

***Interactive comment on* “Technical Note: Constraining stable carbon isotope values of microphytobenthos (C₃ photosynthesis) in the Arctic for application to food web studies” by L. E. Oxtoby et al.**

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 24 January 2014

Technical Note: Constraining stable carbon isotope values of microphytobenthos (C₃ photosynthesis) in the Arctic for application to food web studies L. E. Oxtoby, J. T. Mathis, L. W. Juranek, and M. J. Wooller

The aim of the paper was to have first estimates of the carbon stable isotopic composition of microphytobenthos in the Arctic coastal ocean. These primary producers have been neglected in the Arctic and this type of data could be very useful in future studies on the role of these primary producers in the carbon cycle and food web. δ¹³C ratios in DIC from water samples taken 5 m above the seafloor were determined and

C8213

the model of Laws and Popp was used to estimate δ¹³C ratios of various groups of benthic microalgae. The main conclusion is that microphytobenthos may have similar δ¹³C ratios as phytoplankton, and that the two sources would therefore be difficult to differentiate. As such this is interesting, except that there are major flaws and problems with the approach and assumptions.

These are as follows: 1. There are substantial problems with the DIC composition that was used as a starting point in the calculations. Stable isotopic composition of DIC was determined 5 meters above the seafloor, and it is very unlikely that the benthic microalgae would see DIC with this isotopic composition. The δ¹³C ratio of DIC in the sediment-water interface is affected by DIC from mineralization processes and benthic photosynthesis. As a result, porewater DIC can be substantially more different than overlying waters. 2. The model that was used for estimating isotopic fractionation factors in marine microalgae, has been developed for phytoplankton i.e. cells suspended in water. Benthic microalgae are however growing in dense biofilms that operate more as a closed system. As a result, CO₂ availability will be restricted and actual isotopic fractionation factors reached in benthic microalgae may therefore be much lower than for phytoplankton. 3. Although δ¹³C data may not be available for the Arctic, the data available for more temperate systems suggest that benthic microphytobenthos is heavier (say -11 to -18 ‰) than phytoplankton (around -21 ‰). Several approaches have been used to study the isotopic composition of benthic microalgae: several studies isolated mobile diatoms (e.g. Riera and Richard (1996) *Estuarine Coastal And Shelf Science* 42: 347-360) and others studied FA biomarkers (as proposed by the authors, e.g. Evrard et al (2012) *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 455: 13-31). None of this literature is used in this paper, and would directly indicate that the approach used here is probably flawed. 4. Algal growth rates that were used in the model are derived from phytoplankton. Are these relevant for benthic microalgae?

Basically one can conclude that the authors estimated the isotopic composition of phytoplankton in the Arctic, and not surprisingly they indeed came up with numbers close

C8214

to actual phytoplankton values.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 18151, 2013.

C8215