

Paul Melillo

Critical Review of Geologic Writing

Geology 371

Review of: “Hydrologic Investigations and Monitoring Design of a Vermont Kettle hole Bog” by Paula J. Pitcher and W Cully Hession

The paper in review is about a study done on groundwater movement and water chemistry in ombrotrophic kettle hole peat land bogs near Stowe, Vermont. At this site monitoring wells were installed to investigate the interactions between depth in the peat, distance from the pond, and time of sample.

This paper was well written and contained a large amount of information to support the conclusions drawn from this study. The quality of the data in this paper is good. The interpretations in the paper need to have more supporting evidence so that they flowed nicely through the paper. Both the writing and illustrations were present in a clear and concise way, with the illustrations incorporated well to support the writing. This paper needs a very strong ending that adds to the strength of the paper as a whole.

I recommended this paper for submission to *HYDROLOGY*, after the following corrections are made. The abstract needs to have a main point so that the reading will read further into the paper, I feel that this when well written will complete this paper. I have a list of corrections in this paper over I was very impressed!

1. This part is very awkward and wording try to simplify this section by making the sentence structures shorter.
2. Explain how this is done.
3. I would like to see a good picture referenced in this point.
4. You need to label the methods section and start off with a good introduction to the methods, the dates the study was done, etc.
5. Do you really need to go into the great detail in the water chemistry isn't the methods you used common practice?
6. I didn't see an figure 6

7. A strong ending is missing, as I am sure you know.