

Biogeosciences Discuss., author comment AC1  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2021-170-AC1>, 2021  
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## Reply on RC1

Tom Hull et al.

---

Author comment on "Simultaneous assessment of oxygen- and nitrate-based net community production in a temperate shelf sea from a single ocean glider" by Tom Hull et al., Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2021-170-AC1>, 2021

---

We thank both of our referees for reviewing our manuscript and for providing helpful comments.

We feel we have addressed all of their points and the manuscript is much improved as a result.

## Detailed comments

1. Ken Johnson's and related works typically have used UV (SUNA) sensors in high nitrate regions, these are inappropriate for the central North Sea given the very low concentrations seen in summer, AlterEco is the second deployment of the microfluidic sensor and the first time bloom production rates have been observed with a glider. We'll adjust the text to express this.

- Indeed, the larger requirements of the AlterEco study precluded a transect optimised for NCP determination. A review of optimal sampling strategy is perhaps beyond the scope of this paper however.

2. We believe the novel and useful aspect of this work is in the concomitant determination of NCP through the two methods and therefore the determination of the stoichiometry. The carbon cycling, Dogger bank ecosystem description and deoxygenation sections are included to indicate why determining NCP as an ecosystem parameter is important. However, in retrospect we agree that these sections are longer than needed and we'll revise accordingly.

3. as above

4. Figure 2 simply shows the observed variables in units natural to the sensor observations, which also adhere to the NetCDF Climate and Forecast standard names list. In table 1, columns 4 and 5 do state O<sub>2</sub> based NCP and NO<sub>x</sub> based NCP in depth-integrated units. We avoided using N for NCP as we use statistical notation for the model later which uses N() as the Gaussian distribution. J was used by Steve Emerson in 1987, and many related works since and we mostly followed with that notation. As referee 2 has noted some clarification of the J term is required so we've amended the manuscript.

5. The term "ecosystem services" was first coined in 2007 and has found widespread use. There are now several hundred published papers in biogeosciences which include the phrase "ecosystem services" in the abstract, We think it's a succinct way of talking about

the value of natural systems.

6. as with 2. and 3. We'll change the paper to make the focus clear.

7.  $Z_{mix}$  is still required for determining the value of  $C_s$  used for the air-sea gas exchange calculation so was included for completeness, this is in the supplementary material. We'll move these lines there to improve the flow of the methods section.

8. The tidal ellipse is centred in the middle of the transect and scaled to be visible. We refer to the historic buoy data when discussing interannual variability.

9. No, this Seaglider was not fitted with Wetlabs or similar chlorophyll fluorometer.

10. We're using the buoy observations to discuss if there is evidence for changes in the nutrient dynamics in this region over the last several years as has been suggested by modeling studies. The new observations from the glider and the previously unpublished observations from the buoy are useful in this regard and we feel are deserving of the readers' attention.

Attached is a tracked changes version of the manuscript

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://bg.copernicus.org/preprints/bg-2021-170/bg-2021-170-AC1-supplement.pdf>