

Interactive comment on “Ash leachates from some recent eruptions of Mount Etna (Italy) and Popocatépetl (Mexico) volcanoes and their impact on amphibian living freshwater organisms” by M. D’Addabbo et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 22 October 2015

General comment

The manuscript "Ash leachates from some recent eruptions of Mount Etna (Italy) and Popocatépetl (Mexico) volcanoes and their impact on amphibian living freshwater organisms" by D’Addabbo et al. provides a good instance of integrated (geochemical-biological) study of the impact of the volcanic ash deposits on lake water chemistry and amphibian biota. Analytical methods are well described and high quality data are presented and discussed properly. In general, the manuscript is well-written and well structured. Summarising, subject and data make this manuscript surely suitable for

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Biogeosciences, and, therefore, in my opinion it deserves to be published. I only find very little to disagree. My minor, mainly stylistic comments are listed below.

Technical corrections

Page 13246, lines 10-13: the sentence which introduces the method procedures is not proper for the introduction.

Page 13250 to 13254: sections 3, 4 and 5 describe the results of analyses and experiments. I suggest to group these under a unique section titled “4 Results”. So sections 3, 4 and 5 become 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3, respectively, and thus the sub-sections 4.1, 4.2, . . . , will be 4.2.1, 4.2.1. This would make more clear for the readers the content and the matter treated in the sections.

Page 13250, lines 2-3: it is useless and redundant repeat here the methods that are widely described before, in the proper section. This apply also to the first sentence of the page 13251.

Page 13254: The discussion section begins with two paragraphs which generally discuss the results. It is however not numbered and titled. I suggest to reorganize this part as follow:

5 Discussion

5.1 General remark (for instance)

5.2 Origin of leached elements

. . . and so on

Figure 5 to 9: legends in these figures are uselessly duplicate and the symbols of the mQ water and lake water are often hardly readable.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, 13241, 2015.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

