

I really appreciate the author's effort. The changes and corrections made by the authors successfully addressed most of the comments expressed by the reviewers, improving the quality of the manuscript. Nonetheless, I indicate some aspects, not very important, which could still be improved.

- 1) I think that the correlation between μ and m deserves more attention in the discussion section. Taking into account the higher phytoplankton growth rates obtained in summer and the μ/μ_n ratios, the idea of the stimulation of phytoplankton growth in winter by the input of nutrients should be refined. In this way, Cáceres et al. (2013) suggested the occurrence of a higher coupling between both rates in summer than in winter as a consequence of the lower nutrient concentration and phytoplankton biomass. Similar reasons were exposed by Schmoker et al. (2013) when they made a comparison between ecosystems. On the other hand, some explanation for the difference between both size fractions could be proposed.

Cáceres, C., Taboada, F. G., Höfer, J., & Anadón, R. (2013). Phytoplankton growth and microzooplankton grazing in the subtropical northeast Atlantic. *PloS one*, 8(7), e69159.

Schmoker, C., Hernández-León, S., & Calbet, A. (2013). Microzooplankton grazing in the oceans: impacts, data variability, knowledge gaps and future directions. *Journal of plankton research*, 35(4), 691-706.

- 2) The legend in Fig. 2 should be completed, indicating the meaning of the symbols (summer or winter), or removed. If the legend is completed the description of the symbols in the footnote would be unnecessary.