

Biogeosciences Discuss., referee comment RC7
<https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2021-276-RC7>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



Comment on bg-2021-276: Section 4.4

Henk van Hardeveld (Referee)

Referee comment on "Cutting peatland CO₂ emissions with rewetting measures" by Jim Boonman et al., Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2021-276-RC7>, 2021

The comparison between your approach and previous methods is very valuable. But the chosen relations seem a bit random. On the one hand, the relation of Fritz et al. (2017) was found in a semi-scientific Dutch magazine, which is only accessible by sending an e-mail to the authors. On the other hand, the often used relation of Couwenberg et al. (2011; doi.org/10.1007/s10750-011-0729-x) is lacking. As is the often used relation of Van den Akker et al. (2008), which uses the average summer water table, which in line 622 you claim is better than the average annual water table such as used by the chosen relations. Your comparisons will make a stronger point if you include those relations as well.

Technical comments: please explain what the dots in Fig. 11 are, change the units of the x axis of Fig. 11 and Fig. 10 into m below surface, and change the caption of Fig. 11 (in a concise manner) to match everything that you present.