

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

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



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.

BGD

10, C895–C896, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C896

