

Dear Ms. C. Löscher,

during the last step of proof-reading the typesetted manuscript, we realized that we mistakenly provided the cited literature range for the size of diatom frustules ( $d_{p,frustule}$ ) in Tab. 1 of our manuscript in terms of radius and not, as noted in the description, as diameter. In the manuscript text, we correctly described the size range of  $d_{p,frustule}$  as 12-58  $\mu\text{m}$  (we carefully checked the literature again; see also p.10, l. 71-73 of the typesetted manuscript, where  $d_{p,frustule}$  is correctly described). It's a slightly embarrassing mistake. However, it is minor since it does not change any other content of the manuscript. We therefore would like to ask for your consent that the typesetters are allowed to correct the cited literature range, provided in the table as follows:

~~6 to 29/ $O(\mu\text{m to mm})$~~   $\rightarrow$  12 to 58/ $O(\mu\text{m to mm})$

to correct for the factor of two, while leaving our model parameter value of  $d_{p,frustule} = 20 \mu\text{m}$  unimpaired. With this correction, the content of the manuscript will be consistent.

Sincerely yours,

Joeran Maerz on behalf of all co-authors