

Interactive comment on “Determination of dissolved nitric oxide in coastal waters of the Yellow Sea off Qingdao” by Chun-Ying Liu et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 23 May 2017

Overall I concur with Reviewer 1's concerns. I will confine myself to responding to the revisions by the Authors

Table 2- What are the errors (standard deviations) on these measurements? Were they replicates, triplicates? The very large change in recovery at 400 ml/min compared to other flow rates does not make a lot of sense even with their explanation, and without an idea of the variability at each flow rate it is not possible to determine if the selected optimum is really the best for precision. Why include 200 mL/min if no measurements? Why not run at 350 and 450 mL per minute (or even 410 and 390) to see how sensitive the extraction is to flow rate- that will tell the user just how good their flow control must be to get good results. Perhaps it is possible to obtain even better results with fine tuning? At the very least the recommendation should be that anyone attempting to set this method up on their own will have to run this sort of experiment to determine the

optimum flow rates.

Figure 4- This raises more questions than it answers. First, you have a lot of data at unrealistically high nitrite concentrations, why no data at 0.5 or 1 micromole concentrations? Second, the fact that the blank is so high (100 nanomolar if I am reading this correctly) means that the level of contamination is orders of magnitude greater than the signals you report, and the variation in these measurements over both nitrite concentration and time swamps any natural signal. Basically the graph is not going to prove anything except that the nitrite you are using has a huge NO blank associated with it. And if the graph shows anything the UV effect is significant over 1 hour! If you are to prove a lack of a nitrite effect, you need to run samples with some nitrite in it at natural levels (say 0.1 to 1 micromolar) and use nitrite with no appreciable blank, either by purging the solution or using a different nitrite source. I will say that nitrite cannot be causing significant problems with natural samples, or else the signals you see would be dominated by nitrite levels. But this graph doesn't show that.

In terms of the Environmental data, it is unclear if the manuscript has been modified to reflect the Author's clarifications. They need to be in the discussion.

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/os-2017-10, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

