

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Two High-Nutrient Low-Chlorophyll phytoplankton assemblages: the tropical central Pacific and the offshore Perú-Chile Current” by F. Gómez et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 20 July 2007

I have read the manuscript and I have very little to add to the comment already posted except for the following:

The methods explain that several groups of phytoplankton were not well preserved (eg cryptophytes and coccolithophorids). I therefore don't understand how it is possible for the authors to calculate relative abundances of other species, and in turn compare stations or regions. That is, how is it possible to say that P-N delicatissima accounted for more than 85% of the community if significant sections of the community were not counted. Perhaps this is just a point of misunderstanding on my part, in which case the authors should clarify. However, if I am understanding the preservation issues correctly

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

and their influence on calculations of relative abundance, the conclusions of the paper are invalid.

One other point: The discussion of domoic acid (p 1548) is not relevant because there is no suggestion that there was any production of domoic acid at any of their stations. They did not measure it.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 4, 1535, 2007.

BGD

4, S928–S929, 2007

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper