Biogeosciences Discuss., 4, S1315–S1316, 2007 www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/4/S1315/2007/ © Author(s) 2007. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons License.



BGD

4, S1315–S1316, 2007

Interactive Comment

Interactive comment on "Ocean biogeochemistry exhibits contrasting responses to a large scale reduction in dust deposition" *by* A. Tagliabue et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 7 September 2007

General Comments on Tagliabue et al. This is a well-written and straightforward paper. -The finding that simulated reductions in Fe (via dust) influx show a lower sensitivity of ecosystem response than previous studies is certainly of interest. I cannot comments on the methods used for the modeling, as I am not a modeler.

Specific Comments In the end, I am left wondering which models, and which results, to believe: Those that have suggested relatively significant impacts (to ocean biogeochemistry and C cycling, for instance) of changes in dust flux, or those that (like this one) suggest minimal impacts. I appreciate the authors? caveats regarding the sensitivities of model results to particular model inputs (eg. importance of atmospheric deposition vs. other inputs, etc); I felt that they presented their results, and contrasted results with other models, in a very honest and straightforward manner. I can only



Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

echo their statement that ?Notwithstanding, observational estimates of sedimentary Fe fluxes, as well as their geographic variability and the bioavailability of the Fe supplied, remain sparse (but see: Elrod et al., 2004; Lam et al., 2006, Blain et al., 2007) and require further investigation.? Ultimately, I will reserve judgment on the importance of Fe on ocean biogeochemistry until we have sufficient data to further constrain the models. One other comment: Geologically speaking, 140 years is exceedingly brief; That is, changes in aeolian input in the geologic past, extending beyond the LGM, could have been much greater than supposed, and might pose a different challenge to the model results. I would appreciate more discussion of the influence of time on model results.

Technical Corrections I found very few needed corrections; the writing is clear. There are minor issues with hyphenation and so forth.

BGD

4, S1315–S1316, 2007

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 4, 2525, 2007.