

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 del13C 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 del13C!

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?

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



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 %0 when it might have actually been 0.2 %o)? 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.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

