

***Interactive comment on* “The National Eutrophication Survey: lake characteristics and historical nutrient concentrations” by Joseph Stachelek et al.**

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 1 November 2017

Please use the full doi designation: <https://doi.org/10.5063/f1kk98r5> ? The full designation allowed this reviewer to avoid a search through DataCite to access the KNB site.

Data very well organized and easily accessible. Very good metadata. Spot checks (Montana, Illinois) showed believable locations and values, evidently quality control has worked reasonably well.

Good product, potentially very useful as baseline for both chemical and hydrological / geomorphological purposes.

No information about sampling date in the master .csv file? E.g. a reader gets ref-

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



erence to the report number (.pdf 475, published 1978) and to a page number (for Bloomington Lake, Maclean County, Illinois, actually on page 79 rather than 81 as in .csv file), but no reference to sampling dates. Bloomington Lake data shows nutrient and biological samples collected on 5/11/73, 8/9/73 and 10/17/73. For MacDonald Lake (.pdf 477, page 78 rather than 80 as in .csv) Montana, nutrient and biological sampling on 6/1/75 and 7/28/75. In text we read that sampling of geographic regions occurred by year (e.g. 1973 for southeastern including Illinois and 1975 for western) but the user does not see actual dates where available, or would need to extract those dates themselves? But apparently none of the raw files captured these sampling dates from the original .pdf?

Data from Illinois resides in two separate sections of .pdf 475 (page numbers 80 to 99 and 100 to 110 contiguous) but one needs to search by storet_code or state name to find all data per each state? This scattering arises from processing sequence?

Page numbers in .csv file refer to page number of digitized .pdf, not to page numbers used within the individual reports? I did not see reference to this small discrepancy in the metadata.

Need specific clarification about the page number discrepancies and about whether the digitisation process captured the sampling dates.

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2017-52>, 2017.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)