This email is being blind copied to the referees

August 4, 2005

Dr. Ruth Yanai State University of New York College of Environmental Science & Forestry One Forestry Drive 346 Illick Hall Syracuse, NY 13210 United States

Dear Dr. Yanai:

Re: Manuscript No. 05-247 - The vertical and horizontal distribution of roots in northern hardwood stands of varying age by Ruth D. Yanai, Byung Bae Park, and Steven P. Hamburg

The above-noted manuscript may be acceptable for publication in the Canadian Journal of Forest Research after major revisions. In your revisions please pay careful attention to the enclosed comments of the referees and the Associate Editor. The revised manuscript will be carefully evaluated by the Associate Editor.

When you submit the revised manuscript, please include a cover letter, in which you quote the manuscript number, itemize each comment of the referees and the Associate Editor, describe in detail (with reference to page and line number in the revised manuscript) how you have addressed each of their comments in the revisions, and respond to those comments with which you disagree.

We prefer that you submit your revised manuscript by using our new on-line submission process located at:

http://osprey.pubs.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca/publisher/access.view?journalCode=CJFR

All other links you previously used should be deleted.

The revised manuscript must be returned to our office by September 15, 2005, or the manuscript will be considered withdrawn. You may also return the revised manuscript via courier or similar expedient means to avoid delays in the mail.

📵 🕙 🧭 🧭 🗹 guy@interchange.ubc.ca, 6/20/07 8:03 PM +0100, Your Submi..

+_



BLAH BLAH RLAH

Your Submission

From: guy@interchange.ubc.ca To: <rdyanai@mailbox.syr.edu>

Cc: <heinz.rennenberg@ctp.uni-freiburg.de>

Subject: Your Submission

Date: Wed, 20 Jun 2007 15:03:23 -0400

Ref.: Ms. No. TREES-D-07-00063

Estimating nutrient uptake by mature tree roots under field conditions:

challenges and opportunities Trees - Structure and Function

Dear Dr. Yanai,

Two referees have now commented on your paper. Their reviews (appended below) are quite favorable and, indeed, enthusiastic. Only minor revisions are required to make the manuscript suitable for publication.

In doing your revisions please submit a list of changes or other response to each point raised by the referees.

Your revision is due by 20-07-2007.

To submit a revision, go to http://trees.edmgr.com/ and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item call Submission Needing Revision. You will find your submission record there.

Yours sincerely

Robert D. Guy Managing Editor Trees - Structure and Function

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1: The manuscript (Review) "Estimating nutrient uptake by mature tree roots under field conditions: challanges and opportunities" by Lucash et al gives and overview on the different techniques applied for assessing nutrient transport in trees on the root level and intensively discusses the pros and cons of each approach.

I am looking forward to seeing this review published in TREES because it brings together for the first time the information on field uptake studies which try to directly address root processes.

Before publication, however, the authors should address the following points:

1) page 5 line 18: The author should point out here that the interactions

Subject: Your Submission PLSO5015

Date: December 11, 2008 10:01:51 AM EST

To: Ruth Yanai

Dear Dr. Yanai,

I have received the reports from our advisors on your manuscript PLSO5015 "Nutrient concentrations in roots, leaves and wood of seedling and mature sugar maple and American beech at two contrasting sites".

With regret, I must inform you that, based on the advice received, I have decided that your manuscript cannot be accepted for publication in Plant and Soil.

Below, please find the comments for your perusal.

I would like to thank you very much for forwarding your manuscript to us for consideration.

With kind regards, Yong Chao Liang Section Editor

Comments for the Author:

Please check online for possible reviewer attachments.

Reviewer #1: The replacement of sugar maple by American beech due to anthropogenic soil acidification (e.g. low nutrient availability and/or Al toxicity), addressed by this paper, is an interesting ecological phenomenon. Although reworked, the MS PLSO5051 "Nutrient concentrations in roots, leaves and wood of seedlings and mature sugar maple and American beech at two contrasting sites" can not be considered for publication in PLSO for three main reasons:

1. The research objectives of this work are not clearly stated. The experimental sites differ only slightly in their chemical properties, with the exception of Ca and Mg concentrations (see Table 1), hence the "contrasting sites" from the title is misleading. Sometimes, the discussion appears to be too mechanistic with wrong statistical interpretation. The explanation of the possible mechanism(s) of nutrient uptake, translocation and storage in two woody species grown in acid soils (both H and L sites) is missed. Also, the potential Al toxicity is not considered, (no explanation which Al fraction is shown in Table 1).



From: Jean-Paul Laclau <laclau@cirad.fr>

Subject: FORECO6176

Date: May 9, 2009 10:53:58 AM EDT

To: Ruth Yanai

Re: FORECO6176

Title: Nutrient concentrations in roots, leaves and wood of seedling and mature sugar maple and American beech at two contrasting

sites

Authors: Byung Bae Park, PhD; Ruth D. Yanai, PhD Submitted to Forest Ecology and Management

Article type: FLA Full Length Article

Dear Dr. Yanai,

I can now inform you that the Editorial Board has evaluated the manuscript FORECO6176: Nutrient concentrations in roots, leaves and wood of seedling and mature sugar maple and American beech at two contrasting sites.

I am pleased to inform you that it has been favourably received. The Editor has advised that the manuscript will be acceptable subject to satisfactory revision. Both reviewers agree that your paper provides new insights and is well prepared. The comments are very supportive of your work. There are, however, many suggestions of detail where improvement is needed. Please follow carefully the guide for authors in the reference section.

The comments below should be taken into account when revising the manuscript. Along with your revised manuscript, you will need to supply a Reply to Reviewers in which you list all the changes you have made to the manuscript, and in which you detail your responses to all the comments passed by the reviewer(s) and Editor. In addition, please highlight the changes in the revised manuscript. Should you disagree with any comment(s), please explain why in the Reply to Reviewers.

To submit a revision, please visit http://ees.elsevier.com/foreco/ and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item called Submission Needing Revision. The revised manuscript and Reply to Reviewers can be submitted there.

When submitting your revised manuscript, please ensure that you upload the source files (e.g. Word). Uploading a PDF file at this stage will create delays should your manuscript be finally accepted for publication. If your revised submission does not include the source files, we will contact you to request them.

We expect the revision to be submitted within 30 days.

Kind regards,

Jean-Paul Laclau Editor-in-Chief Forest Ecology and Management

