

Interactive comment on “Winter phytoplankton blooms in the offshore south Adriatic waters (1995–2012) regulated by hydroclimatic events: Special emphasis on the exceptional bloom of 1995” by Mirna Batistić et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 7 August 2017

The aim of this paper is stated as to 'illuminate key factors in the development of south Adriatic winter blooms'. The manuscript mostly reports data collected in 1994 and 1995 at three survey stations in the Adriatic Sea. Additionally Sea Wifs chlorophyll data is included in Hoevmolle figures covering the period 1997- 2012. I cannot recommend a paper that reports routine collected data from more than 20 years ago in a high profile journal such as Biogeosciences. The data presentation is basic and superficial with combinations of simple profiles and contour plots of density and nutrients in Figures 5-9. One has to ask why has it taken so long for the authors to report this data. Most

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Interactive
comment

of the figures are far too small and why are they imbedded in the text? Fig 13 scales are not legible. The discussion is long and detailed and well referenced but I cannot see that the limited amount of new data presented in this manuscript is worthy of such detailed interpretation.

Method details of nutrient analysis- it is not sufficient just to cite Strickland and Parsons 1972 page 4 line 98. Why was formaldehyde used to fix phytoplankton this is non standard Lugols iodine is the normal phytoplankton preservative. page 4 line 100. Met data is described very superficially and under the methods heading page 5 lines 133-128. Oxygen saturation data should be as a % not as a fraction of 1 page 6 line 160.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2017-205>, 2017.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

