

Author reply to comments by Anonymous Reviewer #3:

*The paper is based on a good idea but this paper is poorly written and a little messy. It is probably possible to amend these shortcomings but it would require extensive re-writing considering the following issues:*

**Author reply:** Thanks to thoughtful and thorough comments by all reviewers, we feel our manuscript is much improved and more accurately reflects our works' contribution to the field of ocean acidification research. Following our extensive re-writing, we hope you agree it is appropriate for publication in BG.

*- Be much clearer about what was done (e.g. it is not clear in the abstract that only pH was tested in one experiment and pH/hypoxia in the other; it is also not clear where the "food limitations" part fits, this makes it hard to get a clear picture of the work done)*

**Author reply:** In response to this and comments by other reviewers, we have edited text throughout the manuscript, and especially in the abstract, to be more clear about what variables were tested during experiments one and two.

*- In general, methods, results and figures are poorly described. This includes chemistry that is poorly described (1 sentence) and should be presented in tables for the different experiments. It also includes a poor description of statistics.*

**Author reply:** In response to this and again to comments by other reviewers, we have added additional detail to our methods and results to more accurately reflect our experiments and findings. We have also added Table 1 which describes experimental water chemistry for all treatments in both experiments. As detailed in comments by (and to) other reviewers, we have majorly overhauled our description of statistics, including what we feel to be adequate details to interpret the significance of our results.

*-Furthermore, the authors should include more background information (e.g. on the biology of the species, feeding, etc.)*

**Author reply:** Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We have edited the text throughout, and as detailed by other reviewers, to remedy the shortcomings of background information.