please move the mention to the software used to the end of the statistics section, and provide adequate reference including R, the version number and the appropriate citation (e.g. R Core Team. R: A language and Environment for Statistical Computing. (2021)

Citations will be added for R, replacing R-Studio.

L200: “(?)”?

Due to a formatting error, the chosen reference was not displayed properly. This will be fixed.

L226 – Figure 1: I would recommend making two separate panels out of panel (a). I do not think the y-axis break simplifies the figure, and the factor 5 change in axis scale would be more obvious that way.

L437-439: Please consider rephrasing, the current syntax poses “increases in primary productivity” as an explanation for increased GPP.

The sentence will be rephrased.

L480: “differences in NEE were not pronounced” -> “no differences in NEE were found”

The statement will be rephrased according to the reviewer’s suggestions.

Appendix A, L494-496: This sentence would be easier to understand if the information was split across several sentences, please rephrase it.

The sentence will be split up, and slightly rephrased, to make it easier to understand.

References cited:

Kwon, M. J., Heimann, M., Kolle, O., Luus, K. A., Schuur, E. A. G., Zimov, N., Zimov, S. A., and Göckede, M.: Long-term drainage reduces CO₂ uptake and increases CO₂ emission on a Siberian floodplain due to shifts in vegetation community and soil thermal characteristics, *Biogeosciences*, 13, 4219-4235, 2016.

Winslow, L., Zwart, J. A., Batt, R. D., Dugan, H., Woolway, R. I., Corman, J., Hanson, P. C., and Read, J. S.: LakeMetabolizer: An R package for estimating lake metabolism from free-water oxygen using diverse statistical models, *Inland Waters*, 6, 622-636, 2016.