

Interactive comment on “Ocean dynamic processes causing spatially heterogeneous distribution of sedimentary caesium-137 massively released from the Fukushima Dai-ichi Nuclear Power Plant” by H. Higashi et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 9 September 2015

The authors employed complex model for Cs-137 concentration in seawater and sediment to represent the spatially heterogeneous distribution in sediment. I don't agree with their results of total amount of Cs-137 in sediment which is 10 times larger than previous estimated value based on observation. Main problem is that they only considered sedimentation and resuspension process in a similar manner to Europe. In Fukushima case, very high concentration of Cs-137 passed through on the sediment in the earlier period. Therefore, absorption and desorption process on sediment is dominant (Otosaka and Kobayashi, 2013). Sediment properties is a major factor of

C5124

Cs-137 on absorption and desorption process. They did not considered these dominant process. They simulated the sedimentation rates of Cs-137. The sedimentation rates were observed by sediment trap (Honda et al., Biogeosciences, 2013; Buesseler et al., ES & T, 2015). They should validate the sedimentation rates in comparison with observed data if they believe that sedimentation process is dominant. I think their simulated sedimentation rates are overestimated to observed value. If they simulate more than 2 or 3 years, difference between observation and their simulation is getting larger. Because their model focus on sedimentation process which is not dominant in Fukushima case.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, 12713, 2015.

C5125