

Interactive comment on “Recolonization of the intertidal and shallow subtidal community following the 2008 eruption of Alaska’s Kasatochi Volcano” by S. C. Jewett and G. S. Drew

M G Chapman (Referee)

gee@bio.usyd.edu.au

Received and published: 3 September 2014

I cannot see this manuscript as a scientific paper because it contains essentially no data, the sampling design is minimal, so it is unlikely that useful data could be collected and the analyses are irrelevant. It purports to be about recolonization of the intertidal and shallow subtidal community on an island after a volcanic eruption. With respect to the intertidal area, only 1 height was sampled on 6 permanent transects, with $n = 3$ small quadrats at that height, containing a mix of sedimentary or hard substrata. 3 transects were sampled in sand in 2009 and there was no sampling after this. Over the next few years, there are only anecdotal descriptions of some intertidal species

C4887

in unspecified locations. These data are of no scientific value in assessing recovery of the intertidal areas. Similarly, subtidally, at only 1 depth, there were 3 sets of 3 nested quadrats designed for each transect, but the only data described are sediments from 5 transects in the first year. How one analyses 3 categories of sediment (all non-independent, by the way) to get a single ANOVA result is not clear, unless this was a multivariate analysis. But, nonetheless, there were no differences in sediments. Differences are claimed for fauna, but there is little value in comparing number of individuals across sites, when they come from a variety of taxa. There are no other subtidal data from equivalent sampling at subsequent times. The comparison with another island, sampled at a different depth, is completely anecdotal. There are some purely anecdotal statements about cover of kelp and from observations with the splashcam. The observations on foraging birds have nothing to do with intertidal and subtidal communities. The information included in this manuscript is subjective, anecdotal and does not make a scientific manuscript.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 11, 3799, 2014.

C4888