Biogeosciences Discuss., 6, C1306–C1307, 2009
www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/6/C1306/2009/

Biogeosciences Discussions

Interactive comment on "Coastal hypoxia responses to remediation" *by* W. M. Kemp et al.

R. Diaz (Referee)

diaz@vims.edu

Received and published: 28 July 2009

Additional Literature: Baird, D., R.R. Christian, C.H. Peterson, G.A. Johnson. 2004. Consequences of hypoxia on estuarine ecosystem function: Energy diversion from consumers to microbes. Ecol. Appl. 14:805-822.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 6, 6889, 2009.



FIG. 3. Calculated summertime hypoxic volumes for Chesapeake Bay during 1950–2001 as reported in Table 3 and corresponding model predictions calculating using observed river flow (Eq. 1). Trend lines indicate model-predicted (e.g., 1) hypoxic volumes assuming low winter–spring average Susquehanna River flow (1,300 m^3 s^{-1}), average flow (1,700 m^3 s^{-1}), and high flow (2,100 m^3 s^{-1}). Note the differences in y-axis scales.

Figure B. From Hagy et al. 2004.

Fig. 1. Figure B for Kemp et al. review

BGD
6, C1306–C1307, 2009