

Biogeosciences Discuss., referee comment RC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2022-101-RC1>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on bg-2022-101

Anonymous Referee #1

Referee comment on "Trace gas fluxes from tidal salt marsh soils: implications for carbon–sulfur biogeochemistry" by Margaret Capooci and Rodrigo Vargas, Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2022-101-RC1>, 2022

In general, the study presents useful contribution in our understanding of trace gas fluxes from saltmarsh ecosystem. I believe that manuscript is well-written and fits well in the frame of the basic requirement for Biogeosciences Discussion.

Please find below some specific recommendations which may be useful.

Introduction: This section covers the background information nicely.

Line 65: I suggest finding some recent references.

Lines 92-98: Please provide references.

Methods:

Line 134: How the position of the collars was selected to best represent the study area? What was the extent of the sampled area/total area?

Lines 135-137: Please describe how the disturbance to the soil was addressed while removing vegetation? Was all vegetation removed?

Line 192-195: It seems to me that you have subsamples within the same area that presents the risk of pseudo replication. I suggest providing some more details about that.

Results

Line 334: I could not see Table 2 mentioned in the text

Discussions:

Line 380-383: Is this generalisation for temperate wetlands?

Line 385-387: Reference needed

Line 401: Reference needed

Conclusion: Well done. Very interesting read.