

Interactive comment on “Biogeochemical data from terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems in a periglacial catchment, West Greenland” by Tobias Lindborg et al.

J. Stern (Referee)

jennifer.c.stern@nasa.gov

Received and published: 12 August 2016

This manuscript presents a large and detailed set of new measurements taken in a location that may be representative of portions of the Arctic currently subject to global change. As such, this dataset is a great contribution to the community and will hopefully stimulate some interpretation and comparison between other Greenland sites and the Arctic as a whole.

When I first read the manuscript, I was surprised at the relatively small amount of discussion and synthesis there was of the results. However, after reading the aims and scope of ESSD, I understand that interpretation is not required and is in fact somewhat discouraged. Regardless, It would have been nice to see a small discussion section

C1

making connections between the various data in the dataset, even though I realize that this is not the aim of the journal.

As such, it is difficult to comment on anything more than the data collection methods and data presentation, which appear to be thorough and appropriate for the scientific study. The data presented is interesting and suggests, to me, other possible measurements and studies that could be performed at this site to provide even more information about the exchange of carbon between different pools.

I did notice that none of the trace and major elemental data obtained by ICP-MS was presented in results, and I think this is a big omission that could be remedied with a figure similar to figures 10 and 11 showing at least major elements.

Also, it should be made clear exactly on which carbon phase isotopes are measured. While this is somewhat clear in the methods section, but in figures 10 and 11, it should be made clear that in waters you are measuring ^{13}C -DIC only (and not POC or DOC).

Finally, some of the figures are referenced incorrectly or not referenced at all. For example, Fig. 12 should be referenced on p. 15, l.3. On the same page, l. 13, where Fig. 8 is referenced, it appears that Fig. 9 is the one that should be referenced, and because this is the first reference to this figure, it should appear after Fig. 12.

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., doi:10.5194/essd-2016-23, 2016.