

# ***Interactive comment on “KRILLBASE: a circumpolar database of Antarctic krill and sulp numerical densities, 1926–2016” by Angus Atkinson et al.***

**Angus Atkinson et al.**

[aat@pml.ac.uk](mailto:aat@pml.ac.uk)

Received and published: 9 February 2017

## RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

KRILLBASE: a circumpolar database of Antarctic krill and sulp numerical densities, 1926–2016 (Angus Atkinson et al.)

Dear Editor,

We thank all three reviewers for going through this manuscript and being so positive about it. All three were enthusiastic about the concept and potential value of this data paper and made only minor comments.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



We have now clarified in the Abstract (lines 9 and 10) the important point over whether the numbers of salps refers to individuals or colonies. The clarification is made also now more clearly in the “salp” row of metadata Table 2.

Following reference to other ESSD papers that present equations, we have omitted the dots from the equation.

Future database suggestions from Reviewer 1. No.1. Good idea, thanks for that. No. 2. This is a good idea, but we were struggling here, because the uses might vary and there is not a single fixed criterion on which to judge data reliability. We have a data caveat column already, but other variations in sampling method, such as variable sampling depth, have no single fixed answer on data suitability.

Reviewer 2. This reviewer was very positive about the study and there were no issues to address.

Reviewer 3. The link to the database should go in the Results. Done. We have referenced it now on line 359-360 in the Results.

Line 60. Stock identity. We have clarified this as genetic stock identity (line 60)

Line 64, what is feedback approach? We have removed this jargon and rephrased

Line 116 bold or uppercase? We have changed this to uppercase

Line 187: low densities were removed? Line 189 Which test?. We substituted “procedure” for “test” to clarify that this was not simply a way of screening out wrong data but a way of checking how a data manipulation had been done and then correcting the manipulation.

Line 200 Water depths allocation for which samples? We have now (line 201) used the word “every” to make clear that we did it for every station.

Interactive comment

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Line 229 Needs dot and end of Fig. Done

Line 241-242. Not clear who should remove. We have clarified this with the phrase “by the user”

Line316-336: Standardisation text unclear. This has been condensed and simplified (lines 321-326)

Table 2: The date text is unclear (This is now clarified in the “Date accuracy” row of Table 2. Table 2 Locale? This phrase now changed to location.

We have made a few other minor amendments. Most importantly we realise that Sophie Fielding should be an author, given her contribution to KRILLBASE at the British Antarctic Survey. She is now added.

Also we have corrected pangaea to SCAR-MarBIN (line 137)

None of the Figures need amending so hopefully can just upload the revised main text and Tables, with changes marked in Track Changes.

With best wishes,

Angus Atkinson On behalf of the authors

---

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., doi:10.5194/essd-2016-52, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

