

***Interactive comment on* “Observations of dissolved iron concentrations in the World Ocean: implications and constraints for ocean biogeochemical models” by J. K. Moore and O. Braucher**

o. aumont (Referee)

olivier.aumont@ird.fr

Received and published: 22 May 2007

Review of the manuscript entitled "Observations of dissolved iron concentrations in the World Ocean: implications and constraints for ocean biogeochemical models" by Morre and Braucher.

Before beginning the review, I should mention that I have agreed on reviewing both manuscripts submitted by the authors to BGD. However, since these papers are not supposed to be part I and part II papers, they are meant to be independant. As such,

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

I haven't read yet the second paper to avoid, at least for my first review, to have part I and part II reviews ...

My review is not anonymous as from the second review and from my english, I presume it will be pretty obvious to guess who I am (French, global modeler and pretty aware of the Aumont and Bopp (2006) paper).

In this manuscript, the authors have constructed a global compilation of dissolved iron observations. This compilation is based on previous efforts achieved by several modelling groups (Gregg et al., 2003 ; Parekh et al., 2004 ; Aumont and Bopp, 2006) and has been augmented by about 30% relative to the version published by Parekh et al (2004). Several conclusions are drawn from its analysis. First, the distribution of iron is consistent with the conceptual colloidal pumping model of Honeyman and Santschi (1989). Second, two external sources of iron, i.e. dust deposition and mobilization from the sediments, are demonstrated to be critical. Finally, the authors deduce some constraints for the modelling of the iron cycle: basically, significant scavenging and/or coagulation occur for concentrations below 0.6 nM (which is, to some extent, connected to the agreement with the colloidal pumping model).

In the first part of this work, the authors redo and follow quite closely the seminal study by Johnson et al. (1997). However, the database is now much larger and as a consequence, some hypotheses can be now much better addressed. Furthermore, in a second part, the authors deduce some constraints for the modelling of the iron cycle by comparing the database to model outputs, which is quite new and interesting. Thus, I find this work quite interesting and definitely consider it worth to publish. However, I have some major concerns that should be addressed before, which will imply (to my opinion) major revisions.

As I am not a native english speaker, I don't think I am qualified to judge of the quality of the writing.

Major concerns:

My first major concern is about the whole discussion section. I find it quite weak and insufficient. Many arguments are highly speculative and do not appear to be really deduced from the database or the model output. For instance, in the second paragraph of the discussion, the authors present a description of the current knowledge on the iron cycle. It is not really a discussion and it is more or less already said in the introduction. I don't think there is anything new here. Furthermore, this is completely qualitative with no attempt to derive any time constants (for instance) from the observations, on the contrary to previous studies (e.g., Bruland et al., 1994). Furthermore, the authors comment on the different forms of iron in the ocean by quoting the literature. The problem is that I don't understand the objectives of this discussion and how it is related to the database. The only connection I am able to find in the paper is that soluble iron may partly explain the nutrient like profile of iron. So what ?! Finally it is postulated that scavenging should increase above 0.6 to 0.7 nM as ligands become saturated with iron (basically, what was postulated already by Jonhnsen et al., (1997)). The only problem is that in many parts of the ocean, ligands concentrations have been observed to be much higher than 0.6 or 0.7 nM (Boye et al, 2005 ; Cullen et al., 2006 ; ...). Thus, the argument seems to be incorrect. Last point here, the authors claim that surface iron has a bimodal distribution. There is no figure nor statistical analysis to confirm that statement.

My second concern is about the seasonal cycle. The authors mention several times that iron exhibits a strong seasonal cycle in some regions. It would have been interesting to have an analysis (even basic) of this seasonal cycle, when enough data make it possible. It would add value to the study as it has never been done before on the global scale. It would also put some strength on the arguments on the seasonal cycle.

Finally, the result section is not always easy to follow and some parts seem redundant. In the first part of this section, the authors analyse the surface iron distributions using full vertical profiles. Then, a potential relationship between this surface distribution and the magnitude of the dust deposition is looked for. Finally, the rest of the vertical

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

profiles is examined. Not very fluid ... Furthermore, the analysis of the spatial plots is very often a repetition of the analysis of Figure 5.

Specific comments:

Page 1244, lines 20-21: in most current ecosystem models, this is not true anymore as they all include some simple (or less simple) description of the iron complexation with ligands which allows some scavenging below the ligands total concentration (Moore et al., 2004,2006; Parekh et al., 2005; Aumont and Bopp, 2006).

Page 1246, lines 5-10: reversible adsorption is still subject to debate. Some observational studies suggest irreversible adsorption or very slow desorption at the molecular level (Quigley et al., 2001; Santschi et al., 2006; ...).

Methods section: Have you gridded the observations onto the BEC mesh? From page 1249, line 4, it seems to be the case. But it is never said. Furthermore, have you included the total dissolvable iron observations from the database ? Examination of the database (both literature and iron values) suggests that they are not included (which is correct in my opinion) but it should be stated in the text.

Page 1252, lines 8-10: scavenging equations in BEC. The Chigh parameter has been drastically changed since Moore et al. (2004). In fact, I don't really understand that value (perhaps it is better explained in the other submitted manuscript). If I assume the Dfe is in nM, then Fescave is extremely high (more than 1714/d). If it is in nM, then it is extremely low ... Could you explain it a little bit more ?

Page 1253, 1st paragraph: Here are some statements on the seasonal cycle. But no figures to support them (see my general comments).

Page 1253, line 20 and Figures 2: It is hard to follow because the figures are quite difficult to read. A zoom over the top 100-500 meters of the ocean would help the reader.

Page 1254, line 8: definition of the HNLC regions. Your criteria to define the HNLC

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

regions is incomplete as you only use the annual mean NO₃ concentration. With this criteria, you take into account the North Atlantic Ocean, the Benguela upwelling, part of the Arabian Sea, the Mauritanian upwelling, ... which are not exactly HNLC regions. You should use not only NO₃ but also Chla to define HNLC regions (obviously, High Nutrient but also Low Chlorophyll). In that case, the mean iron concentration in the HNLC regions will be certainly lower (by how much, I don't know).

Page 1254, line 26: reference to figure 3 is incorrect. Furthermore, the information could not be read from figure 2 (at least, I can't). See one of my previous specific comments.

Page 1255, lines 1-22: This is basically a description of the dust deposition fields which is not the scope of this paper and has been done elsewhere in other specific studies. You should concentrate on the (quite weak) relationship between iron and dust deposition. Furthermore, some statistical information would be nice.

Page 1256, line 28 : relatively well correlated (figure 5b). It is quite subjective. I would not have said that. In fact, there is much less variability in the model than in the data. You are certainly not very happy with those results otherwise you wouldn't have done the second study (topic of the second manuscript).

Page 1257, lines 1-3: again the seasonal cycle. But you chose not to show the results which is, in my opinion, unfortunate.

Last two paragraphs of page 1257: Many parts here are redundant with the analysis of figure 5.

Discussion section: see my general concerns.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 4, 1241, 2007.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)