

Interactive comment on “Nitrogen and Warming Control the Vegetation in Inner Mongolia Tourist Area” by Qiong Sun et al.

Dr Oliva (Referee)

oliva_marc@yahoo.com

Received and published: 24 March 2016

This paper presents an experiment to better understand global warming and atmospheric nitrogen deposition. The study focuses on the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region and constitutes an interesting approach to examine these topics. However, I have major concerns about the current version of the manuscript.

The structure is not clear. I am afraid that the abstract does not synthesize clearly the methods and findings presented in this study. The reader does not know about the characteristics of the study site, and this is of crucial importance for the objectives of the paper. A need section should be included explaining in detail the main geographical features of the area: climate, geomorphology, geology, vegetation cover, human activities, etc. Also, you should include a (regional/local) map of the area, the reader

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



needs to know where the study focuses!

Moreover, the results should be better organized. It is very difficult to follow, very dense and poorly structured. Maybe you could organize the results in different subsections. The same for the discussion section, you should split it into different subsections to clearly frame your findings and interpretation. This will make easier for the reader to follow your arguments and interpretation of the entire manuscript. Also, the discussion section could be improved by adding further comparisons with already existing studies on similar topics. I have only counted 5 citations while in the Introduction you refer to several more. What are the most novel findings in your paper with respect to previous studies? Are your results and interpretations similar/different to former studies? What is different in your approach that may be useful for scientists in future studies?

The authors should revise all the citations following the guidelines of the journal. In many cases (e.g. line 43, 45, 46, 52) they mention the name and surnames of the authors and then include the reference at the end. This is not correct. Or they mention the authors at the beginning (Wen & Lu (2015) studied....or only at the end (Wen & Lu, 2015). Check it throughout the text.

Figures and tables are enough and of good quality. But please introduce a new figure 1 (location).

l. 31 please refer to the last IPCC (2013) l. 32 use “°C” here and along the text l. 32 Earth l. 35 increased 1 time with respect to what? l. 35-36 estimated or based? l. 43-55 please rewrite this paragraph citing correctly the references mentioned in the text.

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., doi:10.5194/se-2016-52, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

