

Interactive
Comment

***Interactive comment on “A simple method for
air/sea gas exchange measurement in mesocosms
and its application in carbon budgeting” by
J. Czerny et al.***

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 22 October 2012

The submitted manuscript deals with a novel and elegant method to determine air-sea gas exchange in mesocosm experiments. The work deals with the issue of gas exchange under very low wind conditions, for which the standard oceanographic parameterisation is inappropriate. The authors use N₂O to determine transfer velocity, and then translate this to a CO₂ transfer velocity. In addition, chemical enhancement of CO₂ air-sea exchange is quantified. The paper is important and provides a key contribution to carbon related processes in mesocosms. It deserves publication. The paper is however not very clearly written. It will need one or two more iterations by the team of authors to make it a flowing manuscript. I have made a number of comments on the writing style below.

C5031

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Specific comments: Abstract: line 9: cumulative extrapolations of bioassays.....explain term bioassay here. There is a switch from mesocosm to bioassay, unclear why that is.

P 11991 'For this purpose, in situ measurements using the whole enclosure as experimental vessel have to be elaborated, in order to avoid problems occurring when extrapolating from bottle incubations to the mesocosm'. It is unclear here what how the bottle incubations are linked to the mesocosms? What type of bottle incubations?

P 11991: Air-sea gas exchange rates are needed to calculate the rate of exchange between the ocean and the atmosphere. The rates are not needed for comparing gas concentrations between mesocosm experiments or ocean regions. P 11991: line 20-21: sentence lacks meaning. P 11991: line 26: what is CT? P 11993, Line 5: what was the source and purity of N₂O. P 11993, line 6: 'Additions were calculated....'. Unclear what this means P 11993, line 20: units in equation 1 do not square up. P 11994, line 22: headspace was added to what? P 11994, line 24: mixing rates of what? Equation 2: what is the variable d? Fig. 2: Please relate the different trends to the pCO₂ perturbations Fig. 6 and 3 are referred to before Fig 2. Potential errors section (3.3) is not clearly reasoned. Various errors are listed in a seemingly random manner. P 12000, line 4: N₂O analytics should read N₂O measurements. P 12000, line 17: should read: too low

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 9, 11989, 2012.

BGD

9, C5031–C5032, 2012

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper