

Interactive comment on “Bioerosion by microbial euendoliths in benthic foraminifera from heavy metal-polluted coastal environments of Portovesme (South-Western Sardinia, Italy)” by A. Cherchi et al.

A. Cherchi et al.

acherchi@unica.it

Received and published: 18 October 2012

Dear Editor, We thank so much the reviewers and the yourself for the punctual critical reading of the paper. We have accepted almost all the suggestions given that surely improve so much the paper; otherwise, we have argued the sentences. We thank you all, hoping the paper will be definitely published.

Best regards The Authors

Pag. 2 line 14: This sounds like you meant "not interesting" with boring. Rather start

C4909

the sentence differently with, e.g., Microflora attacking carbonate substrates by broing activity is constituted...

Reply: The term “boring microflora” is commonly adopted in recent scientific papers (e.g. Tribollet, 2008).

Pag. 11 line 13, Pag. 12 line 4: here, the short - instead of the long one should be used

Reply: OK

Pag. 14 line 4: I said earlier that the term Conclusion may not be the best. However, it seems, this is the usual way in this journal. I would like to see the Editors remark to this and you should follow that

Reply: We wrote Summary and Conclusions.

Pag. 23 line 14: should this be a capital C?

Reply: OK

Pag. 24 Tab.: here, the ? may be acceptable. If you find any better way, please use it!

Reply: This mode of writing is common in paleontological publications (e.g. Wisshak et al., 2008)

Pag. 27 Figure caption: alike to instead of ?

Reply: see previous answer.

Pag. 28 Figure caption: wouldn't it be better to say "undetermined"?

Reply: OK, we modified.

Pag. 28 Figure caption: rather: most likely bacteria, possibly cyanobacteria

Reply: OK

C4910

Pags. 29, 30, 31: see below and Pag. 32: why ??? If you are not sure, you should write so!

Reply: We believe that the taxa with ? belong to the species assigned although we are not completely sure. This mode of writing is common in paleontological publications (e.g. Wisshak et al., 2008).

Pag. 33 figure caption: shows that Mg content at the bottom.. lower...

Reply: OK

Pag. 34 figure caption: to me, it seems "bioerosional percentages" sounds strange. I would suggest "occurrence of bioerosion... given in percent"

Reply: OK

Pag. 35 figure caption: s.o.

Reply: OK

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 9, 11103, 2012.