

Interactive comment on “Can morphological features of coccolithophores serve as a reliable proxy to reconstruct environmental conditions of the past?” by Giulia Faucher et al.

Baptiste Suchéras-Marx

sucheras@cerege.fr

Received and published: 22 October 2019

Reading quickly the submitted manuscript, I was looking at Figure 3, the hearth of the study (along with Fig.4). However, I don't understand what represent the whiskers around what I suppose are mean. And I found that there were 50 coccoliths measured per treatment only by reading the Tables captions. It should be in the methods. Any stats depends on n so it should be clear and easily accessible. I recommend to show 95%CI (2 sigma on each side) in Figure 3 or switch for boxplot. You should also show 95%CI in Figure 4. Because those are counted coccoliths, you may be able to apply counting uncertainty following Suchéras-Marx et al. 2019 and the "exact" Clopper-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Pearson method easily accessible with PAST 3.06 and updated. The Clopper-Pearson is a good solution because you have in Fig. 4 a lot of numbers close to 0%/100% borders. If you apply it, please rather cite Hammer et al., 2001 (Hammer, Ø., Harper, D.A.T., Ryan, P.D., 2001. PAST: paleontological statistics software package for education and data analysis. *Palaeontologia Electronica* 4, 1-9.) than Suchéras-Marx et al., 2019. Some words are too small in Fig. 3 and in Tables (d std). It should be the same size everywhere. Good luck Sincerely

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2019-84>, 2019.

CPD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

