




Reply

Idiographic and nomothetic approaches to heterogeneity are complementary: Response to comments on “Evaluating the influences of temperature, primary production, and evolutionary history on bivalve growth rates”

James Saulsbury , David K. Moss, Linda C. Ivany, Michał Kowalewski, David R. Lindberg, James F. Gillooly, Noel A. Heim , Craig R. McClain, Jonathan L. Payne , Peter D. Roopnarine, Bernd R. Schöne, David Goodwin, and Seth Finnegan

James Saulsbury. Museum of Paleontology and Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109, U.S.A. E-mail: jgsauls@umich.edu

David K. Moss. Department of Geography and Geology, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas 77341, U.S.A. E-mail: dcm112@shsu.edu

Linda C. Ivany. Department of Earth Sciences, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13244, U.S.A. E-mail: lcivany@syr.edu

Michał Kowalewski. Florida Museum of Natural History, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, U.S.A. E-mail: mkowalewski@flmnh.ufl.edu

David R. Lindberg and Seth Finnegan. Department of Integrative Biology and Museum of Paleontology, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California 94720, U.S.A. E-mail: drl@berkeley.edu, sethf@berkeley.edu

James F. Gillooly. Department of Biology, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, U.S.A. E-mail: gillooly@ufl.edu

Noel A. Heim. Department of Earth and Ocean Sciences, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts 02155, U.S.A. E-mail: noel.heim@tufts.edu

Craig R. McClain. Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium, Chauvin, Louisiana 70344, U.S.A. E-mail: cmclain@lumcon.edu

Jonathan L. Payne. Department of Geological Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305, U.S.A. E-mail: jlpayne@stanford.edu

Peter D. Roopnarine. Institute for Biodiversity Science and Sustainability, California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California 94118, U.S.A. E-mail: proopnarine@calacademy.org

Bernd R. Schöne. Institute of Geosciences, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, 55128 Mainz, Germany. E-mail: schoeneb@uni-mainz.de

David Goodwin. Department of Geosciences, Denison University, Granville, Ohio 43023, U.S.A. E-mail: goodwind@denison.edu

Accepted: 16 April 2020

We thank Vermeij (2020) for his comments on Saulsbury et al. (2019), which provide an opportunity for us to clarify and expand on some points raised in the original paper. The goal of our study was to evaluate the degree to which relationships between environmental factors and growth rate observed in populations and species can be generalized across the entire bivalve clade. In our view, Vermeij’s idiographic focus on specific examples complements rather than contradicts our nomothetic search for overarching patterns.

We highlight three points of apparent contention where we see no inherent contradiction between Vermeij’s arguments and our findings.

1. Vermeij points out that the estimated dependence of growth on different factors (temperature, food supply, phylogenetic history) should be sensitive to sampling (Vermeij’s point 4). Indeed, we recovered especially strong environment–growth relationships within a handful of families (Fig. S4, our study), with weak relationships