

Interactive  
Comment

***Interactive comment on “Impact of change in climate and policy from 1988 to 2007 on environmental and microbial variables at the time series station Boknis Eck, Baltic Sea” by H.-G. Hoppe et al.***

**I. Vuorinen (Referee)**

ilppo.vuorinen@utu.fi

Received and published: 7 February 2013

Journal: BG Title: Impact of climatic and political changes from 1988 to 2007 on environmental and microbial variables at the time series station Boknis Eck, Baltic Sea  
Author(s): H.-G. Hoppe et al. MS No.: bg-2012-461 MS Type: Research Article Special Issue: Boknis Eck Time Series Station (SW Baltic Sea)

1) "general comments" This paper is distinguished because it comments on political and societal changes and their effects in the coastal ecosystem. It falls short in proving

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



the connection, but environmental data and its presentation are correct, the approach is welcome and actual, and the message is clear. 2) "specific comments" page 18656 lines 5 to 8 and page 18681 1 to 5. Just a comment: It is interesting to think that the controlling environmental effects: political/economic changes and the global climate change (at least partly), actually both may be anthropogenic. Maybe you should ponder that too. page 18662 lines 15 to 18. Wording "We interpret" is okay, and should be used also in the abstract. 3) It was also asked; 1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of BG? Yes 2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? Yes, ideas and data 3. Are substantial conclusions reached? Yes 4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? Yes, but see general comments. 5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? Yes, but see general comments. 6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Yes 7. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? Yes 8. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? Well, they really don't show the impact, they just give it as an interpretation. 9. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? yes, but see general comments. 10. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? Yes 11. Is the language fluent and precise? Yes 12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? Yes 13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? No need 14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? Yes 15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? Yes

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 9, 18655, 2012.

**BGD**

9, C8022–C8023, 2013

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C8023

