Thank you for your thoughtful suggestions and comments.

Comments 1:
In my opinion, the lack of the integration of the coccoliths with coincident particles (quartz, clays, other calcite particles, including other coccoliths) represents a major caveat of the refinement of the decanting protocol. The Authors treat their assemblages as monospecific coccolith assemblages. For the large assemblages, which yielded 50% relative abundance of the target species, what is the effect of other calcite particles? If their composition change, would that change the settling velocity?
Reply: Good question. If our understanding is correct, we think your question can also be asked in another way: what’s the behavior of particles in a multi-species or multi-particle type settling system?
Based on the work by Masliyah (1979), we know that when particle concentration is smaller than 10%, the collisions among particles don’t have significant influence on sinking velocity. Hence, in a situation where there are several kinds of particles in the suspension, if the concentration is low enough, we can treat them as independence settlings. In our experiments, because the particles concentration were below 5%, we therefore think that varying composition of the suspension would have a negligible influence on the measured sinking velocities. This would be the case for a multi-species coccolith assemblage or one with different particle times, so long as total particle concentration remained low.

Comments 2:
More importantly, it is well known that clays are charged particles that are able to form aggregates (‘flaks’) in suspension and as such, these particles are prone to substantially influence the setting velocity. This issue is only briefly acknowledged by the ‘hindered settling’. This is crucial for the application of the parameters in natural assemblages containing various concentrations (?nature) of clay minerals. Therefore I am of the opinion that this points need to be further discussed. Adding synthetic clay minerals in the assemblages would have been a sensitive means to address this criticism, although I am not advocating that the Authors should perform more experiments.
Reply: We emphasize that ‘hindered settling ’ is different to ‘settling as aggregates’. As we mentioned in Lines 154-158 (Lines 134-141 in the former version), ‘hindered settling’ was caused by high concentration of suspension and collisions among particles. In the sample of ODP 807, there are aggregates in raw sediments even after 24 hours soaking in 0.2% ammonia. There is a protocol using benzalkonium chloride to disaggregate (Minoletti et al., 2008). In our pretreatments for this site, we discarded any large rapidly sinking aggregates that remained after soaking, before proceeding with settling steps. We now mention this in Lines 91-92. We acknowledge that, in this study, we have not tested the direct effect of disaggregated clays present in the solution on coccolith settling rates. However, as mentioned above, low concentrations should minimize these effects.

Comments 3:
It is not clear to me how many particles (coccoliths) were actually counted, nor if replicated measurements have been conducted? Also, it would be good to explain the ‘drop technique’ used in this study.
Reply: Thank you for pointing this out. In most experiments, more than 300 (usually around 500) coccoliths were counted. For H. carteri, we counted more than 100 FOVs and about 100 specimens because the number of H. carteri is much smaller than other coccolith even after pretreatments. We have added this statement in the new version (Lines 113-119).

Comments 4:
It is not clear from reading the text why Helicosphaera carteri escapes the settling velocity equation derived for other taxa (L203-205).
Reply: Thanks for pointing out that this needs clarification. We didn’t use H. carteri in the regression because of its specific shape, which is quite different to the other species studied. This was explained it in Lines 224-233 (Lines 203-205 in the former version): the ellipticity of H. carteri (~0.6) is
significant lower than other coccolith (among 0.8-0.9), therefore its settling behavior differs from other species. This is also illustrated in Figure 6d and Figure C3. We have reorganized this part to make it clearer.

Comments 5:
Why is the potential of centrifuging not discussed at all - except a brief mention L47?
Reply: This is a good point and a question that we are currently working on. To date, we have calculated the movement of coccoliths in a centrifuge machine and tried to use centrifuging instead of gravity settling. The centrifuging method works well for small coccolith such as F. profunda and E. huxleyi. However, the uncertainty will become larger when we try to separate large coccolith such as C. pelagics. We are still working on improving the centrifuging method, which would be the subject of a future publication and we would prefer to focus on sinking velocity measurements under gravity in this study.

Comments 6:
Figure 1 should include the array of sizes of the various coccoliths presented.
Reply: Thank you for your suggestion. We have listed mean sizes and standard deviations of size in Table 2. Since Figure 1 showed the evolutionary ranges timing of different coccolithophores and the coccoliths’ size for each species varied in geological time, we think plotting the size data in our sample with fixed values on Figure 1 could be misleading.

Comments 7:
Figure 2 is not really convincing given the number of coccoliths in the field of view.
Reply: We have redrawn Figure 2 and replaced these photos by a schematic drawing. See the new version Figure 2.

Comments 8:
That Pseudoemiliania lacunosa and Umbilicosphaera sibogae are impossible to differentiate is premature here, and should be discussed later in the manuscript.
Reply: We have changed this sentence as ‘Pseudoemiliania lacunosa and Umbilicosphaera sibogae were measured together’ and we have modified the former ‘Conclusions’ part as ‘Suggestions for coccolith settling velocity estimations and separations’ and you can find an explanation in Lines 277-279.

Comments 9:
L143 "in ammonia at 20 C" – I guess you mean in deionized water neutralized by addition of ammonia?
Reply: Yes. We have changed this sentence as ‘in 0.2% ammonia at 20°C’.

Comments 10:
L348 : Publication date is 2009. L415 Pseudoemiliania lacunose is mispelt. L420 Calcidiscus leptoporus is mispelt. (Many other taxa are misspelt throughout the text and captions).
Reply: We apologize for the spelling mistakes. We have done double checks in this new version. We have changed publication data in Line 34, 88 and 411.

References:
A refinement of coccolith separation methods: Measuring the sinking characters of coccoliths

Hongrui Zhang1,2, Heather Stoll2, Clara Bolton3, Xiaobo Jin1, Chuanlian Liu1
1 State Key Laboratory of Marine Geology, Tongji University, Shanghai, 200092, China
2 Geological Institute, Department of Earth Science, Sonneggstrasse 5, ETH, 8092, Zürich, Switzerland
3 Aix-Marseille Univ, CNRS, IRD, Coll de France, CEREGE, Aix en Provence, France.

Correspondence to: Chuanlian Liu (liuc@tongji.edu.cn)

Abstract. The quantification sinking velocities of individual coccoliths are relevant will contribute to for export of their CaCO3 from the surface ocean, and for optimizing laboratory methods to for separating coccoliths of different sizes and species for geochemical analysis. In the laboratory, the repeat settling/decanting method was the earliest method proposed to separate coccoliths from sediments for geochemical analyses, and is still widely used. However, in the absence of estimates of settling velocity for non-spherical coccoliths, previous implementations have depended mainly on time consuming empirical method development by trial and error. In this study, the sinking velocities of coccoliths belonging to different species were carefully measured in a series of settling experiments for the first time. Settling velocities of modern coccoliths range from 0.154 to 10.67 cm h⁻¹. We found that a quadratic relationship between coccolith length and sinking velocity fits well and coccolith sinking velocity can be estimated by measuring the coccolith length and using the length-velocity factor, k. We found a negligible difference in sinking velocities measured in different vessels. However, an appropriate choice of vessel must be made to avoid ‘hindered settling’ in coccolith separations. The experimental data and theoretical calculations presented here will support and improve the repeat settling/decanting method.
1. Introduction

Coccolithophores are some of the most important phytoplankton in the ocean. They can secrete calcareous plates called coccoliths, which contribute significantly to discrete particulate inorganic carbon in the euphotic zone and to CaCO\textsubscript{3} fluxes to the deep ocean (e.g., Young and Ziveri, 2000; Sprengel et al., 2002; Zhang et al., 2016). However, the use of coccolith geochemical analyses in paleoenvironmental reconstructions was so far hindered by the difficulty of isolating coccoliths compared with foraminifera. Two main methods have been developed to concentrate near-nanometric coccoliths from bulk sediments: one is the method based on a decanting technique (Paull and Thierstein, 1987; Stoll and Ziveri, 2002) and the other is that based on microfiltration (Minoletti et al., 2008; Stoll, 2005; Beltran et al., 2007; Bolton and Stoll, 2013; Rousselle et al., 2013). Moreover, the development of coccolith oxygen and carbon isotope studies in culture in recent years (e.g. Ziveri et al., 2003; Rickaby et al., 2010; Hermoso et al., 2016; McClelland et al., 2017) has provided an improved mechanistic understanding of coccolith isotope data and therefore stimulated the need for more purified coccolith fraction samples from the fossil record.

Both decanting and microfiltering are widely used methods for coccolith separation. The microfiltering method separates coccoliths with polycarbonate microfilter membranes heavily on the specifications of microfilter membrane (such as with pore sizes of 2\textmu m, 3\textmu m, 5\textmu m and 8\textmu m, 10\textmu m and 12\textmu m pore size), and this method is highly effective in the larger size ranges, but is very time consuming in sediments with a high proportion of very small (<5\textmu m) coccoliths (which tends to be the case in natural populations). It is also impossible to separate coccoliths with similar lengths by microfiltration, such as Florisphaera profunda and Emiliania huxleyi (Hermoso et al., 2015). Decanting, on the other hand, is highly effective for the small-sized coccoliths, because their slow settling times permit a greater ability to separate different sizes. Consequently, in some studies, a combination of the micro filtering and sinking or centrifugation method were applied for coccolith separation (Stoll, 2005; Bolton et al., 2012; Hermoso et al., 2015). The repeated...
sinking/decanting method, first employed by (Edwards, 1963; Paull and Thierstein, 1987) follows the simple principle formalized by Stokes’ Law for spherical particles: particles of larger size settle more quickly because they have a higher ratio of volume and mass (accelerating sinking) to sectional area (resistance retarding sinking). However, the sinking velocities of coccoliths with complex shape are difficult to calculate and have not been quantified in previous studies. Consequently, the repeated decanting method has generally used settling times based on empirical trial and error. In this study, we present a novel and rigorous estimation of the sinking velocity for 16 species of modern and Cenozoic coccoliths, carefully measured in 0.2% ammonia at 20°C. With this new dataset, we explore how to estimate the sinking velocity of coccoliths based on their shape and length, which allows our estimations to be generalized for other species, and for situations where the mean thickness length of coccoliths of a given species was different from that of our study. These generalizations, together with our results on sinking velocities of one coccolith species (Gephyrocapsa oceanica) in different vessels, should allow a significant improvement in efficiency of future protocols for separation of coccoliths by repeated decanting.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Sample selections

We measured the sinking velocity of 16 different species of coccoliths isolated from eight deep-sea sediment samples from the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans (Figure 1, Table A1). Sample were principally of Quaternary age but include two Neogene/Paleogene samples (Figure 1). In general, numbers of small coccoliths, including E. huxleyi, Gephyrocapsa spp and Reticulofenestra spp. are about an order of magnitude greater than that of larger coccoliths. However, the larger coccoliths’ contributions to carbonate can be as high as 50% (Baumann, 2004; Jin et al., 2016). Moreover, both small coccoliths and large coccoliths are useful in geochemical analyses (Ziveri et al., 2003; Rickaby et al., 2010; Candelier et al., 2013; Bolton et al., 2012, 2016; Bolton and Stoll, 2013). Therefore, both small and large coccoliths were studied in this research. The coccoliths were isolated from eight samples from the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans (more location information are in Figure 1 and Table A1; the pictures of studied coccolith can be found in Appendix B). All pictures of the studied coccoliths are shown in Appendix B, and all classifications of coccolith...
2.2 Experiment designs

2.2.1 Sample pretreatments

The sinking velocity measurement depends on absolute abundance estimation (more details in 2.2.2). However, on microscope slides, larger coccoliths and foraminifer fragments may cover smaller coccoliths, reducing the accuracy of coccolith absolute numbers. Thus, before sinking experiments were carried out, raw sediments were pretreated to purify the target coccoliths to reduce errors in coccolith counting. The raw sediments were disaggregated in 0.2% ammonia and sieved through a 63 μm sieve and then treated by sinking method or filtering method (Bolton et al., 2012; Minoletti et al., 2008) to concentrate the target species up to at least more than 50% of the total assemblages (for Noëlaerhabdaceae coccoliths, a percentage more than 90% can be easily achieved).

In one sample with aggregation (ODP 807), we did a rapid settling (30 min, 2 cm) to eliminate aggregates. Most of the species were measured individually in settling experiments, except the for Pseudoemiliania lacunosa and Umbilicosphaera sibogae, which cannot be separated from each other were measured together.

2.2.2 Measuring the sinking speeds of coccoliths

We are not aware of any prior direct determination of the sinking velocity of individual coccoliths, although the sinking velocities of live coccolithophores and other marine algae cells have been successfully measured by the ‘FlowCAM’ method (Bach et al., 2012) or a similar photography technique (e.g. Miklasz and Denny, 2010). Here we introduce a simple method to measure the particle sinking speeds without special equipment.

1. After pretreatment, the coccolith suspensions were gently shaken and then moved into comparison tubes which were vertically mounted on tube shelves. We set the timer going and let the suspension settle for a specified period of time, marked as sinking time or settling duration (T).

2. Thereafter, we removed the upper 15 ml supernatant into a 50 ml centrifuge tube with a 10 ml pipette. This operation should be performed slowly and gently to avoid drawing lower suspensions upward. The absolute counting of coccolith was achieved by using the ‘drop technique’ to make quantitative microscope slides (Koch and Young, 2007; Bordiga...
et al., 2015). 0.3 ml mixed suspension was extracted and pipette onto a glass cover and dry the slider on a hotplate;

3. The lower suspension was then homogenized and another slider was prepare as described above;

4. The number of coccoliths in the upper and lower suspensions were carefully counted by the ‘drop technique’ on microscope at $\times1250$ magnification and the number of coccoliths and fields of view (FOV) were recorded for further calculations, which is a quick method to determine absolute abundance of coccoliths (Koch and Young, 2007; Bordiga et al., 2015). More than 300 specimens were counted for most of the measurements. For the *Helicosphaera carteri* measurements, more than 100 FOV were checked and about 100 specimens were counted.

To calculate the sinking velocities of coccoliths, we define a parameter named the separation ratio (R), which represents the percentage of removed coccoliths in one separation by pumping out the upper suspension. This parameter is important and will be repeatedly mentioned in the following part. R was measured using the following equation (more details about derivation can be found in Appendix D):

$$R = \frac{N_1 - N_2}{N_1} \times \frac{V_2}{V_1 + V_2}$$

(2-1)

where $N_1$ and $N_2$ are numbers of coccoliths counted in upper and lower suspension slides, respectively; $n_1$ and $n_2$ are the number of fields of view (FOV) counted. $V_1$ and $V_2$ are the volume of the settling vessel defined by the settling distance, as shown in Figure 2.

The separation ratio, R, also has a relationship with sinking time, $T$ (Appendix D):

$$R = \frac{V_1 - V_2}{V_1 \times T}$$

(2-2)

where $V_1$, $V_2$ and $D$ are shape parameters shown in Figure 2; and $s_v$ is the average sinking velocity of measured coccoliths. If we plot $R$ against $T$, the slope of line has a relationship with $s_v$. Hence linear regressions between $R$ and $T$ were processed with MATLAB to calculate the $s_v$ (details about error analyses can be found in Appendix E).

There are still two issues to be explained. Firstly, to eliminate the shape differences among vessels, all separation ratios have been transferred to calibrated separation ratios ($R_{cal}$), which means the separation ratio measured in a standard vessel with $V_1=15$ ml, $V_2=10$ ml and $D=6$ cm...
(more details about transformation from $R$ to $R_{\perp}$ can be found in Appendix D). The other one is

Secondly, we treated the average sinking velocities as the sinking velocities of the coccoliths with the average length. This approximation has been proved reasonable in Appendix D.

2.2.3 Detecting the potential influence of vessels

Seven commonly used vessels were selected to detect the potential influence of vessels (Figure 3). Two of them are made of plastics (No.2 and No.3 in Figure 3) and all others are pyrex glass vessels. About 500 mg of sediment from the core KX21-2 were pretreated as described in 2.2.1 and suspended in about 500 ml ammonia. After that, settling experiments were performed as described in 2.2.2 using different vessels. In these experiments, only the dominant species, *G. oceanica*, was measured.

2.2.4 Other factors influencing the sinking velocity

Temperature can change the density and viscosity of liquid. Generally speaking, the higher the temperature is, the lower the density and viscosity will become and the faster pellets will sink. Take water for instance, if the temperature increases from 15 to 30°C, the particle sinking velocity will increase by ~43% (Table 1). All sinking velocities measured or discussed in the following sections were velocities at 20°C to minimize the influence of temperature.

The calibration of sinking velocity in high concentration suspension has been calculated by Richardson and Zaki (1954)

$$w = w_0 (1 - \alpha_s)^{2.7}$$

where the $\alpha_s$ is the solids volume fraction. Based on equation 2-3, the higher the suspension concentration is, the slower the sinking velocity will be. That is so called ‘hindered settling’. When the $\alpha_s=0.2\%$, the reduction of sinking velocity owing to hindered settling is negligible cannot be neglected ($w/w_0$ equals 99.46%). Hence, in this study all suspensions have solid volume fractions lower than 0.2% to avoid notable reductions of coccolith sinking velocities.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1 Influence of vessels

The sinking velocities of *G. oceanica* in the core KX21-2 in 0.2% ammonia at 20°C measured in different vessels vary from 0.99 to 1.23 cm h⁻¹. The lowest value occurred in the 100 ml centrifuge
tube and the highest sinking velocity was measured in the 50 ml centrifuge tube experiments. The correlations between sinking velocities and different vessel parameters are quite low: $r=0.13$ for the vessel inner diameter, $r=0.0005$ for the sinking distance and $r=0.051$ for the upper volume and total volume ratio ($V_{\text{upper}}/(V_{\text{upper}}+V_{\text{lower}})$). The dissipation of energy by friction between the moving fluid and the walls can cause a reduction of sinking speed (wall effect). A significant wall effect will be detected when a particle is settling in a vessel which, with a diameter that is smaller than the particle size by two orders of magnitude (Barnea and Mizarchi, 1973). The length of coccoliths is on the micron scales, so the diameters of vessel used in laboratory are about more than three four orders of magnitude larger than coccoliths. Moreover, our results show that the difference between vessel materials, glass and plastics, can also be ignored (Figure 4). Hence, we suggest that vessel type almost has no significant influence on sinking velocity of coccoliths.

However, our experiments were premised on the basis that the concentration of suspension was equal among different vessels. This means that large vessels can treat more sediment at one time but if we choose a larger vessel, more suspensions should be pumped and it often costs more time in sinking (often due to longer sinking distance). Assuming that the sediment is composed of 50% calcite (with density of 2.7 g cm$^{-3}$) and 50% clay (about 1.7 g cm$^{-3}$), the largest amount of sediment that can be used without significant reduction of the sinking velocity (5%) is about 400 mg in 100 ml suspension (this calculation is based on equation 2-3). However, because the sediments accumulate in the lower suspension, the particle concentration can be more than 4 times higher than in the initial homogenous concentration. This phenomenon will be more significant for a vessel with a narrow bottom, such as centrifuge tubes. To avoid this, we recommend using about 100 mg dry sediment should be suspended in at least 100 ml suspension to avoid ‘hindered settling’. If more sediment is necessary for geochemistry analyses, then a larger vessel should be selected to separate enough sample in at one time.

### 3.2 Sinking velocities at 20°C in 0.2% ammonia

We measured the separation ratios of different coccoliths in comparison tubes at 20°C in 0.2% ammonia (Figure 5). The sinking velocities of coccoliths were then calculated by linear fitting of separation ratios and settling durations. The sinking velocities of studied coccoliths vary by one two orders of magnitude from 0.154 cm h$^{-1}$ to 10.67 cm h$^{-1}$ (Table 2). The highest sinking velocity was
found in the measurement of *Coccolithus pelagicus* and the lowest velocity was found for *F. profunda*. The average sinking speed of coccoliths is about 10-50% of the terminal sinking velocities of calcite spheres calculated by Stokes’ Law (Figure 6c). These ratios are comparable with those data from Xie and Zhang (2001) and smaller than steel ellipsoids. The sinking velocities of coccoliths measured in our experiment are about 2-3 orders of magnitude smaller than values from sediment traps of 143-243 m d⁻¹ (595–1012 cm h⁻¹) in the North Atlantic (Ziveri et al., 2000 and Stoll et al., 2007), suggesting the fact that the coccoliths sinking out of the euphotic layer are mainly in the form of sinking aggregates rather than individual coccoliths.

### 3.3 Estimating the sinking velocities

Generally speaking, the sinking velocities of coccoliths increase with the distal shield length (Figure 5a), as expected from the increase in volume to sectional area for a given geometry as length increases. Our data implies that the sinking velocity has a power function relationship with distal shield length.

We propose that the sinking velocity of coccoliths might have a quadratic relationship with distal shield length as described by Stokes’ Law (Figure 6a). If we use data for all species except *Helicozoa-H. carteri* (the reason can be found in the following discussion), the sinking velocities can be described by the following equation:

\[ s_v = 0.0982 \pm 0.001 \times \phi^2 \]  

(3-1)

Based on this quadratic regression, we derive a shape-velocity factor \( k_{sv} \) that relates settling velocity to coccolith length.

\[ s_v = k_{sv} \times \phi^2 \]  

(3-2)

Furthermore, this factor is analogous to the shape-mass factor, ‘k,’ used to relate coccolith mass to coccolith length (Young and Ziveri, 2000). The length and shape-velocity factor of coccoliths can be used to predict most of the sinking velocity variations, however, variations may also arise due to changes in coccolith mass and thickness, for a given length, and due to the hydrodynamics of particular shapes. We noticed that the smaller coccolith *G. caribbeanica* has a greater sinking velocity than the larger coccolith, *G. oceanica*. We suggest that this was caused by greater mass per length (or greater average thickness) in the case of *G. caribbeanica* and this may be due to the closed
central area while *G. oceanica* has an open central area. Another example is *H. carteri*, in which lower smaller sinking velocity of which can be explained by the unique structure of *H. carteri* coccolith. Firstly, the broad edge of *H. carteri* can increase the drag force significantly, and *H. carteri* has the largest ellipticity (major axis length and minor axis length ratio) among the measured coccoliths, which means the mass of *H. carteri* is smaller than other species of coccoliths with similar lengths (Figure 6d and Figure C3). Moreover, most of the measured coccoliths have a ellipticity (major axis length and minor axis length ratio) larger than 0.8, while the ellipticity of *H. carteri* is around 0.6, which means the mass of *H. carteri* is smaller than other species of coccoliths with similar lengths (Figure 6d and Figure C3). That is also the reason *H. carteri* was excluded from the general regression in equation 3-1. In the case of partial dissolution, the well-preserved *Cyclicargolithus floridanus* may have higher mass than dissolved (or disarticulated) *Cy. floridanus*, and therefore a slightly higher shape-velocity factor.

4. Conclusions

Suggestions for coccolith velocity estimations and separations

To improve coccolith separation by settling methods, we measured sinking velocities of different coccoliths by gravity. Sinking velocities in this study varied from 0.154 to 10.61 cm h⁻¹, about 10% to 50% of those of calcite spheres with same diameter. The shape of different vessels had little impact on the sinking velocity. But we should consider the volume of vessels to avoid ‘hindered settling’. The sinking velocities are mainly controlled by the shape of coccolith, including the distal shield length, the size of central area, and the ellipticity of coccoliths. Besides the shape of coccoliths, temperature is also crucial to the coccolith separations because of the dependence of sinking velocities on temperature. Length-velocity factors were proposed to estimate coccoliths sinking velocities, so coccolith sinking speeds in different samples can be easily estimated. Separation can be achieved by following steps:

1) Measure the mean length of coccoliths in your target assemblage under the microscope and regress the length distribution by the assumption of normal distribution (details are in Appendix C);

2) Estimate sinking velocities for each important species. For species which sinking speed has been directly measured, we can use the length-velocity factor directly (v=k * ϕ²). For unmeasured species, we can choose the length-velocity factor of coccoliths
with similar morphology in this study or use the general length-velocity formula 

\[ v = 0.098(\pm 0.001) \times \phi^2 \]

3) Calculate the separation time for main species. For example, in KX21-2 there are three main coccoliths, *F. profunda*, *G. oceanica* and *Ca. leptoporus* and we wish to separate *G. oceanica* out from the bulk sediment. Calculate each coccolith’s sinking velocity distributions as described in Step 2 above. As shown in Figure 7, a sinking velocity intermediate between *F. profunda* (with a length 2σ larger than average, marked as +2σ) and *G. oceanica* (with a length 2σ smaller than average, marked as -2σ) optimal to separate them, would be 0.6 cm h\(^{-1}\). Similarly, we can chose speed thresholds 1.85 cm h\(^{-1}\) to separate *G. oceanica* from *Ca. leptoporus*. If we settle in a 50 ml centrifuge tube with a sinking distance, D, equal to 5.84 cm, the sinking time for separating *F. profunda* should be \( T = \frac{5.84}{0.6} = 9.73 \) h. Similarly, we can calculate the time for separating *G. oceanica* by \( T = \frac{5.84}{1.85} = 3.16 \) h;

4) Homogenize the sediment suspension and let coccoliths settling as the period calculated in Step 3. After that, pump out the upper part of suspension. In the upper part, we have exclusively the smaller of the main coccoliths. However, column will still contain some smaller ones. So this step (settling and pumping) should be repeated until the lower part no longer has significant contribution from the smaller coccoliths. This step has been well described in previous studies and more details can be found in Stoll and Ziveri (2002) and Bolton et al. (2012).

We find, if we use the general formula, it should be noted that a closed central area coccolith will sink faster than prediction (for *G. caribbeania* and small *Ca. leptoporus* will settle ~40% faster) and coccoliths with greater ellipticity can settle much slower (for *H. carteri* will settle as 30% of the predicted sinking velocity for coccolith with similar length). Moreover, the sinking method cannot separate every species of coccoliths perfectly. As mentioned in Section 2.2.1, *P. lacunosa* and *U. sibogae* cannot easily be separated from each other because they have similar sinking velocities. Nevertheless, this study provides the first direct estimation of coccolith settling velocities, which should simplify implementation of future methods to separate coccoliths by settling time.
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Table 1. The influence of temperature on sinking velocity. Density data is from Kell (1975) and viscosity data is from Joseph et al. (1978).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T (℃)</th>
<th>ρ (g cm⁻³)</th>
<th>η (mPa s)</th>
<th>SV T</th>
<th>SV T = 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.9991</td>
<td>1.1447</td>
<td>0.8804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.9982</td>
<td>1.0087</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.9970</td>
<td>0.8949</td>
<td>1.1279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.9956</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>1.2627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The sinking velocity and shape-velocity factor of different coccolith species: ϕ means the distal shield length of coccolith and St ϕ is the standard deviation of distal shield length; sv represents the sinking velocity; SV (95% -) and SV (95% +) represent the lower and higher limit of 95% confidence level, respectively. ‘ks’ represents the length-sinking velocity factor. The short name of coccolith can be found in the caption of Figure 4. The details of coccoliths length distribution are in Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Abb.</th>
<th>ϕ (μm)</th>
<th>St ϕ (μm)</th>
<th>sv (cm h⁻¹)</th>
<th>SV (95% -)</th>
<th>SV (95% +)</th>
<th>ksv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. profunda</td>
<td>Fp-WP</td>
<td>1.508</td>
<td>0.557</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. profunda</td>
<td>Fp-SCS</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small Reticulofenestra</td>
<td>Ret (+4μm)</td>
<td>2.454</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. huxleyi</td>
<td>Emi</td>
<td>2.512</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gephyocapsa spp.</td>
<td>G spp</td>
<td>2.755</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. caribbeanica</td>
<td>Gcar</td>
<td>3.312</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>1.873</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. sibogae</td>
<td>Umb</td>
<td>4.060</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1.268</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. oceanica</td>
<td>Geo</td>
<td>4.187</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. lacunosa</td>
<td>Pla</td>
<td>4.350</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>1.171</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Ca. leptoporus</td>
<td>Cal small</td>
<td>4.605</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>3.351</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large Reticulofenestra</td>
<td>Ret (&gt;4μm)</td>
<td>4.988</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>2.379</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cys. floridanae</td>
<td>Cyf</td>
<td>5.805</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>4.174</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dissolved) Cys. floridanae</td>
<td>Cyf -d</td>
<td>6.134</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>4.508</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Ca. leptoporus</td>
<td>Cal large</td>
<td>6.370</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>3.737</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. carteri</td>
<td>Hel</td>
<td>8.936</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>2.541</td>
<td>1.740</td>
<td>2.440</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co. pelagicus</td>
<td>Cpl</td>
<td>10.640</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td>10.610</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Temporal and spatial distribution of samples. (a) The evolution of studied coccoliths: first occurrence and last occurrence data are from Nannotax3 (http://www.mikrotax.org/Nannotax3/index.html). The blue bars represent ranges of first occurrence and the green bars represent ranges of last occurrence. The blue diamonds represent samples used in this study. (b) Spatial distribution of samples. 1304 means IODP U1304, 3428 means MD12-3428cq, 1433 and 1435 means IODP U1433 and U1435, respectively. 807 means ODP 807 and 21-2 means KX21-2.
Figure 2. Schematic of settling experiments. The pictures were taken after *Coccolithus pelagicus* sinking experiments with $T=0$ and $T=30$ min. $V_1$ and $V_2$ are the volumes of the upper and lower cylinders, $D$ is the settled distance. The numbers in circles are same as the number of Steps described in Section 2.2.1.
Figure 3. The shape parameters of vessels. V₁ and V₂ means the volume of upper suspension and lower suspension, respectively. D means sinking distance. Φ means average inner diameter which is calculated by \( \frac{2}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{V_1}{D}} \) and \( D \).
Figure 4. Sinking velocities of *G. oceanica* in the core KX-21-2 measured in different vessels. (a) The calibrated separation ratios measured in different vessels. Error bars show 95% confidence level of calibrated separation ratio. (b-d) The relationship between sinking velocity and different vessel shape parameters. Error bars represent 95% confidence level of sinking velocity in each vessel and the shade area represents 95% confidence level of sinking velocity considering all data points.
Figure 6. Coccolith sinking velocities and coccolith shape factors. (a-b) Sinking velocities and mean distal shield length. The horizontal error bars represent one standard deviation of coccolith length and the vertical ones represent 95% confidence level of measured sinking velocities. The blue, green and red lines represent sinking velocity of calcite sphere objects, coccolith sinking velocities estimated by Bolton et al. (2012) and this study, respectively. (c) The ratio of measured speed and speed calculated by Stokes’ Law. (d) Coccolith short axis length (SAL) and long axis length (LAL) ratio against shape-velocity factor $k_s$. Box shows median value and upper/lower quartiles, whiskers show maximum and minimum values, outliers larger than 1.5 of the interquartile range are shown as red crosses. The SAL against LAL plot was shown in Figure C3. The short names of coccoliths can be found in Table 2.
Figure 7. The selection of separation velocities: the sinking velocities of three main coccolith species in sample from core KX21-2 were calculated by the length distribution and velocity factors in Table 2. The yellow dots represent sinking velocities of coccoliths with mean length. The edge of boxes show the sinking velocities of coccolith within one standard deviation of length (±1σ) and the whiskers mark the sinking velocities of coccolith within two standard deviation of length (±2σ).
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### Table A1. Sample selections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured coccolith</th>
<th>abb.</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Epoch</th>
<th>Age model ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F. profunda</td>
<td>Fp-SCS</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>MD12-3428</td>
<td>0-1 cm</td>
<td>Holocene</td>
<td>Zhang et al., 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. profunda</td>
<td>Fp-WP</td>
<td>W.P.</td>
<td>KX21-2</td>
<td>2-4 cm</td>
<td>Holocene</td>
<td>Liang et al., 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. huxleyi</td>
<td>Emi</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>MD12-3428</td>
<td>0-1 cm</td>
<td>Holocene</td>
<td>Zhang et al., 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gephycosphaera spp.</td>
<td>Gpp</td>
<td>W.P.</td>
<td>ODP 807A</td>
<td>1H SW 102-104</td>
<td>Pleistocene</td>
<td>Jin et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. oceanica</td>
<td>Geo</td>
<td>W.P.</td>
<td>KX21-2</td>
<td>2-4 cm</td>
<td>Holocene</td>
<td>Liang et al., 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. caribbeanica</td>
<td>Gcbr</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>IODP 1304B</td>
<td>7H SW 69-70</td>
<td>Pleistocene</td>
<td>Channell et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small Reticulofenestra</td>
<td>Ret-4</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>IODP 1433B</td>
<td>2B R 2W 30-34</td>
<td>Miocene</td>
<td>Li et al., 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large Reticulofenestra</td>
<td>Ret-4</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>IODP 1433B</td>
<td>2B R 2W 30-34</td>
<td>Miocene</td>
<td>Li et al., 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclicargolithus floridanus</td>
<td>Cyf</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>IODP 1435A</td>
<td>6R 3W 25-29</td>
<td>Oligocene</td>
<td>Li et al., 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclicargolithus floridanus</td>
<td>Cyf-d</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>IODP 1435A</td>
<td>8R 1W 27-31</td>
<td>Oligocene</td>
<td>Li et al., 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbilicosphaera sibogae</td>
<td>Umb</td>
<td>W.P.</td>
<td>ODP 807A</td>
<td>3H SW 92-94</td>
<td>Pleistocene</td>
<td>Jin et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudoemiliania lacunosa</td>
<td>Pla</td>
<td>W.P.</td>
<td>ODP 807A</td>
<td>3H SW 92-94</td>
<td>Pleistocene</td>
<td>Jin et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helicosphaera carteri</td>
<td>Hel</td>
<td>W.P.</td>
<td>ODP 807A</td>
<td>3H SW 92-94</td>
<td>Pleistocene</td>
<td>Jin et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large Calcidiscus leptopus</td>
<td>Cal large</td>
<td>W.P.</td>
<td>ODP 807A</td>
<td>3H SW 92-94</td>
<td>Pleistocene</td>
<td>Jin et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small Calcidiscus leptopus</td>
<td>Cal small</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>IODP 1304B</td>
<td>7H SW 69-70</td>
<td>Pleistocene</td>
<td>Channell et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coccolithus pelagicus</td>
<td>Cpl</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>IODP 1304B</td>
<td>7H SW 69-70</td>
<td>Pleistocene</td>
<td>Channell et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix B. Coccolith images under circular polarized light

Plate B1. Images of measured coccoliths in this study: (a) *Pseudoemiliania lacunosa* in the core ODP 807; (b) *Gephyrocapsa oceanica* in the core KX21-2; (c) *Reticulofenestra* spp. (large) in the core IODP U1433B; (d) *Umbilicosphaera sibogae* in the core ODP 807; (e) *Florisphaera profunda* in the core KX21-2; (f) *Reticulofenestra* spp. (small) in the core IODP U1433B; (g) *Gephyrocapsa caribbeanica* in the core IODP U1304B; (h) small *Calcidiscus leptoporus* in the core IODP U1304B; (i) large *Calcidiscus leptoporus* in the core ODP 807A; (j) *Emiliania huxleyi* in the surface sediment in the South China Sea; (k) *Gephyrocapsa* spp. in the core ODP 807; (l) *Cyclicargolithus floridanus* in the core IODP U1435A and (m) dissolved *Cyclicargolithus floridanus* in the same core; (n) *Helicosphaera carteri* in the core ODP 807A; (o) *Coccolithus pelagicus* in the core IODP U1304B. White bars represent a length of 2 μm.
Appendix C. The length distribution of coccoliths

To measure the distal shield length of coccoliths, pictures were taken at a magnification of 1250x under circular polarized light. The coccolith lengths were measured by using the image analysis software, ImageJ. More than 5 pictures were taken and more than 50 (usually more than 100) coccolith specimens were measured. The length distributions of coccoliths measured in our experiments were shown in the Figure C1.

![Figure C1](image_url)

**Figure C1.** Size distribution of coccolith measured in the present study. The shorten names of coccolith follow Table A1.

The classification of coccoliths by length was supported by mixture analysis in PAST (Hammer et al., 2001), such as *Reticulofenestra* spp. and *Gephyrocapsa* spp. *Reticulofenestra* spp. in the Miocene were classified into two groups, Ret. (<4 μm) and Ret. (>4 μm). The traditional classification of *Reticulofenestra* spp. is <3 μm, 3-5 μm and 5-7 μm didn’t pass the normal distribution test. Hence, in this study the *Reticulofenestra* spp. are divided at 4 μm (Figure C2).

*Gephyrocapsa* spp. were classified by the shape of coccoliths into small *Gephyrocapsa* (central area opening and length <3.5 μm), *G. oceanica* (central area opening and length >3.5μm) and *G. caribbeanca* (closed central area) by the length and central area.
Figure C2. The classical classification of *Reticulofenestra* spp. (a) and the classification used in our study (b). The curves represent the normal distribution fits of different coccolith groups and the dish curve marks that the goodness of fit is below 0.2.

Figure C3. The short axis and long axis length distribution of coccoliths in Figure 6d.
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Appendix D. Coccolith movement in gravity settling

In this part, the derivation of equation will be explained in detail including proofs of several assumptions mentioned in the methods part.

When the well mixed sediment begins to sink, the decrease of coccoliths number in the upper suspension ($N_u$) can be described as following equation:

$$\frac{dN_u}{dT} = -\frac{N_{u(t=0)}}{D} \times \Delta v$$  \hspace{1cm} (D-1)$$

where the $D$ is the length of upper suspension and $N_{u(t=0)}/D$ is the initial number of coccolith in cross-section with a unit thickness of $dD$. $\Delta v$ is the sinking velocity of coccolith.

Do integration for the equation D-1, we can get the variation of coccolith number in the upper column over time:

$$N_u = N_{u(t=0)} - \frac{N_{u(t=0)}}{D} \times \Delta v \times T$$  \hspace{1cm} (D-2)$$

where $T$ is settling time. After a period of time ($T$), we pump out the upper suspension. Here we define the number of coccoliths in the upper supernatant dividing the total coccoliths number in the tube ($N_t$) as separation ratio ($R$), which represents the percentage of total coccoliths removed in one separation. This parameter is important and will be repeatedly mentioned in the following part. $R$ can be expressed by

$$R = \frac{N_u}{N_t}$$  \hspace{1cm} (D-3)$$

Assuming all coccoliths are uniformly distributed in the suspension at the beginning of settling, $N_{u(t=0)}$ has relationship with $N_t$ as follow:

$$\frac{N_{u(t=0)}}{N_t} = \frac{V_1}{V_1 + V_2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (D-4)$$

where $V_1$ is the volume of upper suspensions and $V_2$ is the volume of lower suspensions.

Combining the equation D-1, D-2, D-3 and D-4, we obtain the relationship between separation ratio, $R$, and sinking velocity, $\Delta v$, as follow:

$$R = \frac{N_u}{N_t} = \frac{N_{u(t=0)}}{N_t} - \frac{N_{u(t=0)}}{N_t} \times \Delta v \times T = \frac{V_1}{V_1 + V_2} - \frac{V_1 \times \Delta v \times T}{V_1 + V_2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (D-5)$$

If we plot the $R$ and $T$ on a figure, the slope of the line is a function of $V_1$, $V_2$, $D$ and $\Delta v$. Since the $V_1$, $V_2$, $D$ are known parameters, we say the slope of $R$-$T$ is a function of $\Delta v$, which is exactly what we want.
Comparison tubes used in our experiments have the same $V_1$ and $V_2$ but different $D$. Other vessels used in other experiments have different $V_1$, $V_2$ and $D$. So we should adjust the raw separation ratio to calibrated separation ratio ($R_{cal}$), which represents the separation ratio made in a standard vessel with $V_{1\text{std}}=15$ ml, $V_{2\text{std}}=10$ ml and $D_{\text{std}}=6$ cm. This step can be described by equation D-6:

$$R_{cal} = \frac{R \times (V_1 + V_2 \times D)}{(V_1 + V_2 \times D) \times (V_{1\text{std}} + V_{2\text{std}} \times D)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (D-6)

After calibrated, the slope of $R_{cal}$ against $T$ has relationship with $sv$ as following equation:

$$sv = -\frac{D_{\text{std}}}{V_{1\text{std}}} \times k = -10 \times k$$  \hspace{1cm} (D-7)

where $k$ is the slope of $R_{cal}$ against $T$ from regression and other parameters are as described above.

Hence, the sinking velocity of different coccoliths can be achieved by measuring the variations of $R_{cal}$ over time.

The coccoliths’ lengths in the sediment have some variations. So what we measured is actually the bulk settling velocity of whole coccolith population. We also offer a test for the assumption that the average sinking velocity of all coccoliths can be treated as the sinking velocity of coccoliths with the average length. Here we used the data of $G.\ oceanica$. A normal distribution was fitted to the measured length distribution (Figure D1-a). We generated 100000 coccolith following the normal distribution and let these coccolith evenly distributing in the comparison tube at the initial and then set them sinking without collisions with each other. And then we simulate a normal distribution situation of coccoliths in the vessel. The sinking velocities of different size coccoliths were calculated by the cubic velocity shape parameter $b'k'$ as described in discussion part. We modeled the coccoliths sinking process and computed the separation ratio (red dash line in Figure D1-b), coccolith length (red dash line in Figure D1-c) and instantaneous sinking velocities (orange dots in Figure D1-d) at different time sections.
Figure D1. The simulations of coccoliths settling with different lengths: (a) the length distribution of coccoliths. The green bars represent measured data and red dash line represents the best fit for normal distribution. (b) The calibrated separation ratio: the green dots are measured data in our settling experiments, the blue line and shade area represent the calculated sinking velocity based on $R_{cal}$ measurement and the red dash line represents results obtained from Monte Carlo simulations. (c) The average length of removed coccolith in simulations; (d) the modeling sinking velocities of coccoliths: the orange dots are instant sinking velocity calculated from derivation of $R_{cal}$, the red dash line is weighted average for the instant sinking velocity. Blue line represents the average sinking velocity we measured and the green shade area represents 95% confidence level of the measured velocity.

For *G. oceanica* experiments, the instant sinking velocity would not change significantly until settling for more 3 hours. That means for all $R_{cal}$ larger than 15% are safe for liner regressions. The
minimum safe number of \( R_{\text{cal}} \) will descend with the drop of dispersion degree of coccolith length distribution. Hence our assumption for average sinking velocity and the use of linear regression are proved to be reasonable.
Appendix E. Statistical and error analyses

The errors of measured separation ratio ($R$) and calculated sinking velocity ($sv$) are mainly caused by counting coccolith, the error of which follows the Poisson distribution. To detect the influence of counting number on the result error, the error of separation ratio was simulated by 5000 times Monte Carlo calculations with assumptions that ‘$V_1/V_2$=15:10’ and ‘$n_1=n_2$’ (Figure E1). The result shows that the number of coccolith counted in the upper column draws more influence on the relative error ($|R-\text{mean}|/R$). That means more coccolith in the upper suspension should be counted to make results more accurate. The slope of $R_{\text{cal}}-T$ was calculated by liner fitting with the intercept fixed on $V_1/(V_1+V_2)$. The input $R_{\text{cal}}$ were generated from measured values considering the error of coccolith counting. The error of sinking velocity-regressions of $R_{\text{cal}}-T$ was also repeated calculated by 5000 times Monte Carlo simulations in the software Matlab and the error of sinking velocity, $v$, was source from the distribution slope of $R_{\text{cal}}-T$ in Monte Carlo process.

Figure E1. The error distribution with different $N_1$ and $N_2$ (ranging from 1 to 1000) simulated 5000 times by the Matlab with assumptions that the error distributions of $N_1$ and $N_2$ fellow Poisson distribution. The calculation of $R$ follows equation 2-5, and here we assume numbers of FOV are equal ($n_1=n_2$). Counter lines mark values equal to 5, 10 and 20. (a) and (c) represent the lower 95% confidence level and (b) and (d) represent upper 95% confidence level. (a) and (b) the relative error of $R$ and (c) and (d) represent the absolute error of $R$. 
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