

## ***Interactive comment on “Unveiling the Perth Canyon and its deep-water faunas” by Julie A. Trotter et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 25 October 2018

General comment: The ms presented an excellent, one-of-the-kind data set including numerous ROV dives at 5 different sites and depths along the Perth canyon, and ship-board CTD casts (with water samples) collected from those sites that allowed a variety of physical, chemical, and isotope analyses of the entire water column. It is a rather comprehensive field report of very good quality, but unfortunately somewhat short to be considered a "research article" that this ms is intended to be. After double checking the scope of the journal and its requirement for a research article manuscript ("...on all aspects of the interactions between the biological, chemical, and physical processes ... to cut across the boundaries of established sciences and achieve an interdisciplinary view of these interactions"), I reluctantly had no choice but rejecting the current form of the ms.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Specific comments: 1. I would recommend the author to think about, in their revising ms, what's the story in it? Namely what's the hypothesis or science questions the ms wants to address? What's the importance or relevance in solving those hypotheses or addressing the science questions. 2. The ms had in-depth descriptions of the CTD/water sample works with respect to the physical, chemical, and isotope analyses. Except for the isotope discussion related to LGM (very nicely done!), there was hardly discussions linking those properties of different disciplinarians. 3. One key difference between research articles and data reports is concise vs overdone details. There are just too many details in the ms that should go to a supplemental file.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2018-319>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

