Biogeosciences Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2017-249-AC3, 2017

Biogeosciences
Discussions

Interactive comment on "An empirical method for absolute calibration of coccolith thickness" *by* Saúl González-Lemos et al.

Saúl González-Lemos et al.

heather.stoll@erdw.ethz.ch

Received and published: 23 November 2017

The reviewer asks about evidence for the preservation status of the Rhabdosphera employed in the measurements which have given inverse relationships, and the subtraction of the background.

There are no evidences of poor preservation of Rhabdosphaeras (R9 and R10). Of course, we are agree that these specimens should not be considered for calibration. We have represented these specimens on the graph to show the high range of variation existing according to the Rhabdosphera chosen, since in most cases only a single specimen is used to calibrate a measurement series.

We clarify that the background gray level of sample slides is subtracted from all images

before quantifying gray level of coccoliths or nannoliths. A more detailed description of the process would be "After subtracting the background gray level from the image, for each rhabdolith we made 10 measurements of width/thickness and its corresponding gray level at different points." Consequently, the Rhabdosphaera width is defined by all pixels with a grayscale value greater than 0.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2017-249, 2017.