

Interactive comment on “Spatio-temporal patterns of C : N : P ratios in the northern Benguela upwelling regime” by A. Flohr et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 29 July 2013

General appreciation: Overall this is an interesting manuscript discussing the C:N:P cycling in the Benguela upwelling area. The study reveals the potential significance of the PO₄ that is released from Namibian shelf sediments, upwelled and advected to more northward located areas, where this extra PO₄ sustains N₂ fixation. This newly fixed N is then advected southward with SACW eventually to be reduced in OMZ waters. The authors underline the need for N₂ fixation studies at the northern edge of the NBUS system.

Comments: Section 2.3, p10466: please show the appropriate T-S diagrams. Section 3, P10467, line 6-8: this sentence is too long and not very clear; please reformulate; Section 3.1, p10469, Line 1: This is in line (is was missing) ...; Lines 4 to 11: this section is not very clear. Make clear what causes the PO₄ maximum and where. Do

C3813

the authors suggest the PO₄ max in the Kunene section originates from PO₄ efflux ? Also, may be redraw Figure 5 by showing the ODV plots of NO₃ and PO₄ with O₂ iso-lines superimposed instead of the opposite. Section 3.2, p10470, Line 15: “. . . the decomposition of organic matter exported locally from the surface ..” ; Lines 18-19: “This variability was ..” be more explicit here. What is it you want the reader to discover from Fig. 7 ? Line 17 p10470 till end of section 3.2: The discussion about N*: Sub-surface positive N* values are attributed to nitrate remineralised from OM produced by N₂-fixers and advected southward with SACW. The nice coincidence of the subsurface N* max with the O₂ min waters (Figure 9; Kunene section; offshore stations) thus reflects this remineralisation, right ? But nothing is said here about the negative N* vales in the very surface waters (due to Ekman transport of upwelled water?) and in deeper water, where O₂ is plentiful. May be the use of the global equation to calculate N* is not fully appropriate here, and regional, local, variations in the NO₃/PO₄ ratios need to be taken into account; see recent paper by Singh et al. (DSR I, 93, 2013). This needs to be discussed further. Section 3.3, Page 10472, Line 12, sentence starting with “Since the mud belt is a geological feature ..” what is the reader supposed to deduct from that statement? Please be more explicit. Further down sentence “. . .variability of that P source depends ..” authors mean P* source ?

Graphs: Figure 1: ESACW is defined as Eastern South Atlantic Central Water, but in the text at p10463 is is called Eastern South Altantic Water .. please check for other typos Figure 3: please use different symbols which eventually also are visible in a black and white print out; avoid grey shadings; correct inserted legend of 3 a: Benguela; Figure 4 legend: lots of typos here; please check; the legend mention 'lines' but these are arrows of which only 2 of the 3 are explained in the legend. Figure 5: Increase size of the graphs. Suggestion: inverse the representation: show ODV plots of NO₃, PO₄ and superimpose O₂ isolines Figure 6: How was the gridding obtained for the December cruise between Rocky Point and Walvis Bay (since the central part of the area was not sampled) ? Idem for the off-shore region in February. Figure 9: Indicate the months the sampling took place. Figure 10: Specify the months and indicate in the

C3814

figure caption this is the section off Walvis Bay. Figure 11: blue dashed line and grey shadings are barely visible.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 10459, 2013.

C3815