

Interactive comment on “Introduction to the project VAHINE: VAriability of vertical and troPHic transfer of diazotroph derived N in the south wEst Pacific” by S. Bonnet et al.

S. Bonnet et al.

sophie.bonnet@univ-amu.fr

Received and published: 1 March 2016

Dear Reviewer,

We thank you very much for the constructive comments and suggestions, which have improved the manuscript. We have addressed the concerns in a point by point response below (comments are copied with our replies below) and in a revised manuscript attached as a supplement.

Best Regards,

Sophie Bonnet

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Reviewer 1.

While the article is generally well written and structured, several grammatical errors and instances of improper use of the English language (e.g. past perfect instead of simple past) detract from its quality. I have taken the liberty of going through the manuscript using “track changes” to provide suggested rewrites of these uncomfortable passages.

We are very grateful to the reviewer for providing such suggestions. They all have been taken into account in the revised version of the manuscript.

After what appears to have taken substantial exercise of the imagination, the authors came up with the acronym “VAHINE” choosing the appropriate lettering from the title (see above). It is puzzling then that the authors have not seen fit to explain, justify or even acknowledge this rather unusual acronym which, to my limited understanding of the Polynesian language, means “woman”. Perhaps a sentence to that effect might be in order.

We agree that the acronym VAHINE is quite unusual. We have added a sentence page 3 line 30 to explain this choice: ‘The acronym VAHINE (VARIability of vertical and tropHic transfer of diazotroph derived N in the south wEst Pacific) was chosen in order to take reference to the Pacific culture where this experiment has been performed with the help of local people’. The project is also leaded by a woman and some readers might see a fully assumed feminist Act.

While it is understandable that collaborating authors will want to set forth their results in detail in their individual articles, the reader of this manuscript is left largely in the dark as to results of the experiment: the fate the N fixed through P stimulation. Once again, a brief sentence or two describing the major findings appears to be in order.

We decided not to provide one or two sentences of the major results after each scientific question, as it would require many explanations. We rather extended the section 4 of the manuscript ‘Special issue presentation’ and summarized the major

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



results of each contributing paper to the special issue to provide the reader the main findings of this study. Section 4 has thus been totally modified.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/bg-2015-615/bg-2015-615-AC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., doi:10.5194/bg-2015-615, 2016.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

