

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Net community production and stoichiometry of nutrient consumption in a pelagic ecosystem of a northern high latitude fjord: mesocosm CO₂ perturbation study” by A. Silyakova et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 14 September 2012

This paper reports the results of total CO₂ and nutrient drawdown, following nutrient additions, in mesocosms placed in Arctic waters. The experimental design included 7 elevated pCO₂ bags and 2 controls (ambient pCO₂).

The paper is well organized, and the data clearly presented. Unfortunately, I don't know how to relate the results of the mesocosm experiments to what might happen in nature with increasing pCO₂. The experimental outcomes were variable throughout various phases of the time course experiment. In considering the significance of these findings in a natural setting, I don't know if I should be considering the final incubation results

C4003

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



(at day 27), or those at the end of one of the experimental phases.

It is the responsibility of the authors to tell the readers how we should interpret the significance of the results. At present, the paper is more of a 'data dump' than it is an advance of our understanding of the system. The Summary simply restates the findings, and the findings are limited to quantifications, but no insights. The reader needs better guidance from the authors as to the real world/ocean meaning of the results. I do not object to this article being published since it is apparently complementing several other papers in a special issue. But to have some impact the article needs to do a better job of standing on its own; what did the authors learn from this work, other than just C:N and C:P drawdown ratios, etc? Given the results of this work, what do we now know about increasing pCO₂ in the Arctic in terms of its impact on NCP and elemental drawdown ratios? The paper would be much strengthened if those issues were addressed.

The Abstract, Intro and Methods have several grammatical problems.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 9, 11705, 2012.

BGD

9, C4003–C4004, 2012

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

