Biogeosciences Discuss., 7, C519–C521, 2010 www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/7/C519/2010/© Author(s) 2010. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



BGD

7, C519-C521, 2010

Interactive Comment

Interactive comment on "Calibration of δ^{18} O of laboratory-cultured deep-sea benthic foraminiferal shells in function of temperature" by C. Barras et al.

C. Barras et al.

christine.barras@univ-angers.fr

Received and published: 12 April 2010

The authors are grateful for all the constructive comments made by the referees that greatly contributed to improve the manuscript. Each of their comments was address separately.

[Comment] - Introduction, page 337, line 6: you mention a microhabitat effect for δ 18O, referring to McCorkle et al. (1997). I am not aware of a significant microhabitat effect in the δ 18O signal of benthic foraminifers. If temperature and salinity remain more or less constant in the upper few centimeters of the surface sediment, how can the microhabitat affect the δ 18O signal of infaunal taxa? Are you referring to a carbonate

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



ion effect? [Answer] The reviewer is right, we were referring to the carbonate ion effect that is changing depending on the depth in sediment (foraminiferal microhabitat). We removed our mention of microhabitat effect for δ 18O since it is already included in the carbonate ion effect.

[Comment] - Material and methods, page 340, lines 3-5: The choice of linear or quadratic equations should be addressed in a few sentences (in addition to referring to Bemis et al., 1998) [Answer] An explanation of the choice of linear equations has been added in the text (last paragraph of part 2.2).

[Comment] - Results and discussion, page 342, lines 2-10 and Figure 2: the presented δ 18O data versus shell size indicate a more or less linear onthogenetic trend, that is similarly expressed at different culture temperatures. Although the data are convincing. I wonder why B. marginata does not show an asymptotic approach to a specific isotopic composition as observed in other studies (Schmiedl et al., 2004, McCorkle et al., 2008). Are you sure that your B. marginata specimens reached the maximum adult size or were they still growing at the termination of experiments? When comparing the observed onthogenetic slopes of B. marginata and Uvigerina mediterranea, you should consider that the average size of adult B. marginata is considerably smaller than that of adult U. mediterranea. Therefore, metabolism may have slowed down in adult B. marginata at test sizes similar to iuvenile U. mediterranea with still maximum metabolic rates. It would be nice to have the discussion on this issue a bit more extended in the revised version of the manuscript. You may also address the potential reasons for the presence and species-specific expression of onthogenetic effects. Do you think that addition of food changes metabolic rates? If so, inter-specific differences in feeding strategy may result in characteristic onthogenetic isotopic trends. [Answer] It is important to note that the dataset of size vs δ 180 of B. marginata have been fitted to a linear regression (as it is presented in Figure 2) but logarithmic regression leads to equally good determination coefficient. We think that Bulimina marginata actually didn't reach an adult size at the end of the experiments (either they did not finish to grow or they

BGD

7, C519-C521, 2010

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



died before attaining an adult stage) since adult specimens in natural environments measure around 600 μ m. We think that this can explain why we do not observe an asymptotic value around which the larger specimens cluster. We think that at present, too few data are available to speculate about eventual interspecific differences in the relationship between isotopic composition and growth stage. We agree with the reviewer that the addition of food may cause higher metabolic rates. However, such food additions can not explain the differences in δ 180 between the different size classes in our study.

[Comment] - The raw data (δ 18O values, culture environmental data) of this study should be provided as an electronic supplement to this paper. As an alternative, data could be also made available through an internationally accessible data base. [Answer] We combined in a table the δ 18O data of foraminiferal calcite according to the different size fractions as well as the number of shell produced and the averages of physicochemical parameters controlled for each temperature experiment.

[Comment] - page 338, line 4: replace "adults" by "adult" [Answer] The text has been changed.

[Comment] - page 339, line 18: you mention "spectrometers". Did you use different spectrometers? If not please write "spectrometer" [Answer] We actually used 2 different spectrometers.

[Comment] - page 339 line 21: replace "were" by "was" or write "Seawater δ 180 (δ 180w) values were..." [Answer] The text has been changed.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 7, 335, 2010.

BGD

7, C519-C521, 2010

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

