



Interactive comment on “Seasonal dynamics of *Pseudocalanus minutus elongatus* and *Acartia* spp. in the southern Baltic Sea (Gdańsk Deep) – numerical simulations” by L. Dzierzbicka-Głowacka et al.

L. Dzierzbicka-Głowacka et al.

Received and published: 15 September 2006

Answers to the referee comments:

All the comments of the Referee were exhausted in detail in the corrected manuscript. I hope that the rewritten manuscript demonstrates less of the topographical, grammatical and spelling errors.

(Anonymous Referee 2)

In my opinion in the section 6 “Results” should be the numerical simulations only - the results of paper; however , reports comparisons between sampling and numerical

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

experiments should be in the section 7 “Discussion”.

In my opinion Section 4 should be as independent section, because it is very important part.

I agree that Section 6 should be reorganised. Subsections 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 follow directly 6.1; in this case instead of 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 should be subsections 6.2 and 6.3, respectively. Hence the lines 4 to 6 in page 1173 should be writing at the end of the section 3 (in page 1164 after the line 17).

Page 1160/25-26 The meteorological and physical submodels were detailed discussed in the papers (Dzierzbicka-Glowacka 2005b, 2006a) - see page 1160/14

Page 11650-15 The point of view of the authors about the correlation between egg production and phytoplankton standing stocks is given at page 1168/1-4. In my opinion these relations are not explicitly and are hard to obtain. Food concentration clearly has no effect on egg production. Egg production dependent on temperature and food availability simultaneously; hence, at the same temperature it may be correlated with phytoplankton concentration for some species.

Page 1177/24-26 a short explanation the range of variability of the chlorophyll depending on the conversion factor can be find in paper at Fig. 10; hence at Page 1177/16 instead of (Fig.4.2.4 of Witek 1993) should be (see Fig. 10).

Page 1179/6-8 should be: “The results obtained here are differ than these given by Mudrak (2004) and Maritime Branch Materials (2000) probably as a results of predation, which is proportional to the increase in predator biomass. ”

Table 1. I agree that there is an error in the equation of evolution of detritus concentration. The diffusive term must have a partial derivative respect the z variable instead the partial derivative respect the time.

Technical corrections:

BGD

3, S533–S535, 2006

Interactive
Comment

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

EGU

Should be: Page 1161/9 - as possible

Page 1162/3 - heterotrophic protists

Page 1167/20 - Pseudocalanus

Page 1177/11 - for phytoplankton

Page 1181/21 - instead of "My" should be "Our"

I would like to express my thanks to the Referee for his very instructive and profound comments.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 3, 1157, 2006.

BGD

3, S533–S535, 2006

Interactive
Comment

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)