

Interactive
Comment

***Interactive comment on* “Regional variability of acidification in the Arctic: a sea of contrasts” by E. E. Popova et al.**

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 2 April 2013

I appreciate that the authors are planning to address the critical methodological problems in their (otherwise interesting) study in a reasonable way.

I anticipate that the two additional simulations, one with fixed preindustrial pCO₂ and one with fixed preindustrial climate, will resolve issue 1. Additionally, I think that comparing the two new simulations could add an interesting point to the paper by discussing the similarity/difference between the two approaches to separate climate- and direct geochemical effects on ocean acidification.

I see the points of the authors regarding issue 2 and I am willing to accept their approach as long as it is clearly stated in the revised manuscript that they use an ocean-only model and if the consequences of not using a fully coupled ESM are discussed.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Issue 3 is indeed the most challenging and I don't know which would be the best approach here. Nevertheless, I encourage the authors to try the proposed method and I am looking forward to see what the results are.

In summary, I think that the proposed way forward is reasonable and will likely lead to a more robust paper that is acceptable for publication in Biogeosciences. That said, there is of course no guarantee for this and a second round of review will be necessary.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 2937, 2013.

BGD

10, C696–C697, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C697

