

## ***Interactive comment on “Stable carbon isotopes of dissolved inorganic carbon for a zonal transect across the subpolar North Atlantic Ocean in summer 2014” by Matthew P. Humphreys et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 16 May 2016

Very well-documented and well-presented data set. DOI resolves and data easy to download and use. Appreciate multiple formats: cvs, xlsx, pdf, etc.

Other groups use the RM? Have they published  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values? Only the Dickson pers comm info? Do the RM samples have poison? Strongly agree with the recommendation on making the RM also apply to  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ !

Make Fig 2 larger in page format? Had to zoom several times.

Thinking about cross-over. Basically, no worse than expected given uncertainties of original data sets? Implications? E.g. do we now have data sources for assembling a better geographic coverage or time series?

C1

Curious about this statement (page 14, lines 24, 25:

“although the uncertainty estimate for the previous study was probably too generous and should be approximately doubled”

The word ‘generous’ allows confusion. If I read correctly, the uncertainty of data in the prior study was reported as too low (e.g. 0.1 ‰ when it might have actually been 0.2 ‰)? Generous in the sense that gave too much credit for precision? Therefore one would need to double to now obtain a more accurate uncertainty estimate?

---

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., doi:10.5194/essd-2015-36, 2016.

C2