

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 (thank you). We tried to change the paper to emphasize the data made available and hope it removed any concern from the reviewers. A more detailed answer was submitted as answer to reviewer#1 comments.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.earth-syst-sci-data-discuss.net/7/C154/2014/essdd-7-C154-2014-supplement.pdf>

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

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper