Biogeosciences
Discussions

EGU
Open Access

Interactive comment on "Estimation of nutrient contributions from the ocean across a river basin using stable isotope analysis" *by* K. Nakayama et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 7 January 2016

The authors are clearly writing in English as a second language, and should perhaps consult a copy-editor for help with the ms. It was, quite honestly, hard for me to get past the poor grammar and sentence structure to see the scientific merit of the ms. It may be there, but I think a full revision, and a new submission, is potentially warranted.

1) Scientific Significance Does the manuscript represent a substantial contribution to scientific progress within the scope of this journal (substantial new concepts, ideas, methods, or data)?

Fair to Good: Hard to evaluate due to English language and grammar issues. The MS should be recast with the help of a copy-editor and re-submitted.

2) Scientific Quality Are the scientific approach and applied methods valid? Are the results discussed in an appropriate and balanced way (consideration of related work, including appropriate references)?

Fair to Good: Hard to evaluate due to English language and grammar issues. The MS should be recast with the help of a copy-editor and re-submitted.

3) Presentation Quality Are the scientific results and conclusions presented in a clear, concise, and well structured way (number and quality of figures/tables, appropriate use of English language)?

Fair to Good: Hard to evaluate due to English language and grammar issues. The MS should be recast with the help of a copy-editor and re-submitted.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, 18185, 2015.