

Review on “Inputs and processes affecting the distribution of particulate iron in the North Atlantic along the GEOVIDE (GEOTRACES GA01) section” by Gourain et al.

The manuscript has improved much! I agree with the scientific findings and suggestions made, but still the language is sometimes hard to follow and paragraphs are not always, but sometimes very long. All this makes it to a real challenge to read the manuscript.

From the scientific part, I have just some minor points, listed below

Line 32: Insert “thermohaline overturning circulation.”

Line 131: I do not know what the Berger citation has to do with your results. I would remove the Berger et al. citation!

Line 210: Include “Close to the sea floor....”

Line 318: Replace (PMF, factor 3 = 4.1%)

Line 319ff: Replace “, but its contribution is most likely obscured...”

Line 321ff: The reasoning is plausible, but please shorten this paragraph, it is too long. You can distill the message down to a couple sentences.

Line 388: Replace “in” by “to the Atlantic Ocean.”

Line 401-409: I do not follow the reasoning! PP is high because of high DFe and elevated primary productivity, which subsequently reduced DFe by biological utilization. First you need to show that DFe concentrations are elevated. Then use Chl a to show that the production is elevated, and then you may argue that the high PFe with a high PFe/Pal ratio comes from elevated productivity.

Line 410ff: Shorten the paragraph, you say a lot without saying something useful.

Line 446ff: This paragraph is out of context. Also the next one, which I suppose was written to sum up the results. But somehow it doesn't, maybe better to create another section.

Line 466ff: What is new, that has not been said earlier. Nepheloid layers have been already introduced!

Line 490ff: You could also use DFe and DMn as a tracer. What are these elements showing!

Line 527ff: This is speculative!