

Interactive comment on “Bathypelagic particle flux signatures from a suboxic eddy in the oligotrophic tropical North Atlantic: production, sedimentation and preservation” by G. Fischer et al.

G. Fischer et al.

gerhard.fischer@uni-bremen.de

Received and published: 17 March 2016

We thank C. Panagiotopoulos (Reviewer #1) for the constructive comments and for the time and effort spent reviewing our manuscript.

RC: General Comments However, I found the paper too long (maybe this is also due to the numerous parameters measured in this study which is not necessarily bad), especially the discussion section, which I had to read slowly to understand the information the authors were trying to deliver. I believe that this section should be reorganized and shorten along the lines given in summary (page 18284). In fact, I got most of the information by reading the summary and then I went back and read again the discussion.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Finally, I believe that although the major outputs of this study are well summarized in Fig.10, the latter figure is only discussed in the summary section. This was really unfortunate as it hampers the possibility to the reader to have an overview of this study along with the discussion of the results. Moreover, I believe that the conclusions and outlook should also be moved to discussion section and elaborated along with the author's results. Please consider my following comments while revising your MS. AC We agree with Dr. Panagiotopoulos that the Discussion is rather long and might be confusing for a reader less familiar with the issues discussed. This is partly due to the comprehensive, multi-parameter study and the discussion of ACME's effect on deep ocean fluxes. Following his suggestions, the Discussion is now reorganized along the lines given in the summary and shortened. In addition, Fig. 10 (summarizing sketch) was moved from the Summary to the Discussion section as suggested. This scheme is in part an oversimplification of the main findings, therefore we originally put it in the final (summary) part. Other sections were shortened as well (introduction, see below).

RC: Minor comments with short answers from authors (1) Abstract: As a general rule it is good idea to give in the abstract the values of the measured parameters so that the reader is not obliged to look for them inside the paper. line 7, page 18255 : give the values of the mass fluxes line 8, page 18255: same for BSi and organic carbon line 17, page 18255 : same for $\delta^{15}N$ page 18256, line 6: Give the values of the carbonate fluxes

The values are now given

(2) Abstract : line 24, page 18255. Give an example to support your statement. What kind indication do you mean ?

e.g. from diatom association, this is now explained

(3) Abstract: line 26 page 18255- line 2 page 18256. Please rephrase this sentence, it is not clear.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

It has been rephrased

(4) Abstract: lines 10-12, page 18256. The abstract lacks of an overall conclusion of your study. Is this statement your final conclusion ?

Yes, this has been rephrased

(5) Introduction, C9200 page 18256, line 15: There is no need to indicate the name of the stations (BATS, HOT etc) because you indicate Atlantic & Pacific ocean by giving the references as well. Please also delete “e.g.” and do not provide an overwhelming amount of references (max 3-4; the most recent by preference).

This has been changed.

(6) Introduction page 18256, line 17. Delete “e.g”

done

(7) Introduction page 18256 line 21. Delete the coordinates of the EUMELI site, too much info.

done

(8) Introduction page 18257 line 25. We used monthly catches. (Since the experiment is over now use past tense).

done

(9) Introduction page 18257, line 28. Same as above (use past tense). “allowed us”

done

(10) Introduction page 18258 lines 4-9. Please delete. This repeats what is said before in the same paragraph (18257 page, lines 24-).

done

(11) Introduction page 18258, lines 10-15. Does this experiment/project has a name?

C10220

BGD

12, C10218–C10224,
2016

[Interactive
Comment](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



If so, just mention quickly the name of the project without giving references. Example: Our work is a contribution to the “ X” project that aims to explore ecology, physical processes etc in low oxygen eddies. As general rule please shorten your sentences. There is no need for such detail info unless you feel that this is crucial for the readers to understand your context. The above info may alternatively be included in the acknowledgement section.

We removed this part and shortened this section considerably.

(12) Oceanographic, biological and atmospheric setting at the CVOO. This section should merged and shorten if possible with in the Materials & Methods (3.1).

We shortened this section 2 but did not merge it with M&M. This section 2 is a description (oceanography, atmospheric setting etc.) of the study area. The section 3.1. (the CVOO) is a description of the methods applied at CVOO-3.

(13) Page 18258, line 26: See comment 8. Showed mostly . . .
done

(14) Page 18258, line 27: . . .was observed. . .
done

(15) Page 18259, line 1: . . .were found. . .
done

(16) page 18259, line 8: Do you mean “exhibit” here instead of develop ?
Yes, done

(17) page 18259, line 20. Delete ballast Theory and give only the Armstrong reference.
done

(18) page 18259, line 25. Delete the coordinates of the EUMELI site because you back

BGD

12, C10218–C10224,
2016

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



it up with the reference Bory et al., 2001.

done

(19) Page 18261, line 10: Delete “eg” and for a review.

done

(20) Page 18261, lines 10-12: Please delete this sentence and include the references Boyd and Trull 2007; Berelson. . . after Buesseler et al., 2007.

changed

(21) Next sentence. We used samples collected on roughly. . . . and March 2011 (Table 1). Delete the next sentence C9201 (detailed sampling analysis is given. . .). Please try to make lighter your sentences and avoid repetition.

Changed and shortened

(22) Page 18261, line 19: Large swimmers were removed manually and /or by filtering carefully. . .

done

(23) Page 18261, line 22: Delete subsequently. (24) Next sentence. Additional methods information is given elsewhere (Fischer and Wefer 1991).

done

(25) Page 18262, lines 14, 16. Use past tense here. (showed, were)

done

(26) 3.4 Coccolithophores studies. -Studies splits ranged from 1/250 to 1/2500 and were filtered. . . . -delete “Schleicher and Schuell 47 mm. Only provide the pore size (0.45 mm). -delete the brand of the electron microscope (too much info).

done

BGD

12, C10218–C10224,
2016

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



(27) 3.5 calcareous zoo studies - delete the brand of the balance and that of the microscope -fluxes mg m⁻² d⁻¹

done

(28) 3.6 Stable isotope ratios. I believe that it was a missed opportunity to perform delta-13C measurements as well. As far as I know Carlo Erba mass spectrometers provide measurements of both isotopes. Was there a reason that such measurement were not performed ? In this section you do not need to give all of these details because it is a common place technique. 1-2 references will do the job along with the analytical error of technique. The purity of gases, the different generated gases by the combustion all this info is unnecessary.

This info will be shortened. The delta-13C-ratios were not measured simultaneously. We believe that these data will not provide additional and clear information on the nutrient cycle.

(29) 3.7 Biomarker studies. Same as 3.6. There is no need for such info. Please state very briefly your analytical protocol including the analysis procedure by giving the appropriate references.

It has been shortened

(30) Page 18268, line 4. In the head title you indicate “Diatom fluxes” and you start the paragraph : Biogenic silica flux showed . . . (You already provided this info in the mass fluxes section; second paragraph). Please advise.

Sentence was removed

(31) Page 18271 line 1. The “Giant Cape Blanc filament” and is characterized changed

(32) Page 18276 line 4. Use past tense (showed) (33) Page 18277 line 12. 200 m d⁻¹

BGD

12, C10218–C10224,
2016

[Interactive
Comment](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



done

(34) Page 18279 line 4. What is CC ?? (35) Page 18281 line 20. 5.1 km d-1. Use everywhere d-1 .C9202

CC=Canary Current, has been explained before, but fully written here again
changed

RC 35: Conclusions and outlook. Although I enjoyed this part of the paper I believe it is out place and should be moved to discussion section and discussed along with your results.

AC : We suggest keeping this section (Conclusions and Outlook) separated from the Discussion section. The “Summary and Conclusion and Outlooks” sections provide an overview of main findings and perspectives for future work. In our opinion, the Discussion would be even more complex and difficult to organize and to read when including this quite long part ‘Conclusions and Outlook’ in the discussion part.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, 18253, 2015.

BGD

12, C10218–C10224,
2016

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C10224

