

Interactive comment on “Post Chernobyl surveys of radiocaesium in soil, vegetation, wildlife and fungi in Great Britain” by J. S. Chaplow et al.

J. S. Chaplow et al.

jgar@ceh.ac.uk

Received and published: 2 February 2015

No detailed information on error estimations, detection limits or calibration methods in the article. The lack of these details doesn't prevent from using the datasets. Adding them would enhance the quality of the datasets.

Response: We have improved description of counting errors, etc. in the manuscript. Limits of detection varied over the circa 10 years sampling was conducted but are evident from the available dataset.

In the data sheets there were no information on estimated errors, confidence limits or detection limits. Short descriptions have been included in the article. It would help for the user if the estimated errors are shown also in the datasets.

C313

Response: see above. Unfortunately not possible to change the dataset as it has been assigned a DOI so that data were available when we submitted the manuscript.

Which samples are used to produce figure 2? The information should be included in the figure caption to make the figure more understandable on its own.

Response: Apologies, figure title now improved.

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., 7, 693, 2014.