

Biogeosciences Discuss., referee comment RC1  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-473-RC1>, 2021  
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## **Comment on bg-2020-473**

Emmanuel Boss (Referee)

---

Referee comment on "Radiative transfer modeling with BGC-Argo float data in the Mediterranean Sea" by Elena Terzić et al., Biogeosciences Discuss.,  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-473-RC1>, 2021

---

Review of: 'Radiative transfer modeling with BGC-Argo float data in the Mediterranean Sea' by Terzic et al.

Reviewer: Emmanuel Boss

This paper studies the utility using simple radiative transfer (RT) model + input from BGC-Argo floats to obtain reasonable optical properties in the water column. A variety of different models are used and evaluated using radiometry and remote sensing measurements.

The topic of the paper is novel and of interest to the biogeosciences readership. I think that with appropriate revisions it could be a useful contribution.

I have major comments that I detail here and more minor one that are on the PDF I am sending back.

- The paper needs some more editing to be easily readable.
- Its organization could be improved a lot using tables describing the different configuration used (e.g. Which specific IOP choice for each, which property profile is used for each) and to display the results.
- The neglect of Raman needs significant justification, in particular at 490nm where it could significantly affect measured  $K_d$  and  $R_{rs}$ .
- The neglect of  $a_{\phi}$  at 380nm deserves more justification. Works of Bricaud, among others, suggest significant phytoplankton absorption there due to MAAs, particularly near the surface.
- The effect of  $S$  and  $T$  on water IOPs is very different in the bands investigated.  $S$  primarily contribute to backscattering but if a mean salinity is used, the change may be rather small.  $T$  affects primarily absorption in the NIR. Again, using an average  $T$  may be more than sufficient anywhere else.
- The final result that the best choice is  $bbp_{\tilde{}} = 0.002$  and  $\eta = 0$  deserves attention. It does not seem consistent with expectation from other studies.
- It is not clear why there seem to be no configuration with  $F_{chl}$  providing the vertical profile for  $a_{\phi}$ ,  $F_{dom}$  for  $a_{cdom}$  and  $b_{bp}$  for  $b_{bp}$  and NAP. If this one does not work well, please explain why you think it does not? What are the implications?

Dear authors: I am often wrong. If you feel my comments are 'off mark' please contact me and if convinced I will be happy to change them.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://bg.copernicus.org/preprints/bg-2020-473/bg-2020-473-RC1-supplement.pdf>