

Interactive comment on “Insignificant enhancement of export flux in the highly productive Subtropical Front, east of New Zealand: a high resolution study of particle export fluxes based on ^{234}Th : ^{238}U disequilibria” by K. Zhou et al.

C. Jeandel (Referee)

Catherine.Jeandel@legos.obs-mip.fr

Received and published: 20 November 2011

This work presents numerous data of good quality allowing an estimate of the POC export flux within different water masses across the Chatham rise, east of New Zealand. Despite a significant natural fertilization of the area, the results evidence a low export. The paper is clearly written, well argued and illustrated and surely deserves to be published in *Bioscience*, after minor corrections listed below.

- Because of the paradoxical low export in this area, I suggest to the authors to change

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



the title in order to underline the contrast between the natural fertilization and the weak export.

- I would explicitly represent the Chatham rise on the figure, and improve the symbols representing the station within their different contexts.
- In the abstract, please specify what "low" and "high" salinity means.
- methodology: Did the authors participate to any analytical intercalibration as the recent Geotraces one? What is the reproducibility of their data? How were the error bars determined? Should be more explicit.
- Figures: there are many figures and all are not always explicit. For example, in order to visualize the Th and POC export fluxes in the different contexts, I prefer to see histograms instead of interpolated coloured maps...
- Are there other ancillary parameters as dissolved Si in order to assess the argument on the activities of diatoms in the area, at this season?
- mesozooplanktonic activity is considered as the most likely actor limiting the export here; what about macro-nutrient (ex: Si) limitation?
- the authors should check thoroughly the references (or change of software!) because there are many small errors in the reference list.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 8, 9535, 2011.

BGD

8, C4506–C4507, 2011

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

