

Interactive comment on “Stimulation of microbial nitrogen cycling in aquatic ecosystems by benthic macrofauna: mechanisms and environmental implications” by P. Stief

P. Stief

peterstief@biology.sdu.dk

Received and published: 27 October 2013

Author: I would like to thank the two referees for their insightful comments and suggestions that helped improving the manuscript. Below I provide a point-by-point response to the referees' comments and indicate how and where I modified the manuscript or explain why I declined to do so. I hope that the present version of the manuscript meets the quality criteria of Biogeosciences and look forward to your further correspondence.

Referee #2 (Anonymous): The introduction provides an overview of the N processing. By addressing N cycling in many settings, the manuscript covers a very wide range of material and highlights the broad role of macrofauna in N cycling. However, due to

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



the breadth of topics, there are some gaps. For example, there is little discussion of N uptake, either for heterotrophic metabolism or in primary production in shallow water environments with benthic photosynthesis where one may also expect a significant presence of macrofauna. I recommend expanding the manuscript to include that.

Author: Nitrogen assimilation (and the possible interaction of grazing macrofauna with the cellular nitrogen pools of bacteria and microalgae) is now included at two places in the Introduction. A short discussion and several references on intracellular nitrate pools of microalgae and the possible liberation of these pools by grazing macrofauna were added to Section 2.2. Thanks for the hint.

Referee #2: Ecosystem engineering: The paragraph on sediment infauna (2.1.1) is well developed, but not without challenges, because any attempt to find simple general patterns is hampered by the diversity (functional diversity in particular) of macrofauna. This is reflected e.g. in the discussion of the effect (or lack thereof) of organism density. I realize that not all existing literature can be reviewed, but I believe that the manuscript could benefit from mentioning studies such as the work by Gilbert et al. 2003 (J. Mar Res 61: 101-125) that attempt to target underlying mechanisms for the presence/absence of density effects, or that of Emmerson et al. 2001 (Nature 411: 73-77) which looks at the role of biodiversity on ammonium fluxes.

Author: A short discussion on the mechanisms underlying the presence/absence of density effects was added.

Referee #2: The review mentions the importance of coral reefs, but then largely focuses on other sediment epifauna. To avoid leaving the impression that N cycling on reefs has not been studied much, I suggest to upfront (i.e. in section 2.1.2) reference some of the existing recent reviews related to N cycling in reefs, e.g. the chapter by O'Neil and Capone on N cycling in coral reef environments (O'Neil and Capone 2008. Nitrogen cycling in coral reef environments. in Capone, Bronk, Mulholland and Carpenter (eds): Nitrogen in the Marine environment, 2nd edition, Elsevier), or the review by Fiore et

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

al. 2010 in Trends Microbiology, which is cited in section 2.3.3. In the section on ecosystem engineering, it might also be worthwhile pointing out the importance of the tertiary reef structure (as opposed to the effect of filter feeding mentioned here) for light conditions.

Author: a) The two citations were added. b) Sorry, but I only could find literature support for improved light conditions by the filtration activity of reef-building bivalves, but not for light limitation due to the 3-D reef structure. I found an article on coral reefs in which self-shading is reported to reduce photoinhibition (so productivity even increases), but this article doesn't really fit here (Long et al., 2013).

Referee #2: Balance: the review is clearly geared towards infauna, and the compilation of the observational data in section 3 is interesting. My main concern is that I don't get a clear sense of how robust these trends, and how comparable the different data really are. I suggest expanding Figure 4, which is central to this paper, and provide more information that allows one to compare the studies cited (e.g., indicate in a separated column which are freshwater and which are marine studies, highlight the method used to quantify N cycling, add other indicators reflecting the environmental setting). Do you see the same patterns when you only compare data obtained by similar methods (e.g. denitrification measured using acetylene vs. ^{15}N label)? Do they change dramatically if one was not to focus on the highest densities in each study only? While I find the first order estimate of the impact on N cycling very useful, it is important to not only acknowledge a potential bias (p. 11801), but present some quantitative assessment. Along the same line, Table 1 presents standard deviations based on Fig. 4, but this does not account for the variation within each study and one might expect the results to be less significant if accounting for that.

Author: Similar criticism and similar suggestions were put forward by Referee #1. Please refer to the reply that I gave to his general comment II). I added a note on the variation of data within each study which will also propagate to the stimulation factors presented in Tabs. 1 and S1.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Referee #2: Conclusion: When reading the paper, I was presented with a lot of interesting material, but there was no overall synthesis that tied together the main findings, linked in N₂O production as one climatically important aspect, or discussed the overall role of macrofauna in eutrophication (stimulation of ammonium fluxes, but also enhanced denitrification). In essence, the manuscript would benefit tremendously from a concise conclusion which is currently missing.

Author: I wrote an entirely new section named Conclusions and perspectives. How do you like it?

Referee #2: The figures could be improved as follows: Figure 1 should contain arrows for ammonium and nitrate out of the sediment as well. Figure 2 to me was of limited use - consider deleting it. Also, there is no pink in panels A and C (surely there is microbial activity round the burrow) Figure 3: are the arrows indicating stimulation or how does this figure differ from figure 1? can it be deleted, or possibly integrated into figure 1? Figure 4: would it be possible to add error estimates to the bars shown? And if using reference numbers, they need to be added to the reference list.

Author: Fig. 1: Please refer to response to comment 12) by Referee #1. Fig. 2: I think that this figure is central to the paper. The coloration in panel C was changed. Fig. 3: This figure was deleted. Fig. 4: This figure is now called Fig. 3 (see above). I agree that error bars would help judging the significance of the results of the original studies. However, the general trends are more than clear without error bars and therefore I think that the relatively small gain by showing error bars would not pay off the tremendous amount of work needed to compile these data from the original articles. Instead, in the figure legend, I refer the interested reader to the original articles in which the variation of data can be seen. The numbers in parentheses are now explained in Tab. 2 (referred to in the legend) because Biogeosciences does not use numbers in the reference list.

Referee #2: How are 'N-cycle bacteria' defined (section 2.3)

Author: I now introduce the term 'N-cycle bacteria' in the Introduction.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Referee #2: Section 3.1, line 19: diffusion of nitrate into deeper anoxic layers implies vertical redox zonation. However, in a bioirrigated sediment, the zonation may be lateral, or conditions may change with time rather than space.

Author: The original Section 3.1 has been deleted.

Referee #2: Can you give an estimate of the importance of N uptake and removal by birds, animals and humans?

Author: I give a number of references on that issue at the end of Section 2.1 where the interested reader can find original data. Aside from that, I think it is beyond the scope of this review to dig deeper than this into that field of research.

Referee #2: Table 1: state that stimulation factors were only calculated if the sign of the flux didn't change not just for nitrate, but for ammonium as well (or, if that is not so, explain what was done)

Author: Change made.

Referee #2: In summary, this is a nice and important paper, the main weaknesses being the lack of a proper conclusion section that brings the paper to a closure, and the lack of detail presented in the analysis of the effect of macrofauna on benthic DIN fluxes and rates of nitrification and denitrification.

Author: Thanks.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/10/C6137/2013/bgd-10-C6137-2013-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 11785, 2013.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)