

## ***Interactive comment on “Multi-year particle fluxes in Kongsfjorden, Svalbard” by Alessandra D’Angelo et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 22 May 2018

I think that it is a scientifically sound study, providing some important insight into sediment fluxes in a rapidly changing fjord in the Arctic. It is based on a relatively "long" time series and it helps understand the role of the glacier discharges in shaping the sediment fluxes within the fjord and also makes some "informed" speculations about expected trends in those fluxes. There are some issues that I believe may require some further clarification in the text and I hope that my comments may be of some use for that. I have made a number of small corrections and added some comments/questions to the pdf version of the manuscript that I uploaded. I think this paper is well written, with the exception of some minor things that are very easy to correct. 1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of BG? Yes 2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? Especially

C1

new data 3. Are substantial conclusions reached? Yes 4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? Yes 5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? Yes 6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Not always. I made some comments about this, especially in what concerns end-members shown in Figure 7. 7. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? Yes. 8. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? Yes 9. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? Yes 10. Is the overall presentation well-structured and clear? Yes 11. Is the language fluent and precise? Yes, except for some minor problems 12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? Yes 13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? Small clarifications indicated in the ms. 14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? Yes 15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate?

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/bg-2018-174/bg-2018-174-RC2-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2018-174>, 2018.

C2