

Interactive comment on “Mass extinctions past and present: a unifying hypothesis” by S. A. Wooldridge

S. A. Wooldridge

Received and published: 19 August 2008

The referee (J. P. Gattuso) correctly identifies that the central tenets of the urease hypothesis rest solely on the interpretation of the pH activity profile of urease (see Wooldridge 2008; Fig. 2) that was inferred from the results of Barnes and Crossland (1976). Is the interpretation valid, or is it over-interpreted? The answer can only be revealed by further (formal) testing; the conclusion reached in the original manuscript. I have endeavoured to draw attention too - with my acknowledged limiting deductive framework - the plausible nature of the interpretation, in particular the relevance of multiple pH maxima (@7.6 and 8.2) and a potential minimum 'dead zone' (@ 7.9) for a range of calcifying invertebrates. I urge those individuals and organisations with the appropriate skill-sets and facilities to rigorously test the ideas presented as a matter of urgency.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

REFERENCES

Barnes D., Crossland C. (1976) Urease activity in the staghorn coral, *Acropora acuminata*, *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.*, 55B, 371-376.

Wooldridge S. (2008) Mass extinctions past and present: a unifying hypothesis. *Biogeosciences Discussions* 5, 2401-2423.

[Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 5, 2401, 2008.](#)

BGD

5, S1453–S1454, 2008

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

S1454

