

Biogeosciences Discuss., referee comment RC5
<https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2021-276-RC5>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



Comment on bg-2021-276: Fig. 6

Henk van Hardeveld (Referee)

Referee comment on "Cutting peatland CO₂ emissions with water management practices"
by Jim Boonman et al., Biogeosciences Discuss.,
<https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2021-276-RC5>, 2021

Can you elaborate on the potential respiration rate? How do you explain that Reco for the sites with and without irrigation drains are quite similar, but the potential respiration rate is much lower at the site with irrigation drains than at the control site? And how do you explain the sharp drop in potential respiration rate in September that is not matched at all by the measurements? It seems the drop can be related to high modelled water tables and the chosen WFPS optimum curve with zero activity at WFPS = 1. How do you interpret that?

Technical question regarding Fig. 6 (a): can you better explain which lines are plotted on which axes and add units to the third axis?

Suggestion: can you also show these graphs for the Vlist site?