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The third review was issued by Prof. J.P. Cook, co-author and editor of the first volume of Phosphate Deposits of the World, which contained the findings of the Unesco/ IGCP Project 156. Mr. Cook agrees that our paper addresses an important topic which has received only limited attention in the past decade and that the research questions explored in our paper provide a basis for publication. Mr. Cook also agrees that the debate on PR reserves and resources is important and can use an airing.
Mr. Cook feels that there are certain shortcomings as identified by the second review, issued by Scholz and Wellmer. Mr. Cook has considered our responses to the second review and acknowledges that we have addressed/considered/commented on the more profound criticism by Scholz and Wellmer. He indicates that he has some sympathy for our position that the reviewers appear to be wanting to change the scope of our paper.

Mr. Cook indicates that part of the problem appears to be in the title of our paper and the qualification of an "in depth review". The third reviewer wonders if a somewhat more modest title would render it less liable to criticism and suggests to change it into "Recent revisions of phosphate rock reserves and resources: a critique". We agree that this is a wise suggestion and will amend our title accordingly.

The third reviewer concludes that the paper should be published and that it will no doubt be the subject of a healthy debate. The third reviewer also indicates that, if there is to be any rewriting of the paper, we should take the comments in the second review into account. As noted in our response to the second review, we feel that a number of their comments contain valuable additions to our paper and we have incorporated those in it. We have also added a number of paragraphs in the introduction section in order to further clarify the relevance of our research questions. The third reviewer suggests to add diagrams to the paper explaining the resource classifications discussed in our paper in order to make the paper more accessible for non-specialists. We agree that this is useful and have included six figures in the supplement to our paper. We thank the third reviewer for his constructive comments.


Please also note the supplement to this comment: http://www.earth-syst-dynam-discuss.net/4/C688/2014/esdd-4-C688-2014-supplement.pdf
Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., 4, 1005, 2013.