Biogeosciences Discuss., 11, C7663–C7664, 2014
www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/11/C7663/2014/


Biogeosciences
Discussions
Open Access

# *Interactive comment on* "Flux variations and vertical distributions of microzooplankton (Radiolaria) in the western Arctic Ocean: environmental indices in a warming Arctic" *by* T. Ikenoue et al.

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 28 December 2014

Please see the attached file. I am willing to read the revised manuscript.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
http://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/11/C7663/2014/bgd-11-C7663-2014-supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 11, 16645, 2014.



**Summary of reviewer's comment**

This paper is the key paper to understand the marine siliceous-test bearing Rhizaria in the Arctic Ocean. The result is so interesting that potential readers to *Biogeoscience* will recognized the value of this manuscript. However, it is unfortunate that this manuscripts have many problems: (i) this manuscript has forgotten citing many important references in the Arctic polycystines; (ii) some terminologies are not precise more or less; (iii) discussion includes many unscientific opinions; and (iv) some points leave scope for misunderstanding as an act of injustice. Although I am positive to be published, these four points must be revised for acceptance.

I will make comments and suggestions to help the authors accept this manuscript.

**Summary of the comments**

**(i) Insufficient citation of the previous publications**

Although the papers regarding on the Arctic polycystines are a few, several important papers are massing. Bernstein (1931, 1932, 1934) and Meunier (1910) are very informative for your study. Dolan et al. (2014) is of particular importance. Dolan et al. (2014) studied the surface water plankton samples from summer 2011 and 2012 in the Chukchi Sea and this paper noted the abundance of radiolarians (*Amphimelissa setosa*) is quite low in 2012, compared with 2011. You must refer this paper and discuss something in your manuscript because the studied period is overlapped each other.

Kosobokova et al. (2002) is also much related with your manuscript.

**(ii) Some terminologies are not precise more or less**

**(ii)-a "Radiolaria**

As the authors said, the term "Radiolaria" is problematic. The author used the term "radiolaria" which includes Phaeodaria (p. 16652, Lines 1- 3: To avoid complications…", but this treatment has no scientific reason. Rather than, this still makes confusions to

1

**Fig. 1.**