

Interactive comment on “Planktonic foraminiferal spine versus shell carbonate Na incorporation in relation to salinity” by Eveline M. Mezger et al.

Eveline M. Mezger et al.

eveline.mezger@nioz.nl

Received and published: 23 January 2019

Dear Prof. Schiebel,

thank you once more for your constructive comments! We can only agree with your suggestions and hope that our manuscript will show the urgency to study the relation between geochemistry and geno-/morphotypes in more detail. Secondly, we looked at the spine bases only, i.e. the place where the triangular or circular shape of the spine is most clearly visible. By including a reference to your and Chr. Hemleben's book, we show that the correlation between El/Ca and spine (bases) may vary with spine morphology.

Sincerely,

Eveline Mezger

Comments Prof Schiebel: "Further to the author's comments on my earlier review (included below), two points may be added. (1) It would always make sense to work on the highest systematic level possible, i.e. genotypes and morphotypes, if possible. (2) Both round and triangular spines differ in cross section at their base and are round at the top. It would hence be the base to look at for the respective difference in spine type. Both of the comments may be taken into consideration for future analyses to again improve the level of the scientific approach."

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2018-454>, 2018.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

