

Interactive comment on “Faunal carbon flows in the abyssal plain food web of the Peru Basin have not recovered during 26 years from an experimental sediment disturbance” by Tanja Stratmann et al.

Tanja Stratmann et al.

tanja.stratmann@nioz.nl

Received and published: 10 June 2018

Reviewer 1 comment 1: ...the reporting of precision in Tables 1 and 2. Up to six significant figures are given (for Ceriantharia in Table 1), and several of the standard deviations include biomasses below zero. In general, precision for means and deviations should be comparable and should exclude the impossible. The authors seem to have defaulted to an arbitrary two places after an arbitrarily placed decimal point. Our response: We adjusted the Result section 3.1, Table 1 and 2 and report all biomass data with a precision of 3 significant figures in the text and only one decimal place

C1

in Table 1. The individual biomasses of organisms in Table 1 are reported as mean \pm standard error and percentages are presented as integers in the text and with one decimal place in Table 2. We also corrected the remainder of the manuscript in this respect.

Reviewer 1 comment 2: In a more minor but related issue, in Fig. 1 the color scheme makes the error bars very hard to discern. Our response: Also Reviewer #2 (see below) indicated that the error bars are difficult to see. Hence, we decided to remove the error bars from the plot for better visibility and refer to Supplement 1 for the standard deviations.

Reviewer 1 comment 3: The approach used to estimate individual biomass of Bryozoa and Hemichordata seems shaky enough that I would recommend doing the calculations with and without those estimates to convince myself that the results are not overly sensitive to their inclusion. Most Bryozoans are colonial, making me wonder what this individual biomass means. Our response: We mistakenly included bryozoans in Table 1 in our initial submission. In the study area bryozoans were only found in the reference sites and, as mentioned in the manuscript (Page 3 line 29), these sites were not modelled. Therefore, we removed bryozoans from Table 1 and from the rest of the manuscript. We calculated the contribution of Hemichordata to megafaunal deposit feeders and Hemichordata contributed a maximum of 3% (PD0.1, inside plough tracks) to megafaunal deposit-feeding biomass. Our results were therefore not overly sensitive to the inclusion of this taxon.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2018-167>, 2018.

C2