Biogeosciences Discuss., 5, S725–S732, 2008
www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/5/S725/2008/

Biogeosciences Discussions

Interactive comment on "Importance of dissolved organic nitrogen in the North Atlantic Oceanin sustaining primary production: a 3-D modelling approach" *by* G. Charria et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 3 June 2008

1. *General Comments:*

The manuscript studies the impact of transport of semi-labile dissolved organic matter for primary production in the North Atlantic Ocean using a 3D-biogeochemical model of intermediate complexity. From their study the authors conclude that lateral supply of DON might be important in closing the N-budget over the Atlantic Ocean and sustaining primary production in the oligotrophic gyre.

The study builds on earlier, well recognized, work by the Toulouse modelling group and gets off to study in detail the relevance of DON transport for primary production distribution in the North Atlantic, in particular PP in the subtropical gyre, and the transport

processes and source regions of DON. The importance of DON transport had been suggested earlier (papers by Ric Williams and Mick Follows and co-workers), but this study provides an important addition to this discussion. The paper convinces with a very detailed (almost complete, but see below) model-data comparison and a sensitivity study of relevant parameters for DON dynamics.

I suggest publication in BG after moderate improvements.

Major critics:

For a paper concerned with the importance of DON transports for production, I missed a more detailed comparison with DON data. As the manuscript stands, the comparison is just some 10 lines (section 4.4) and no figures.

I am aware of the problem that DON data are still not very abundant, however, there are several published data sets, f.e. in Vidal et al., 1999; 2003; Kähler and Koeve, 2001, Roussenov et al. 2005, Knapp et al. 2005; likely others as well, please search the literature). This lack of a, in the context of this paper most needed, quantitative data-model comparison is surprising. The authors conclude that DON transport is a significant nitrogen flux in their model NA, they demonstrate this f.e. by showing various DON transformations and fluxes (Fig. 9a, c, 10, 11), however they don't even show the model distribution of (semilabile) DON, nor data-model comparison. Providing this material is significant to support the manuscript's conclusions on the importance of DON transport, relative to other processes. I strongly suggest to add this material.

So far, the DON transport hypothesis is mainly supported by evaluating the physical aspect of transport as such, i.e. through analysing the distribution of T, S etc. it is confirmed that water transports are reasonable, to the extend that distributions of T and S can judge this. The transport of a tracer, however, is given by the physical transport combined with the tracer distribution, I regard it fundamental to provide an analysis of the tracer distribution (model & data).

BGD

5, S725–S732, 2008

In fact there are some aspects of the paper, f.e. the mismatch of observed, satellite and modelled higher latitude (ARCT, SARC, NADR) primary production, which are largely unexplained. This model feature could be due to too vigorous export of semilabile DON from nutrient rich parts of the North Atlantic, an analysis of the regional DON distribution could help to exclude this possibility.

2. Specific Comments

Introduction (section 1):

Sources of primary production in the subtropical gyre are discussed (DIN-, DON transport, N2-fixation). The major source of N (80-90%) of oligotrophic primary production, however, is NH4, being recycled by zooplankton (and bacteria). Either this should be mentioned clearly, or the introduction should be re-written to discuss nutrients sustaining new/export production, I guess this is what the authors like to refer to, hence relevant references are missing and need to be added as well (f.e. work of Jenkins). - Also atmospheric fluxed might be worth mentioning as a potential N source to oligotrophic waters, see Duce et al., 2008, Science, for a recent review.

Material and Methods (section 2):

Add a table with source-minus-sinks (SMS) equations, please. In particular in view of the open access character of BG and the fact that the paper you refer to as source for SMS equations is not open access. Also the paper by Huret et al. 2005 is in sigma co-ordinates and this one is in Z co-ordinates.

p1731, l 12ff: Regarding the parameters chosen (see also remarks to Table 1) the manuscript refers to Huret (2005) and Oschlies and Garcon, 1999, and concerning this implementation to the thesis of the 1st author. Though details may be in any of the two thesis mentioned, I would like to see some mentioning of the physiological significance of the chosen parameters.

Model-data comparison (section 4):

BGD

5, S725–S732, 2008

Section 4.2 (Nitrate and chl-a): Given the huge model-data mean difference in nitrate at BATS (3.3 mmol m-3), which is explained by weak representation of the western boundary current, is the use of this station for biogeochemical model-data comparison in the context of this paper meaningful? I expect that in the model the BATS location is not an oligotrophic station at all, right? This leads to the general problem that for explicit stations or sections (see f.e. also text on AMT6, 36.6N) improper representation of the circulation field translate into huge differences for nutrients (and chl-a). So how to deal with this general problem? The authors could perhaps discuss this methodolocal aspect of data-model comparison a bit further.

Section 4.4 (DON at BATS and EUMELI): I miss some details here. Please give references for the DON data used. In M+M you give Steinberg et al. for BATS, certainly not appropriate for BATS DON. The same for EUMELI, the reference to the Morel et al. paper does not provide a reference to a description of the DON data from EUMELI. More importantly, it needs to be explained how the refractory fractions at both stations (and AMT) are identified. Reading section 4.4 I learn only about differences between model and data and the standard deviations of both. No details concerning the absolute concentrations of semilabile DON, except for the AMT transect for which a range is given, are provided. As mentioned above, a more detailed evaluation and comparison with data is needed for semilablile DON.

p 1737/1738, discussion of Table 2: see my general remark on Table 2 (below); also the text is weak here: 'f.e. BF97 is based on 1971 to 1994 measurements, AM96 on 1978-1986 data', etc.; this is partly wrong partly, difficult to understand.

Role of DON (section 6):

The model does not differentiate between NO_3 and NH_4uptake (Figure 1). In oligotrophic regions, however, tracer uptake experiments have indicated that 90% of inorganic nutrient uptake is sustained by NH4, where the implicit assumption was that this NH4 is locally regenerated by zooplankton. Model results suggest that nitrogen fluxes

BGD

5, S725–S732, 2008

from semilabile DON to DIN (not NO3, as indicated in figure captions of 9a,b) clearly dominate zooplankton excretion (ZOO to NH4 in reality, ZOO to DIN in the model) by up to one order of magnitude. This questions either the concept of the dominance of locally regenerated nutrients (on time scales of days) for primary production in oligotrophic waters, or the concept of semilabile DON. The authors should clearly state this and discuss it further.

Sensitivity study for DON (section 5):

Two remarks. First, only a comparison with the standard model is given in Fig. 8. Thus we learn about the strength of the varied parameters, but not whether increasing (decreasing) one parameter improves the model with respect to the DON data distribution (or other data distributions). (Again the suggestion for more model-data comparison for DON data.) Second, an additional experiment excluding all DON related processes could be informative: how worse do nitrate and chl-a fields get, compared to observations?

3. Misc:

1730, l 10, give proper scientific reference for the MERCATOR project, web site references are fluent and should only be given in addition to scientific references

1731, l 4-6: please give a reference for the concept on refractory, semi labile, labile DON; f.e. Anderson & Williams 1999 (GBC), or references given therein (their introduction).

1731, l 7; I think the reference of Huret et al. 2005 is misleading here, Huret did not work with the MNATL, right?

1731. l 23: 'is nutrient limited', be more specific here, please

1732, l 5: how is the initial DON concentration (3 mmol N m^{-3}) justified

1733, l 26: correlation coefficient 'is above 90%'; correlation coefficients are between

BGD

5, S725–S732, 2008

Interactive Comment

0 and 1

1741, l 8: 'let's examine': slang!

1741/2: 'This analysis showed that ... (not shown).' a little awkward formulation

Tables/Figure: [Please note that I refer to the printer-friendly version when commenting on quality of figures. There is a tendency with BG manuscripts to present very tiny graphics (graphics with tiny details, captions, lables, etc.), for which details can only be seen on the screen after zooming in. As many people still prefer to read printed papers, I suggest to stick to reasonable quality levels also for these.] In general figure of this manuscript are characterized by often tiny labels and partly (Fig. 8, 9) in-figure captions that duplicate information given in the legend. Work is needed to optimize figures for print and screen reading. Please check carefully.

Table 1: Comparing with Huret, I find that most of the parameters relevant to DON SMS are different from the 2005 paper. Please give a short justification and provide references for all chosen parameter values, if possible pointing to experimental work supporting your choices (i.e. physiological meaningfullness).

Table 2: The column 'JGOFS' refers to data published in Ducklow (2003), however, checking his Table 1.4 I find that most of the numbers cited in this manuscript are from the 'Original estimates' column, which gives numbers as estimated by Longhurst et al. 1995, and are NOT based on JGOFS data. (Exception is for NASW.) Please correct.

Fig. 2. Datasets 1-4 share the same symbol and are differentiated by different colours. F.e. red-green bad eyesighted people will not be able to follow. Use clear symbols / or show cruise tracks as lines with cruise identifiers shown in the figure.

Figs. (2), 3 & 6 could benefit from choosing identical symbols (colors), to the extend possible. Please optimize.

Fig.3: 50% of the symbols are basically invisible in the printout due to wrong colour

BGD

5, S725–S732, 2008

and small symbols. Please improve.

Fig. 4, nitrate panel: 'Colour' scale can be optimized by inverting the scale and also isolines to highlighting the 0-10 uM range (or so).

Fig. 5, nitrate panel: similar to Fig. 4; also indicate month of observation in the legend

Fig. 6, like Fig. 3, some of the symbols are basically invisible in the printout

Fig. 8: Some of the text in the figure is basically too tiny to read, f.e. x-, y-axes labels. This is obviously due to the way BG organizes figures (one figure per half page). Having five Taylor plots and an extensive lengend makes up a figure which ends up being very much useless. BG needs to have more flexibility here! Unless this is not possible, however, it is in the responsibility of the authors to make sure that the reader can access the full information from the printed figure.

Symbols could be better explained (what is MUD? one has to guess; please use the same terms as in Table 3) . Also the small texts in the figure (f.e. a) Sensitivity Run for DIN surface concentrations; etc.) are repetitions of the information given in the legend, they use lab slang (P, Z, DIN, D, and partly are tiny 'eye powder'. Leave out details, just give a), b) etc.

Plot radials, like in Fig. 3

Fig. 9: again tiny labels (units, captions)

4. Language:

I (not a native English speaker myself) sometime found awkward expressions, some of which sound a little French English. Please check carefully and consult adequate advice. Examples, which I picked, not complete:

Leg. Fig. 3: "proportional to their distance appart"

Leg. Fig 8: "simulation of reference"

BGD

5, S725–S732, 2008

1729, l 4/5; “extension of the gyre is important”, you mean that N fluxes in the gyre can be quantitatively relevant due to the large extension of the gyre, right? improve, please

1730. l 18, lie? I think ‘are lying’ is more appropriate

BGD

5, S725–S732, 2008

Interactive Comment