

Interactive comment on “Microzooplankton functional responses in the lab and in the field” by S. F. Sailley and E. T. Buitenhuis

S. F. Sailley and E. T. Buitenhuis

sesa@pml.ac.uk

Received and published: 4 July 2014

Answer to the reviewers comments on “Microzooplankton functional responses in the lab and in the field”. (Note: This answer was originally written for all reviewers. The supplement to this answer is a revised version of the manuscript to help the reviewers visualize the changes made)

We’d first like to thank the reviewers for their pointed comments.

Before going further we’d like to point out that this paper aim to attract attention to the collected data as a useful source, as well as a starting point for anyone needing some data. Reviewer number 3 did “point out that the dataset itself has some value”. The aim is not to analyse them in depths although analysis that had been done were

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



included to illustrate the information present in the data. Which is in agreement with the aim and scope of ESSD: “Earth System Science Data (ESSD) is an international, interdisciplinary journal for the publication of articles on original research data(sets), furthering the reuse of high (reference) quality data of benefit to Earth System Sciences. The editors encourage submissions on original data or data collections [. . .] Any interpretation of data is outside the scope of regular articles.” To avoid any further confusion and expectation the title of the paper was altered to “Collection of data on Pelagic ciliates and heterotrophic dinoflagellates rates (grazing, growth, metabolism) in the lab and in the field”. Note that an analysis of the data is underway for publication in a more appropriate journal, we’re sorry if the manuscript gave the feeling to be aiming at more than presenting the data that were collected.

Reviewer #2 and #3

As both reviewers agreed with reviewer #1 comments, there is little to respond too. Reviewer #2 concerns stemmed from the lack of analysis (see above) and reviewer #3 recognised the value of the data. We tried to change the paper to emphasize the data made available and hope it removed any concern from the reviewers.

Reviewer #1

Point 1: A method section for the collection of the data was added

Point 2, 4, 5 and 11: The purpose of the data collection was restated, along with an explanation as to why some data are missing: “The aim of this data collection was to obtain data to parameterize microzooplankton for a marine ecosystem model (Buitenhuis et al., 2011), and collection was stopped in 2008. Due to the aim and timing of the data collection, there is no freshwater data and more recent works are not included, other sources (e.g. non-english literature) are missing but none were purposefully ignored at the time“. This paper is to present the collected data, hopefully the modification we made through the paper removed any ambivalence that this could be anything else.

Point 3: This point dealt with the terminology employed in the paper which was checked. The specific points regarding this that the reviewer mentioned are treated separately below:

-A: the terminology regarding functional and numerical response, as well as the definition of microzooplankton, was checked and the title changed to reflect the points made by the reviewers. “Data collection on microzooplankton (pelagic ciliates and heterotrophic dinoflagellates) rates: grazing, growth, metabolism in the lab and in the field.”

-B: the dataset cannot be altered unless a new dataset is prepared and submitted. Although redundant clearance rate can be used to separate between Holling type I, II or III functional response.

-C: The needed reference for Nagata was added, and the text checked for egestion and excretion confusion.

-D: The title was changed to refer the fact that the data are ciliate and dinoflagellate centric and HNF reference removed.

Point 6-9: As these regard the datasets themselves, it is unfortunately out of the author hands.

Point 10: The reviewer pointed out that the review by Straille, is not up to date anymore. We removed the reference to the review of Straille, and pointed out the growth efficiency data available in the linked repository instead.

Point 12, 13 and 14: The reviewer pointed several inadequacies in the introduction. It was almost fully rewritten.

Point 15: A data manipulation section was added after the data description to explain the difference between the linked repository and the dataset referred to in it

Point 16: It is not clear what the reviewer meant there. Section 4 was partly rewritten

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

hopefully it took care of what the reviewer meant.

Point 17: Source data refer to data that have been added to a data repository at some point in time. Original references (paper) are given in the databases themselves.

Point 18: The reviewer suggested a table to summarize section 3, see Table 2 that was added to resume the spread of the data in term of size and carbon content range in the laboratory experiments. Table 1 was kept as is as a numbering of collected data.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.earth-syst-sci-data-discuss.net/7/C148/2014/essdd-7-C148-2014-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., 7, 149, 2014.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

