Interactive comment on “Contribution of shipping NO\textsubscript{x} emissions to the marine nitrogen budget of the western Baltic Sea – A case study” by D. Neumann et al.

D. Neumann et al.
daniel.neumann@io-warnemuende.de

Received and published: 20 November 2019

Response to the comments of Reviewer #2

We thank the reviewer for the constructive comments on the manuscript. The reviewer’s comments are written in bold font. The authors’ replies start with a “>” and are written in normal font.

1 General comments

The manuscript attempts to answer a relevant ocean research question, which is very clearly stated in the title.

The manuscript reads in a clear, concise, and well-structured way. The scientific approach is transparent and the methods and results are presented in an appropriate way.

However, the manuscript is lacking in the discussion and conclusions sections.

> see below our reply to Specific comments

2 Specific comments

The summarizing discussion section mainly consists of a summary of the results and very little actual discussion and the results are not set in context to relative literature.

The conclusions section partly consists of discussion and recommendations for further studies. It is not very clear what the conclusions are, except “..., the shipping sector might relevantly contribute to eutrophication at specific locations in the western Baltic Sea in summer.”

It seems too unsubstantial for the work that has been done and needs to be improved.

> A new “Discussion” section has been added, in which we discuss relevant aspects. The “Summarizing Discussion” section has been integrated into this new section and
3 Technical corrections

Page 2, Line 33: I think it should be ‘where’ instead of ‘with’.

> replaced as suggested

Page 3, Line 79: Remove ‘But’ at the start of the sentence.

> removed as suggested

Page 16, Line 288: Consider rephrasing “… stations distant to the coast …”.

> replaced by “stations in the center of the basins”