

## ***Interactive comment on “Calculating the global contribution of coralline algae to carbon burial” by L. H. van der Heijden and N. A. Kamenos***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 14 July 2015

Referee comment

This paper estimates the global contribution of coralline algae and highlights the potentially important ecosystem function of coralline algae to store carbon and the need for further empirical work to be undertaken to quantify this.

General comments The paper makes it clear that calculations are estimates as data are lacking and I believe that the criteria used to make the calculations are reasonable, justifiable and based on the relevant available literature. I'm afraid, due to the nature of the paper there is not much that I can add to this review. Specific comments N/A  
Technical corrections P7847, L16: Please clarify what 2 % refers to P7850, L10: Delete dash (-) P7852, L15: Change “smaller” for “shallower” P7852, L16: insert (,) after coastal zone P7852, L16: delete “of” P7854, L10: Delete dash (-) P7856, L7: change

C3541

“world's ocean” to “the world's oceans”

Access review (quick report), peer review, and interactive public discussion (BGD) 1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of BG? Yes 2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? Yes, this is the first time that this calculation has been made as far as I know. 3. Are substantial conclusions reached? Clear conclusions are given and advice suggested for future work. 4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? They are as valid as they can be as this paper is to estimate the parameters based on current available data. 5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? Yes 6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Yes 7. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? Yes, citations are comprehensive and it is clear where the novel aspect to this work is. 8. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? Yes 9. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? Yes 10. Is the overall presentation well-structured and clear? Yes 11. Is the language fluent and precise? Yes, the paper is well written. 12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? As far as I know, although this is not my area of expertise. 13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? The paper is well balanced 14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? Yes 15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? N/A

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, 7845, 2015.