

## ***Interactive comment on “Temperature and UV light affect the activity of marine cell-free enzymes” by Blair Thomson et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 5 March 2017

General comments The manuscript deals with a subject of utmost importance. Hydrolytic enzymes are essential for microorganisms to process DOM, and in the climate change situation the alteration of the environmental conditions will modify the hydrolysis rates of polymers, and consequently the functioning of the carbon cycle. In this respect, the analysis of the effect of UVR and temperature on the free hydrolytic enzymes becomes relevant and even necessary. The manuscript shows for the first time the reduction of the activity of the free enzymes by the UVR at environmental intensities and this is a substantial contribution. However, regarding the effect of temperature the aim of the study is unclear, the design of the experiments is confusing and needs to be explained or improved, and the analysis and interpretation of the results also requires significant changes. General problems are the high variability of data, the variability of the controls in the UVR experiments, as well as the erratic pattern of the variation in

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



time of the measurements in the temperature experiments.

Specific comments 1. The aim of this work is to study “the effects of temperature and UVR on the activity of three cell-free extracellular enzyme groups” (L80-81). However, the measurements of activity were made in the dark and in situ temperature. Samples were exposed to different UVR doses and at different temperatures for 6- 36 h but the hydrolytic activity was measured in the dark and in situ temperature with 3 hours of incubation (L152-153). The authors should explain why the activity was not measured under the same conditions as the samples. This experimental approach allows detecting changes in the molecular state of the enzymes when they are exposed to different doses of UVR and different temperatures, but the fact that samples return for 3 h to in situ conditions makes it difficult to transfer the results to the ecosystem. Authors should explain the ecological sense of keeping the enzymes at 5°C or 15°C from 6 h to 36 h and then measuring the activity for 3 h at 10°C. I think that this is an important point that should be clarified to facilitate the understanding of the manuscript. 2. L104. In my opinion the treatment of the material used in the experiments should not be called sterilization. I think that the term decontamination would be more appropriate since sterilization destroys all living cells, included spores. 3. L107. The filtration process is critical because the filtration pressure can break the cells and release their contents, resulting in an enrichment of the filtrate. The authors claim that the filtration was gentle but, could the authors point out what they mean by gentle? What filtering pressure was used? 4. L148. In my experience the saturating concentrations are usually different in APase, BGase and LAPase, and frequently LAPase requires higher saturating concentrations than BGase and APase. The authors write that the concentration of substrate was established in previous kinetic experiments but should show some information about these experiments. Both environmental factors, UVR and temperature, can affect to the kinetic parameters and this should be taken into account. For example, changes in temperature do not only affect to the hydrolysis rate but also can modify the affinity of the enzymes and therefore the saturating concentration, 100  $\mu$ M can be saturating at 10 °C, but no saturating at 5 °C. If molecules of enzymes are

affected by UVR and temperatures, the kinetic parameters ( $V_{max}$  and  $K_m$ ) will also be affected. Some kinetic experiments with different UVR doses and temperatures would also significantly improve the manuscript because would show modifications in the enzyme molecules. 5. The introduction highlights the quantitative importance of the free enzymes and according to this it would be convenient to show, somewhere in the results, the percentage of total hydrolytic activity that dissolved enzymes represent in the analyzed samples. 6. It is not clear if figures correspond only to one UVR experiment (Fig 1) and one temperature experiment (Fig 2) or they show the average data of several experiments. If there are several experiments it would be more appropriate to show each experiment on one separate figure in order to reduce the standard errors. If data correspond to a single experiment it is not enough to reach any conclusion and the experiments must be repeated to find a common pattern. 7. Regarding the discussion, the exposure of free enzymes to different doses of UVR and different temperatures during 6-36 h also provides information on the stability of enzymes under different conditions, but it is not discussed in the manuscript although authors have experience on this issue. The authors detect differences between low and high dose of UVR and low and high temperature, but do not compare the evolution of the activity with time although there are important changes. 8. Fig 1. For both BGase and LAPase controls varied between 12 and 36 h and both showed high standard errors. The controls should keep stable for 36 h unless the stability of enzymes is affected. In the case of APase and LAPase the activity of the controls increased from 12 h to 36 h, while for BGase decreased. Were the differences statistically significant? If so, how do you explain these changes? In the case of BGase there was a general decrease from 12 to 36 h and the variability between replicates is so large that it possibly masks the effect of radiation, reason why there is not enough support to suggest that the effect of UVR is enzyme-specific and more experiments are required. 9. Fig 2. This figure tries to represent the effect of temperature on the activity of the free enzymes but it does not reflect the stability of the enzymes to different temperatures over 36 h. In the case of BGase again the variability of data makes any comparison difficult. For LAPase the activity

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

decreased after 12 h but increased after 24 h and again after 36 h at the three temperatures. The effect of temperature could be expected to be maintained or increased over time. Authors should try to explain these erratic tendencies. 10. L230-234. I have some problems with this paragraph. The effect of UVR on APase is evident at 12 h and also for LAPase there are differences between doses at 12 h. Thus, the scales are not as different as the authors claim.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., doi:10.5194/bg-2017-29, 2017.

**BGD**

---

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

