

Anonymous referee #3: minor revision

After major revision, this is the new version of the manuscript by François et al. 2022. I have noted the effort made by the authors to improve the quality of the responses to the reviews, as well as the restructuring and clarification of the new manuscript. I have listed below short questions/corrections to further improve the manuscript before publication.

Reply: We thank the referee #3 for reviewing the document and recognizing the improvements made. Below, you will find the answers to the helpful comments and suggestions.

Short questions:

Comment - L 166: how did you define the surface area with a surface formula closest to the shape of the shell? perhaps add a further indication in the manuscript.

Reply: Foraminiferal the test area was defined following the differences in gray scales between the surface of the test (white) and background (black) in ImageJ. This information was included in l170.

Comment - Paragraph 3.3: it would be more logical to start the description of figure 2 with paragraph L 246-258 dealing with Fig 2a and then with paragraph L 234-245 fig 2b and c?

Reply: The paragraphs were reorganized accordingly.

Comment - Paragraph 3.4: why the shell thickness is in mm³?

Reply: We thank the referee for noting this mistake, we changed it to mm.

Comment - L 161: "Discoloration patterns were analysed to investigate the vertical mixing and exposure of relict tests" do you have a data table with these observations? may be interesting to put this in SI.

Reply: The discoloration counts were included in table S2.

Layout, spelling mistakes:

Comments –

author affiliation, add a dot at the end

L 110: forams sampled weight, washed and dried → stained, weight, washed and dried?

L 190: was used → were used

L 218: problem of repetition in the text $p=0.038$

L 223: $AIC=401.79$ → $AIC = 401.79$

L 246 and others: $p\text{-value} = < 0.05$ → $p\text{-value} \leq 0.05$

Fig. 2: some legends are shifted in the figure

L 307: \. → to remove

Fig. 4a: $R^2 = 0.54$ (text) and $R^2 = 0.59$ (figure) → to be homogenised

Fig 4: some legends are shifted in the figure and in the caption simbiotic → symbiotic

L 445: wight → weight

L 476: post mortem → italic

L 551: this species represent → represents

Reply: We thank the referee for noting these mistakes. We changed them accordingly.

Comment - L 216-218: ($\rho = 0.55$) → why the ρ is written differently?

Reply: Because ρ refers to the correlation coefficient and not significance.

Comment - L465-469: no need to repeat all μ CT results make it shorter.

Reply: This paragraph was shortened by removing the exact values and citing fig. 6 to illustrate the differences in the μ CT results.