

Biogeosciences Discuss., referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-491-RC2>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



Comment on bg-2020-491

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee comment on "Impact of typhoons on particulate and dissolved ^{137}Cs activities in seawater off the Fukushima Prefecture: results from the SOSO 5 Rivers cruise (October 2014)" by Michio Aoyama et al., Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-491-RC2>, 2021

Comments on "Impact of typhoons on particulate and dissolved ^{137}Cs activities in seawater off the Fukushima Prefecture: results from the SOSO 5 Rivers cruise (October 2014) (bg-2020-491)"

Recommendation: Accept, with major revisions noted.

General comments: I reviewed the manuscript " Impact of typhoons on particulate and dissolved ^{137}Cs activities in seawater off the Fukushima Prefecture: results from the SOSO 5 Rivers cruise (October 2014) (bg-2020-491), submitted by Aoyama et al to Biogeosciences. The authors measured ^{134}Cs and ^{137}Cs in the dissolved and particulate samples contaminated by the Fukushima Dai-ichi Nuclear power plant (FDNPP1) accident, which presented some new data. Their spatial distribution reflected the mixing of coastal water and open-ocean water. The $^{137}\text{Cs}/^{134}\text{Cs}$ activity ratio derived from FDNPP accident is used to trace the source of riverine particle, which is very interesting. They also discussed the impact of typhoons on particulate and dissolved ^{137}Cs activities in seawater off the Fukushima prefecture, but did not give a clear picture about the impact of typhoon on ^{137}Cs activities in seawater. The novelty of this study needs to be improved. Additionally, decisions made with respect to data presentation combined with grammatical and other organizational errors result in a MS that lacks clarity and is difficult to follow. It is necessary to polish this manuscript by a native English speaker. Therefore, it is recommended to be published after major revisions.

Specific comments

-Line 14: What is indicated by the dissolved activities.....? ^{137}Cs or ^{134}Cs ?

-Line 18, "ranged from....to" means a range of variation, so the uncertainty in this sentence that "the ranged from 0.01 ± 0.00 to 0.12 ± 0.01 " is redundant? Please note this in the MS.

-Material and methods: What are the detection limits of ^{134}Cs and ^{137}Cs ?

-Lines 169-171, this sentence (the ratio of particulate ^{137}Cs activity concentration.....) is confusing, please rephrase it.

- Lines 179-181. This sentence is too long and needs revise to improve clarity and the flow....

-Lines 206-211, what's meaning that "data not shown or figure not shown"? Add in the Supporting information?

-Discussion section: The discussion was not enough and some conclusions are soft or from conjecturing, for example, "this pattern might reflect complex physical processes....."(lines 210-211); "Possible explanation of this finding are that the radiocaesium in the coastal seawater....."(Lines 236-239). Additionally, API would be sufficient to support the conclusion that high ^{137}Cs activity concentrations caused by the typhoon events, what about is the particle flux?

-Conclusions section: The conclusion section seems long with too much information on some discussion that appears unnecessary. The conclusion should be rephrase.

-Data availability: it should be moved in the Material and methods?

-References: please unify the format of periodicals. For example, Scientific Reports (Line 349); J. Radioanal. Nucl. Chem. (Line 356).....

-Figures: these figures are not clear, please redraw.... For example, fig.2 and fig.9.

