

Peer Review: Asymmetric hydrologic alteration in depressional wetlands: Groundwater pumping disproportionately depresses low water levels in cypress domes

Cortney R. Cameron¹ 

Collaborators: 3 reviewers

¹ School of Life Sciences, University of Essex, Colchester, England

Transparent Peer Review

- [View reviewer summaries](#)
- [View initial submission with reviewer comments](#)

Accepted by 2 of 3 reviewers

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Publishing History

Submitted February 19 2026

Accepted July 8 2026

Published August 17 2026

Corresponding Author

Cortney Cameron

cortney.cameron@gmail.com



Open Access



Peer-Reviewed



Creative Commons

Recommended Citation

Cameron, C. R. 2026. Asymmetric hydrologic alteration in depressional wetlands: Groundwater pumping disproportionately depresses low water levels in cypress domes. Stacks Journal: 26009.

<https://doi.org/10.60102/stacks-26009>.



Reviewer Summaries

Dan Schmutz

Initial Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

What did the authors do a good job with?

The author made good use of existing datasets to further characterize the stage duration curve tendencies of groups of isolated cypress wetlands to warn against the use of environmental levels based on peak inundation metrics.

How do you think this research will contribute to the field?

The research results and curated datasets likely will stimulate and facilitate further research on characterizing differences in aspects of hydrology for isolated cypress wetlands, including improved environmentally-protective levels.

Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

Clear definition of the dry season months would be helpful.

Additional attention to the representativeness of the rainfall during the study periods would be helpful. Confirmation of similarities of wetland morphologies within study groups (as suggested by other peer reviewers) would be helpful.

Consideration of the contributions of above and below ground water levels being combined in stage data (and likely present at a higher belowground percentage in the stressed wetlands) and the potential differences in response to changing surficial aquifer levels due to soil porosity should be considered or mentioned as a complicating factor.

Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

Cucconi tests detect both scale and dispersion changes simultaneously, so additional information about how the author decided whether differences were predominantly scale-based or dispersion-based would be helpful.

A minor symbolization error was detected in Figure 3. (The gray dot just above the " $p=0.036$ " is the year 2000 and should be colored as a red square. The pre-cutback regression model is fit on years ≤ 2002 .)

Results include a statement about "less time near normal pool" which is true for the medians and non-overlapping interquartile ranges, but in the report text this feature is said to show "no significant difference". Therefore, some clarification is needed on whether the observed difference is statistically significant or ecologically significant or not significant.

Some of the interpretations highlight impacts related to annual variations in rainfall and indicate drought coinciding with higher pumping. These are useful areas for further research but are likely beyond the scope of what the current analysis can discern.

Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?



I had to make just a few name changes within the R script based on the names of the files provided. That and other minor suggested changes are provided in the tracked changes version of the draft manuscript.

Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?

No

Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?

This paper requires minor revisions but does not need further peer review

Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?

No, I do not want to be listed as a Collaborator

Christopher Shea

Initial Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

What did the authors do a good job with?

The authors did a good job with the data analysis and presentation of the results.

How do you think this research will contribute to the field?

I think this paper will contribute to wetland science and management by showing that groundwater pumpage effects are greater at lower percentiles of the wetland water level distribution.

Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

The authors should present data on wetland depths, wetland area and the rainfall totals for the study periods.

Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

Analysis of rainfall totals, wetland depths and wetland area may effect conclusions, or require certain caveats, if significant differences are found between study periods or between wetland groups. The role of composite data (above and below ground water levels combined in a time series) should be discussed and addressed.

Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?

No, that's it.

Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?

No concerns.

Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?

This paper needs major revisions and another round of peer review

Ge Sun

Initial Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

NO

What did the authors do a good job with?



very concise in illustrating the differences of hydrologic change between two datasets

How do you think this research will contribute to the field?

this is a wonderful result that shows pumping causes changes in low water levels, not high water levels

Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

Some data are needed to back up the physical differences between Unchanged and Changed wetlands to strengthen the argument of GW pumping effects

Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

The longterm hydroperiod data are powerful to derive solid conclusions

Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?

no

Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?

no

Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?

This paper requires minor revisions but does not need further peer review

Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?

No, I do not want to be listed as a Collaborator