

Interactive comment on “Biogeography of jellyfish in the North Atlantic, by traditional and genomic methods” by P. Licandro et al.

P. Licandro et al.

prli@sahfos.ac.uk

Received and published: 27 April 2015

Please note: Pages and lines below refer to the file “essdd-7-C340-2015-supplement.pdf”.

We have incorporated most of the suggestions of this reviewer. We have now modified the first paragraph in the abstract and the end of the discussion to clarify that our aim is to present sampling and analysis methods that can be used to broaden the currently limited baseline of available jellyfish data so as to enable better monitoring of these taxa in the next decades and potentially answer the remaining question of whether jellyfish really are on the rise or not. We thank the reviewer for the accurate revision of the English.

C387

Below are our answers to the reviewer’s comments.

COMMENT 1- We have addressed the main concern of the reviewer and clarified at the beginning of the ‘Methods’ that the ‘jellynet’ was the main sampling device used to collect jellyfish during the EUROBASIN cruises.

Pag: 3, Line 11-13: We have modified the text according to the suggestions of the reviewer.

COMMENT 2 – Text was ok in the proofs of the paper.

Pag: 3, Line 24: We believe it is better to leave the statement ‘quantitative data’ for the MOCNESS data set, to make clear that there are densities associated to those records.

COMMENT 3 –We have revised the text in order to clarify that we referred to Bongo-nets as a sampling methodology not particularly suitable to quantitatively catch jellyfish specimens.

Pag: 3, Line 33: We have revised the text as suggested by the reviewer.

COMMENT 4 –Reference added as requested by the reviewer.

COMMENT 5 – Swarm is a synonym of outbreak.

Pag: 5, Lines 3, 11, 29-33: Text amended as suggested by the reviewer

Pag:6, Lines 3, 7, 24: Text amended as suggested by the reviewer

COMMENTS 6 and 7 – The names of species were in Italics in the proofs of the paper.

Pag:7, Lines 6: Text amended as suggested by the reviewer

Pag:7, Lines 13: We feel it is important to clarify that small hydrozoans and early stages of ctenophora are not collected by the larger nets. Therefore we have left the sentence as it was, i.e. “..small hydrozoans (e.g. Clytia, Gilia, Muggiaea) and early stages of ctenophora were only caught by the smaller nets ..”.

C388

COMMENT 8 and 9– We confirm the term ‘meropelagic’, indicating that *Cyanea*, which has a polyp stage, is only a temporary members of the pelagic community.

Pag:8, Line 1, 19: Text amended as suggested by the reviewer Pag:8, Line 23: Text was ok in the proofs of the paper

Pag:9, Line 9: Text was ok in the proofs of the paper

COMMENT 10: we have now modified the first paragraph in the abstract and the last part of the discussion to make clear that the intent of the paper is to present new information on jellyfish abundance, diversity and distribution across the North Atlantic to provide an improved baseline for future analysis of jellyfish dynamics.

LEGENDS of Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 have been revised as suggested by the reviewer.

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., 7, 629, 2014.