

Interactive comment on “⁹⁰Sr and ⁸⁹Sr in seawater off Japan as a consequence of the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear accident” by N. Casacuberta et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 28 March 2013

1.- In order to avoid misunderstanding in sentences like: ⁹⁰Sr ranges from to and ⁸⁹Sr ranges fromto. please, explain in Abstract and Results sections that ⁹⁰Sr and ⁸⁹Sr values cannot be compared because they are not measured in the same samples (57 for ⁹⁰Sr and only 19 for ⁸⁹Sr and usually in those that present the highest ⁹⁰Sr values). 2.- Please, explain clearly in the text if the provided ⁸⁹Sr values are referred to measurement date or to sampling date. 3.- I do not understand the meaning or usefulness of section “⁸⁹Sr/⁹⁰Sr ratio”. Why the “time delay between sampling and accident” is calculated if this value is known with an approximation better than 98+/-18, which is the value that authors obtain? Even in section 4.2, authors assume that ⁹⁰Sr peak has been released to the Pacific Ocean on 6 April, and sampling dates are also known. If the objective is to demonstrate that ⁸⁹Sr comes from Fukushima

C622

accident, in my opinion it is clear that with a half-life of 50 days, this radionuclide cannot have another origin. 4.- Table 1 and Fig. 3 has a very small source size, it is quite difficult to read it. 5.- The same for Figures 2 and 4 (right hand plots). It is almost impossible to read them. 6.- In Fig. 1, Fig 2 and Fig 3 it is supposed that the grey contour corresponds to Japanese coast and the red star in Fig 1, Fukusima NPP. Please if this is true, explain it in the text.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 2039, 2013.

C623