

Interactive comment on “Diatoms as paleoproductivity proxy in the NW Iberian coastal upwelling system (NE Atlantic)” by Diana Zúñiga et al.

L.J. de Nooijer (Editor)

lennart.de.nooijer@nioz.nl

Received and published: 6 October 2016

Dear authors and reviewers,

I apologize for the delay in uploading my comments. After the response of the authors to the reviews, I expected to see an updated version of the manuscript, which can apparently only be asked for if the editor has invited the authors to do so. Anyway, I have read the comments of the reviewers, which I hope the authors have used to improve their manuscript in the way their response suggests. I would like to stress that I agree with reviewer #2, that the authors have to show clearly that the dataset they have, despite its occasional poor temporal coverage, does lead to a (clear) seasonal signal in the production of benthic versus pelagic diatoms. This is one of the crucial

points for the manuscript to be acceptable for publication in Biogeosciences. Perhaps equally important, is my own dissatisfaction about the paleoceanographic relevance of this study. The authors end the discussion with the supposed importance of these findings in reconstructing past climates/ environments. To clarify the potential impact of this study, the authors need to make it more clear how their data/ results can directly improve diatom-based reconstructions. I am looking forward to see a revised version of the manuscript, which I will ask to be reviewed by the original two reviewers, and when necessary, a third reviewer.

Sincerely,

Lennart de Nooijer

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., doi:10.5194/bg-2016-201, 2016.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

