



Dewey Dunnington <dewey.dunnington@gmail.com>

Your Submission JOPL-D-16-00088

Journal of Paleolimnology (JOPL) <em@editorialmanager.com>

Sun, Jan 8, 2017 at 7:20 PM

Reply-To: "Journal of Paleolimnology (JOPL)" <swetha.rajendran@springer.com>

To: Dewey Dunnington <dewey.dunnington@gmail.com>

CC: jhescobar@uninorte.edu.co, whitmore@usfsp.edu, mariedin@usfsp.edu, brenner@ufl.edu

Dear Dewey,

We have received the reports from our advisors on your manuscript, "Modeling the effect of convex upward deformation and horizontal sectioning on paleolimnological data", submitted to Journal of Paleolimnology.

Based on the advice received, we have decided that your manuscript can be accepted for publication after you have carried out the corrections as suggested by the reviewer(s). You will find the comments of Reviewer #1 below and those of Reviewer #2 attached here in the Editorial Manager System. As you revise, please follow JOPL style closely, i.e. no periods at the end of Table headers or figure legends. And use journal abbreviations throughout in the References. Please also put figure legends on a page separate from the figures.

One additional thing. I recall that Glew et al. (2001) addressed sediment "compression" during coring. As I remember, the point was that sediment, with fluid-filled pore spaces, cannot be "compressed," so if you drive 1 meter, and collect only 90 cm, for example, it is because not all sediment was collected. This was attributed to a "wave front" that pushed sediment aside, ahead of the core barrel. Anyway, I believe they recommend using "core shortening." OK, we look forward to receiving the revised version.

Attached, please find the reviewers' comments for your perusal.

You are asked to carefully consider the reviewers' comments which are attached, and submit a list of responses to the comments. We do not necessarily expect that you will agree with all the comments, but we would like to receive justifications for any comments you decide should not be incorporated.

"Please submit your revision as an editable Word file. Please do not include active links to your references in the text of the revision".

TO VIEW REVIEWER ATTACHMENTS (should there be any), please login to the journal site as "Author" and access "Submission Needing Revision" from the Author Main Menu. On the next page display, navigate on the "Action Links" and select "View Reviewer Attachments" from the selection box. This will redirect you to the page that will allow you to "Download" and view the reviewer report attachments. Then, proceed with revising your manuscript.

Please submit your revised manuscript online using the Editorial Manager system, which can be accessed at:

<http://jopl.edmgr.com/>

Your username is: paleolimbot

Your password is: available at this link http://jopl.edmgr.com/Default.aspx?pg=accountFinder.aspx&firstname=Dewey&lastname=Dunnington&email_address=dewey.dunnington@gmail.com

Please also submit your response to the reviewers' comments online as submission item.

We are looking forward to receiving your revised manuscript within 120 days.

With kind regards,

Mark Brenner, Ph.D.
Editor in Chief
Journal of Paleolimnology

COMMENTS TO THE AUTHOR:

Reviewer #1: A short paper that provides a mathematical model for evaluating convex-up deformation in sediment cores. While the paper adequately models the deformation I felt that some more practical advice might be reasonable to expect. For example, based on the deformation, once a horizontal slice of sediment has been collected how much of the periphery (outer diameter) could be removed from the slice to minimize the contamination of the sample caused by deformation? Is there other advice/guidance the authors provide?

Minor points

Consider reversing order of 2nd and 3rd sentence in the abstract to have the methods come before the results. Intro, In 2, Glew et al. 2001 is a good reference here. They also discuss sediment bypassing which sometimes is assumed to be compression.

" In 27, spelling of function.

" In 37, whose function is proposed, yours or Kegwin et al's?

" In 57, avoid first person, instead "It is suspected . . ." also line 4, next page.

In second methods, of the photos used, were all cores collected using the same technique?

Methods In 32, when a number is <10, spell it out.

Bottom of page 3 sediment bypassing as well as compression, and delete last phrase in this sentence.

5th line from bottom of page 4: 'inspired' is an odd choice of word.

For results, start second paragraph with "Slice thicknesses of 0.1 . . . "

The conclusions introduce new information about a specific type of corer, which should be mentioned earlier and then is not needed in the conclusions.

Acknowledgments: Did the entire department offer comments? Instead, perhaps there are a few individuals who should be mentioned.

The Menounos et al. 2005 reference was not cited.

Reviewer #2: see attached comments

There is additional documentation related to this decision letter. To access the file(s), please click the link below. You may also login to the system and click the 'View Attachments' link in the Action column.

<http://jopl.edmgr.com/l.asp?i=25851&l=8GMJ4XWY>