

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 #1

Received and published: 10 April 2013

All comments/questions in the initial review were satisfactorily addressed. As stated before, this is an interesting paper containing important new data.

The only criticism I have is the long waiting period (5-6 months) before the relatively short-lived Sr-89 was analysed, while I have a question about the origin of the Sr-90 results presented in Table 1.

If I understand the paper correctly, the samples were analysed for Sr-90 by two laboratories (see Sections 2.2 and 2.3). The first laboratory (Barcelona) separated Y-90 and in this manner quantified Sr-90. The second laboratory (Seville) received the supernatants from this analysis (still containing the original Sr-89 and Sr-90) and subsequently quantified both radioisotopes in a slightly different way. However, in Table 1 only one set of Sr-90 results is presented (while the Sr-89 results must originate from C895

the laboratory in Seville). Are the reported Sr-90 results in Table 1 from the first laboratory (Barcelona), and if yes, how do they compare with the set of secondary Sr-90 results from Seville (if this is the case it raises another question why the Sr-89/Sr-90 ratio determinations were not derived from the Seville results only, as this would eliminate any potential issues with the Sr-recovery)? Or alternatively, does Table 1 contain a mixture of Sr-90 results provided by both laboratories (in which case the origin of the results should be indicated)?

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