

Suggestions for revision or reasons for rejection (will be published if the paper is accepted for final publication)

The revised version of the ms under review has been improved considerably. The authors close followed the suggestions of the reviewers. Thus the ms is now acceptable for publication in Biogeosciences after minor/technical revisions:

Minor points

1) The Abstract gives too many conc and rates and, thus, is not very clear and concise. Please state only the main findings and do not give too many unnecessary details (such as conc) which might confuse readers only.

Author response>>> We have clarified the abstract by removing many of the numerical pieces of information; this necessitated slight modifications to text to improve readability.

2) Throughout Section 3 I find several paragraphs with comparisons with other upwelling regions such as the Benguela Upwelling etc.. I think these information are not absolutely necessary, unless the intention was to write a review article ... which I doubt.

Author response>>>This is a difficult issue to address as broader comparisons with the literature were requested by reviewers. Rather than make extensive comparisons with the four major upwelling systems of the globe, we have mainly limited comparisons with the Benguela system as they share a common source water. We believe this is both appropriate and justified and would rather not remove these points of discussion.

3) A paper by Powell et al. describing the N input to the ETNA has been published while the ms by Clark et al. was under review. (see Powell et al., 2015. Estimation of the atmospheric flux of nutrients and trace metals to the Eastern Tropical North Atlantic Ocean. J. Atm. Sci., 72: 4029-4045.). I suggest to discuss Powell's paper as well.

Author response>>>We have included this citation. The Powell et al (2015) paper adds to a point already made rather than raising a new point of discussion. Consequently, we do not propose to specifically discuss this paper as it is only indirectly related to our focus.

Technical issues:

1) page 1, line 12 and p.13, l. 13: I guess it must read dual not 'duel' .

2) p.3, l. 30: 'Benevides' should be corrected to Benavides

3) p.4, l. 21: I guess 'MPV' should read MVP

Author response>>> All technical issues have been addressed.