

Interactive comment on “Hydrochemistry (major and trace elements) of Lake Malawi (Nyasa), Tanzanian Northern Basin: local versus global considerations” by P. Branchu et al.

T. Steenhuis (Editor)

tss1@cornell.edu

Received and published: 3 November 2010

Before the review process can be initiated, the reply of the authors to the reviewer’s comments should be improved significantly

For a proper reply, the comment should be repeated and then just below it the author should give a response. If the author agrees with the comment, the author should explain in the response why it was incorrect in the original manuscript followed by a paragraph on what changes have been made in the newly submitted manuscript. If the author does not agree a detailed explanation should be given in the response why

the reviewer was incorrect. The reply should be written in good English because it will appear in print and others can read it. Yellow highlighting is not allowed.

The submitted response is not acceptable because it does not follow this pattern. The following is example

Reviewer's comment: "There seems to have been a problem with the analysis of the anions. I would assume that the variability of Cl and probably also of SO₄ in the water column is an artifact. Especially Cl should behave like Na or K with very homogeneous concentrations."

Author's response: "variability in the water column is linked to the analytical method it is not an artifact (artifact). We are confident in the data, the ionic balance is almost equilibrated"

Since the variability is caused by the analytical method and it is not according to what is expected then it seems that the analytical methods are insufficient. Therefore it needs to be demonstrated by the author that the analytical methods are sound and done in a reputable laboratory. If the concentration data are not correct (as is suggested by the reviewer) the data should not be included in the paper. Finally the sentence "We are confident in the data, the ionic balance is almost equilibrated" is not understandable. Finally I would want to know why the author is so confident.

Only with a proper reply, the review process will be initiated. Publication of the manuscript will only be recommended if the manuscript is scientifically significant and written in understandable English

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 7, 4371, 2010.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

