Biogeosciences Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/bg-2015-636-AC1, 2016

Biogeosciences Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Interactive comment on "Spring Blooms in the Baltic Sea have weakened but lengthened from 2000 to 2014" *by* P. M. M. Groetsch et al.

P. M. M. Groetsch et al.

groetsch@waterinsight.nl

Received and published: 18 April 2016

Anonymous Referee #1 Received and published: 5 February 2016

1. Could you please provide some information on the source(s) of nutrient data in chap. 2.3.

Authors' response: These concentrations were derived from laboratory analysis of bottle samples that were regularly collected along the transect (for further detail see section 2.1. in the manuscript). We propose to add this information to section 2.3 to clarify this point.

2. The title is not much appealing to me. However, I don't have any good suggestion. Probably you may include alg@line.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

Authors' response: The title was chosen to highlight the scope of the paper (phenological study of Baltic Sea spring bloom) rather than the methods used to obtain this value-adding dataset. We hope that this will draw readers to the paper who would not normally consider ship-of-opportunity pigment fluorescence data for this type of analysis. We suggest to include an early reference to the 'Alg@line' network in the abstract, e.g. 'Phytoplankton spring bloom phenology was derived from a 15-year time-series (2000-2014) of ship-of-opportunity chlorophyll-a fluorescence observations (collected in the Alg@line network) in the Baltic Sea. '

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., doi:10.5194/bg-2015-636, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper