

Interactive comment on “Reviews and syntheses: Insights into deep-sea food webs and global environmental gradients revealed by stable isotopes ($\delta^{15}\text{N}$, $\delta^{13}\text{C}$) and fatty acids trophic biomarkers” by Camilla Parzanini et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 27 May 2019

The manuscript “Reviews and syntheses: Insights into deep-sea food webs and global environmental gradients revealed by stable isotopes (^{15}N , ^{13}C) and fatty acids trophic biomarkers” is an important contribution to the field of trophic ecology of deep-sea ecosystems. I like table 1, where the authors compared in detail the advantages and disadvantages of gut content, SI and FA analyses, and I highly appreciate the attempt to assess potential latitudinal and bathymetric trends in SI and FA.

I know that the dataset is very sparse, but apparently the keywords, the authors used, did not identify all literature published about this topic. I therefore listed several pa-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



pers that should be included into the data analysis to increase its explanatory power. Gontikaki et al. 2011 (Deep-Sea Research I), Jeffreys et al. 2013 (Plos One) (mainly a tracer study, but it also includes natural abundance SI data), Jeffreys et al. 2015 (Biogeosciences), Kiyashko et al. 2014 (MEPS), Levin et al. 1999 (MEPS) (tracer study, but also natural abundance SI data), Lin et al. 2014 (MEPS), Mincks et al. 2008 (Deep-Sea Research II), Moens et al. 2007 (Polar Biology), Quiroga et al. 2014 (MEPS), Sweetman & Witte 2008 (Deep-Sea Research I) (tracer study, but also natural abundance SI data), Veit-Köhler et al. 2013 (Progress in Oceanography).

There are likely more papers published, but these were the ones that came to my mind. Since the selection process for these papers does not follow the procedure described in the manuscript, the authors could include them under the term 'additional sources'.

I also miss information about the geological feature, i.e., whether samples were taken in canyons, at open slopes, in plains, etc. I assume that especially in canyons the SI composition of detritus that reaches the seafloor will be very different from plains at similar depth due to the faster transport of detritus down the canyon. This factor should also be investigated in the statistical analysis.

Minor comments are: The authors could mention earlier in the study that they explicitly excluded chemosynthetic studies. I know that it is mentioned in the MM section, but when I started reading the manuscript, I quickly went to the supplement to see which studies were included and I missed the chemosynthetic studies. Of course, this is absolutely related to the way I read the paper, but I could imagine that I am not the only one and that other readers would also like to know already in the abstract (or at the end of the introduction), that chemosynthetic studies were not included.

Table 1: The authors stated that the interpretation of gut content analysis is relatively easily, and that prey items cannot be taxonomically misidentified. I disagree here, as I think that it depends on the grade of digestion: Strongly digested prey items might not be identifiable.

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

Minor technical things in table 1: There is a 'may' missing in line 3 of gut content analysis. It should be 'Small sample sizes may lower representativity of diet'.

Please spell out tech and med. Do you mean technology or technique, methods, or something else?

Fig. 2 and 3: The author reported the sample size as $n = 33-1470$ and $n = 7-212$, respectively. I suggest reporting the sample size per latitude instead of a range. This helps the reader to interpret the results and see where the data are specifically sparse.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2019-80>, 2019.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

