

Interactive comment on “Methane emission estimates using chamber and tracer release experiments for a municipal waste water treatment plant” by C. E. Yver-Kwok et al.

D. G. Feist (Editor)

dfeist@bgc-jena.mpg.de

Received and published: 17 April 2015

Dear Prof. Eugster,

thank you very much for comments . I would like to reply to the ones that were addressed to me as the editor. First of all, I was of course aware that the manuscript had been submitted to AMTD before. So was the executive editor Andreas Richter who asked me to handle this resubmission.

The rules for AMT state: "The work submitted for publication has not been published before, except in the form of abstracts, preprints, published lectures, theses,

C723

proceedings-type publications, or discussion papers that have not undergone full journal peer review, and it is not under consideration for peer-reviewed publication elsewhere." So, the resubmission is within the rules of AMT. A detailed similarity report is actually part of the AMT editorial process. The similarities with the previously submitted manuscript were listed. They were expected and pose no problem for the resubmission. The referees for the quick access review were informed about the previous submission and were asked to consider this in their reports.

I very much appreciate your considerations and comments about self-plagiarism and I fully agree in general. However, in this special case, I can assure you that the high percentage of similarities does not constitute a case of self-plagiarism. It is rather a side effect of the public review process employed by the open-access EGU journals. I hope this answers your main question.

Kind regards

Dietrich Feist, AMT associate editor

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 8, 2957, 2015.