

# ***Interactive comment on “Process studies at the air-sea interface after atmospheric deposition in the Mediterranean Sea: objectives and strategy of the PEACETIME oceanographic campaign (May–June 2017)” by Cécile Guieu et al.***

**Jan-Berend Stuut (Editor)**

[jbstuut@nioz.nl](mailto:jbstuut@nioz.nl)

Received and published: 15 June 2020

The authors have submitted their response to the two reviewers' assessments of the original manuscript and submitted a revised manuscript with changes according to the reviewers' questions and suggestions. Unfortunately, the revised manuscript could not be found on the Copernicus server. Therefore, I have requested this revised manuscript from the authors and have noted that they have taken the reviewers' suggestions to heart and have changed the manuscript considerably. Where initially the manuscript was a not-so-organised summing up of initial or anticipated results

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



of the PEACETIME cruise, in the revised manuscript the authors have done a great job in taking the reader on board the ship (R/V Pourquoi Pas?) during the cruise and describing what happened during this very exciting expedition. In that sense, this manuscript is an excellent introduction for all the following manuscripts that describe parts of the results from the cruise. The authors have now clearly sketched what a tremendous enterprise the PEACETIME cruise has been, involving so many scientific disciplines both on board the ship as well as synchronously on land measuring, modelling and forecasting dust outbreaks. Indeed, the expedition managed to measure a score of different settings, allowing the detailed study of various types of deposition (e.g., dry vs wet) and different types of oceanographic settings. The authors describe the cruise and all the ongoing different types of experiments in detail, which forms a great introduction to the special volume as well as to the forthcoming manuscripts, which are all cited as either 'in preparation' or 'submitted'. My recommendation of the revised manuscript is "accept after minor revisions" (some small changes marked in the annotated revised manuscript), as from my assessment of the authors' response to the two reviewers and the revised version of the manuscript I can only conclude that the authors have significantly improved the manuscript. However, I propose to postpone this acceptance until either this special volume is formally closed or until all manuscripts have gone through the review process. That way, the present citations to manuscripts that are yet to be submitted can be completed and/or changed in case these manuscripts were not accepted after all.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/bg-2020-44/bg-2020-44-EC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-44>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

