

Decision for GCB-09-0099 - Global Change Biology — reviews

Delete Junk Reply Reply All Forward Print To Do

From: gcb@life.uiuc.edu
Subject: **Decision for GCB-09-0099 - Global Change Biology**
Date: April 1, 2009 4:34:07 AM EDT
To: gcb@life.uiuc.edu

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for taking the time and making the effort to review the paper entitled
'for Global Change Biology. A decision of 'Reject' has been rendered for the manuscript.

At the time a decision is made, as a courtesy, we like to share with you the comments of all reviewers that worked on this paper. Below you will see your own comments on this work, as well as the comments of others who participated in the review process.

Your participation in the peer-review process is critical to the journal's success and directly impacts the quality of the journal we publish. We appreciate your assistance with the evaluation of the manuscript and hope that we may contact you for assistance with future submissions falling within your areas of interest and expertise.

Sincerely,
Global Change Biology Editorial Office

Reviewer comments to the author:
Reviewer: 1
Comments to the Author
The paper "Reconstructing historical precipitation pH using isotopic and chemical indices of tree rings of *Pinus densiflora* in Korea" by Kwak et al. attempts to correlate environmental parameters with tree ring chemistry and to use these relationships to develop a model for reconstructing values of historic precipitation pH. I liked the paper and appreciate the approach taken by the authors; however, there are significant problems with the paper that must be addressed before it can be accepted for publication. In addition to these I have also listed some minor improvements the authors should make to the re-submission while addressing the major problems.

Major Problems

There are three major problems with the paper which form the basis for the decision to request major revisions.

1 – An error on Figure 5a makes the derived correlation between tree ring $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ value and precipitation $[\text{H}^+]$ incorrect. The correlation on Figure 5a seems heavily influenced by a single data point at $[\text{H}^+] = 1.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{ M}$ and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ value of approximately -28.0 permil. This is the highest $[\text{H}^+]$ reported. From Figure 2a, the highest $[\text{H}^+]$ ($1.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{ M}$) occurs in 2005. The tree ring $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ value for 2005 is approximately -27.0 permil (from

