

Interactive comment on “Biogeochemistry of a large and deep tropical lake (Lake Kivu, East Africa): insights from a stable isotope study covering an annual cycle” by C. Morana et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 9 March 2015

The authors derive conclusions about lake Kivu being autotrophic from the seasonal pattern in ^{13}DIC and other limnological concentration data. I am concerned with their definition of and proof for autotrophy in lake Kivu. Autotrophy means the ratio of primary production (PP)/respiration (R) > 1 . Because $\text{PP} + \text{I} = \text{O} + \text{B} + \text{R}$, this means that in autotrophic lakes $\text{PP} - \text{R} = \text{O} + \text{B} - \text{I} > 0$, which means $\text{O} + \text{B} > \text{I}$, with O = organic carbon out through outflow, B = sediment burial of organic carbon, I = organic carbon inputs from catchment (allochthonous carbon). Please note that from the equations it follows that autotrophy means that the ratio of PP / I (= autochthonous / allochthonous carbon inputs) $> \text{R} / (\text{O} + \text{B})$. Therefore, true autotrophy cannot be demonstrated (or refuted) by the results shown in this paper. At best you can say that from the results,

C9013

it seems 'likely' the lake is autotrophic. See Verburg 2007 (Verburg, P., 2007. The need to correct for the Suess effect in the application of ^{13}C as a productivity proxy in sediment of autotrophic Lake Tanganyika in the anthropocene. *J. Paleolimnology* 37:591–602. DOI 10.1007/s10933-006-9056-z) for a treatment of this subject. Lastly, indicate whether the % cyanobacteria is a % of abundance (cell numbers) or of biomass (Figs 5 and 7)

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 11, 17227, 2014.

C9014