

## Forest Ecology

---

**From:** rdyanai@syr.edu  
**Sent:** Monday, April 07, 2008 9:18 AM  
**To:** Forest Ecology  
**Subject:** data documentation for Bartlett study  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red

Data documentation: (is this still Marty's department?) (notes from e-mail)  
Sanae was looking at Mn concentrations, and the 2004 metadata says that the samples were collected from baskets, so she thought she should compare it to basket samples (in 2003 we analyzed these), not tarp samples. In the manuscript we are more explicit. "In 2004, litter was collected more frequently from the baskets used to collect litter for mass, and samples that fell during a rain-free period in October were used for chemical analysis." I think in the metadata we want to add something even more explicit, like: "These samples should thus be comparable to the "tarp" samples analyzed in other years."

The fact that these samples removed for chemistry were included in the mass totals is not described anywhere. This should be explained in the metadata for the 2004 mass data. It should probably also be in the manuscript.

The "Composite" samples are not described in detail in the metadata. There is nothing about this in the manuscript, either.  
What were the criteria for defining minor species? Were the samples ground before compositing? Maybe some description of how the masses were determined (was it a certain percentage of the sample?) would make it more clear.