

Interactive comment on “The Arctic picoeukaryote *Micromonas pusilla* benefits from Ocean Acidification under constant and dynamic light” by Emily White et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 18 October 2019

The manuscript by White et al described the responses of Arctic picoeukaryote *Micromonas pusilla* to ocean acidification under both constant and dynamic light. The experiments were well designed and performed. The manuscript was well-structured with a good logic flow. However, I do have several minor comments for the revisions before the manuscript be accepted for the publication in BG.

Abstract and Introduction: Good Materials & Methods Line 120: What are the frequencies for the measurements of the pH and did you measure the pH everyday or several times per day, in the mid-phase of light period or dark period? Please clarify. Line 133: Since the authors measured the carbonate system parameters of pH, TA, and DIC,

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



why did you calculate the full carbonate system with pH and TA, but not with pH and DIC? Line 147: When did you perform the sampling for POC and PON, at the end of semi-continuous batch culture or in the middle? And when, the middle of light phase or dark phase? Please clarify. The same for Chla. Line 212: What kind of ANOVA did you perform here for the statistical analysis? And I did not see the details about all the statistical analysis that performed in this study. So I would recommend the authors to add a section of “statistical analysis” in the “Materials & Methods” to clarify this issue. And please also report the degree of the Freedom in a standard way for all the stats. Discussion: good.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2019-343>, 2019.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

