Re-review: Sex-associated variations in coral skeletal oxygen and carbon isotopic composition of Porites panamensis in the southern Gulf of California by Cabral-Tena et al.

General Comments:

I was supportive of this manuscript in my original review and my comments mainly related to clarity of presentation and some additional details of the methods used. I am satisfied that the authors have adequately addressed by original comments and am happy to recommend publication. I still have a few minor comments/corrections (see below).

Specific comments:

Line 46: ‘signals’.
Line 53: ‘variables. The calcareous....’.
Line 57: ‘calcification records variations...’.
Lines 171-172: ‘used to establish the chronology’.
Line 179: ‘colonies. We chose...”’.
Line 184: ‘oceanwatch.php). The environmental...’.
Lines 207-208: ‘A Regime shift index for environmental and isotope data was calculated..’.
Line 212: ‘seasonally low SST’.
Lines 219-220: ‘Figure 2 shows X-ray positive prints for two of the samples’.
Line 239: (Fig. 3)?
Line 246: delete ‘data’.
Line 274-275: ‘isotopic records between 5 and 40 years in length’.
Lines 297-298: ‘Satellite SST data’.
Line 368: ‘at Clipperton Atoll’.
Line 399: ‘the pH of the ECF as (?) proportions of.....’.
Lines 434-435: ‘colonies. Both transformed...’.
Line 452: ‘commonly used paleotemperature’.
Line 728: These look more like positive X-prints to me.