

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

X. Jin (Referee)

386jinxiaobo@tongji.edu.cn

Received and published: 4 October 2017

This paper is concerning about a calibration between coccoliths thickness and their optical properties under circular polarized light microscope. And the usage of calcite wedges for the calibration provides a possibility and also a criteria to compare coccolith thickness and weight as estimated by their optical features when using light microscopes and cameras with different settings in other labs. The paper is well written, and authors provide a detailed technological processes for calcite wedges manufacture, and for measurements of the thickness of calcite wedges. So I see this study is important and recommend it can be published in Biogeosciences. Still, I have several questions that listed below: I have found inverse relations between grey level and width of *Rhabdosphaera* species (R9, R10) in figure 6A. Are these specimens poorly

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



preserved? These specimens may not be considered for calibration. It can be found that the linear K values of relation between grey level and width of Rhabdosphaera increase with the incensing of their width, when the width is $<0.6 \mu\text{m}$ most Rhabdosphaera measurements are below the calcite wedge curve, and when $>0.6 \mu\text{m}$ most Rhabdosphaera are above the calcite wedge curve. So compared with the calcite wedge, all the Rhabdosphaera measurements make their calibration be more like a sigmoidal function. Is the background grey levels of the coccolith sample slides considered in the Rhabdosphaera calibration? And how about the grey level threshold for Rhabdosphaera coccoliths outline constrain? This is important for calibration, since for lighter/brighter part of Rhabdosphaera robs, their width could be overestimated due to dispersion. Technical corrections: Page 4 line 12: the other one “above”... below

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

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

