

Interactive comment on “The coccolithophores *Emiliana huxleyi* and *Coccolithus pelagicus*: extant populations from the Norwegian-Iceland Sea and Fram Strait” by C. V. Dylmer et al.

J.-P. Gattuso (Editor)

gattuso@obs-vlfr.fr

Received and published: 26 December 2013

In their reply to the referees comments, Dylmer et al. write: "We are therefore asking the editor for his decision for the opportunity of a re-submission, before starting to revise our manuscript". The editorial policy at BG does not enable editors to prevent authors to submit a revised version of their manuscript if they feel that they can satisfactorily address the referees comments.

Constructive criticisms were provided by the referees but I find some of the authors's replies unconvincing. For example, the lack of environmental data is an obvious weakness that the authors are not prepared to seriously address beyond insisting on the

C7606

logistical constraints and better explaining the purpose of the study. Also, the reply to the choice of satellite images is not convincing. A second example is the link to ocean acidification, which is potentially interesting but the authors clearly indicate that there do not plan to address it with data in a revised manuscript.

Considering the non-public evaluation provided by the referees, I strongly recommend that Dylmer et al. specifically and thoroughly address all referees' comments, should they plan to submit a revised version. A revised manuscript would be sent out for a second round of review.

Jean-Pierre Gattuso

BG editor

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 15077, 2013.

C7607