

Interactive comment on “Spatiotemporal variability and drivers of $p\text{CO}_2$ and air–sea CO_2 fluxes in the California Current System: an eddy-resolving modeling study” by G. Turi et al.

L. Cotrim da Cunha (Editor)

lcotrim@uerj.br

Received and published: 23 November 2013

First, I'd like to thank the reviewer for the comments on the manuscript. While reading them, there were two points I'd like to comment:

1) About the figures' quality when printed (printer-friendly version of the discussion manuscript): I am afraid I do not have much control on the figure quality of the discussion manuscripts. Before accepting a manuscript for BGD, if I feel the figures need any improvement, then I send a comment to the authors. For the final manuscript version (after being accepted), the figures should also follow the instructions to the authors shown at http://www.biogeosciences.net/submission/manuscript_preparation.html

C6803

My suggestion here to the authors is to try and enlarge the figures (especially those with CalCS maps and Hovmöller diagrams - when possible) for the revised manuscript version.

2) Unpublished papers (e.g. Nagai et al. 2013, cited by the authors):

According to the instructions to the authors (available at http://www.biogeosciences.net/submission/manuscript_preparation.html), it is accepted by BGD to have manuscripts in preparation to be cited by the authors. Here is a quote from BGD's web site:

"Papers should make proper and sufficient reference to the relevant formal literature. Informal or so-called "grey" literature may only be referred to if there is no alternative from the formal literature. Works cited in a manuscript should be accepted for publication or published already. These references have to be listed alphabetically at the end of the manuscript under the first author's name. Works "submitted to", "in preparation", "in review", or only available as preprint should also be included in the reference list. Please do not use bold or italic writing for in-text citations or in the reference list. "

In this case I don't see why the authors shouldn't cite Nagai et al. My question here to the authors is: since you submitted your manuscript, were there changes in the Nagai paper status? If yes, then the Nagai reference in the manuscript should be updated.

I hope this helps the authors and reviewer #2.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 14043, 2013.

C6804