

Interactive comment on “Organic matter across subsea permafrost thaw horizons on the East Siberian Arctic Shelf” by Birgit Wild et al.

Dominé (Editor)

florent.domine@gmail.com

Received and published: 24 January 2019

Dear Authors,

Both reviewers conclude that your article is nicely written and contains nice and potentially useful data, but point to a major flaw in your paper: a lack of scope and it is not clear what question this study answers. There is also a significant overlap with an earlier paper by Shakova et al. (2017). These are major issue that could lead to rejection at this stage. However, if you feel you can produce a very significantly revised version, I leave this option open to you. Should you choose to do so, I will be very attentive to the following points:

1- A clear and logical line of thought must be followed, with clear questions posed at

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



the start and a strategy that logically answers that question, at least partially, while possibly stressing outstanding issues.

2- The manuscript must be significantly streamlined to avoid duplication of earlier work and above all to avoid superfluous digressions from the main line of thought.

Alternatively, you could decide to resubmit a new version of your paper as a new manuscript, which of course would take into account the reviewers' very helpful and constructive comments. I would be grateful if you would please let me know of your intentions within 2 weeks.

Best regards,

Florent Domine, editor.

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2018-229>, 2018.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)