

Response to Referee #1 Comments, “A comprehensive estimate for loss of atmospheric carbon tetrachloride (CCl<sub>4</sub>) to the ocean”, by J.H. Butler et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

1. Page 2, lines 6 and 7. The referee is correct that this is a mischaracterization of the relative uncertainty of the soil sink. We have removed the reference to the soil sink being less certain.
2. Page 2, lines 24-25, Done; changed to “we sampled daily”
3. Page 5, line 19, Done; changed to “estimated”
4. Page 6, lines 30-32, Done as requested. The statement reads as, “This is an area that requires further investigation, as there is no direct evidence to date for such pathways, microbial or otherwise, in the ocean, although there is evidence for microbial removal of CCl<sub>4</sub> in well oxygenated soils (e.g., Mendoza et al., 2011)”
5. Technical corrections
  - a. Page 7, line 10, Text now reads “bomb and”
  - b. Page 7, line 14, Text now reads “(~14%)”
  - c. Page 11, line 25, Text now reads “SF<sub>6</sub>”
  - d. Table 1. (The referee refers to “Figure 4” in making this comment, but we believe the reference was to “Figure 1”, which is relevant to his or her point.) After consideration, we have decided to keep Table 1 in the text and leave the Figure 1 caption as is. The information in the caption refers only to what’s in the figure; information in the table addresses additional items such as ship names and sampling and analytical techniques, which are relevant to the data collected and can be linked to other studies.