

Biogeosciences Discuss., referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2022-209-RC2>, 2023
© Author(s) 2023. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on bg-2022-209

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee comment on "Understanding the impacts of peatland catchment management on DOM concentration and treatability" by Jennifer Williamson et al., Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2022-209-RC2>, 2023

I enjoyed reading this document, and most of my comments are easily dealt with. I have included some detailed comments on an attached version of the manuscript.

My major comments is that the paper needs a Methodology. Literature review is not just an essay on a subject, it has a an aim, a question and a method. The lack of a method means:

- there a inconsistencies in what is or is not included in the review - see the abstract where some things are listed but not then commented on.

- there are inconsistencies in the scope of the literature reviewed - I have already assumed that only literature from peer-reviewed literature is included although that is never stated - for example in some sections UK data is used; in others it is from outside the UK and in still others it is only British Isles data.

- how was data combined? In some sections there are median effects and in others there are mean difference. Some sections talk of significant effects and others seem to be mean important by significant.

- lack of clearly defined method and aim means that snippets of method and discussion appear in the results

The conclusion is not a conclusion, there seems to be a better conclusion in the discussion. Whole new ideas appear in the conclusion that were never mentioned in the rest of the

text.

There are other reviews on related subjects that do use an appropriate meta-analysis for their review and so I do think the authors should have a look at some other reviews and meta-analyses to see how to structure their paper.

At the moment the paper reads like a small report given to industry partners and not a literature review for an international journal.

More specific comments:

- remember to include the subject of the sentence.
- there are plenty of pregnant sentences where a reference is expected but not given.