

## ***Interactive comment on* “Historical record of the effects of anthropogenic pollution on benthic foraminifera over the last 110 years in Gamak Bay, South Korea” *by* Da Un Jeong et al.**

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 27 November 2017

The manuscript is on an interesting topic but is very descriptive and lacks implications for a wider audience.

The abstract is much too long and full of details; it would instead need a synthetic treatment of problem, the approach, the most significant results and some conclusive statements.

Although the introduction is solid in terms of describing the problem (pollution) and the approach to reconstruct its history (forams and geochemical data from sediment cores), there is no interesting hypothesis raised and the approach is therefore very descriptive.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



$^{210}\text{Pb}$  is used for dating and to estimate sedimentation rates, it is not a geochemical signal

The second half of the text under the heading "Study area", starting with "The bay is home to. . ." would at least partly better fit into the introduction. It would offer the chance to formulate more interesting study aims / hypotheses.

Provide equation for diversity indices and make clear which of the two ( $H'$  or  $J$ ) you used were in the text. What is the justification for using exactly these 2 indices?

Figs 6, 7, 8 are only presented in the discussion. They all deal with results and should be moved (together with the text that relates to them) to the Result section.

Fig 9 is presented only in the conclusion. This is totally inappropriate. Please use this figure for a thorough discussion. I am not sure, however, if this figure is needed at all.

The conclusions are actually a summary and real conclusions from this study are lacking.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2017-383>, 2017.

BGD

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

