Dear Editor and Reviewer,

Attached is a second major revision. Like before, all corrections are in blue. Detailed comments are below.

I find that the manuscript has improved a lot. Thank you for following my comments and suggestions. Unfortunately, I still think that the manuscript needs some work, particularly regarding the statistics and figures. Please find my comments below.
AUTHORS: Dear referee, it's a pleasure to read these lines.

Major comments:

Thank you for showing the scatter plots with the raw data. This is very useful in determining whether fitting a linear regression to your data is sensible. It looks like your data is significantly right-skewed: the majority of your data points are clustered near the origin and the trend you observe is driven by a few individual points. Please check whether your data is normally distributed before fitting a linear regression. A log-log transformation might help to fulfil the assumptions (i.e. normal distribution). You will likely still obtain a significant relationship between Chl and zooplankton abundance after transforming the data, but the results will be robust.
AUTHORS: Yes, most of tests for normal distribution failed. The data were log-transformed as recommended and all distributions except a single one became normal. Figure 5, Table 3, and a respective part in Results were redone.

The notion of an inverted food pyramid is very interesting and it would be nice to have a graphical representation of this. Have you considered, maybe for a future study, to look at biomass spectra?
AUTHORS: Yes, we plan to do this in the nearest future after collecting additional material this year. We feel this idea needs a separate detailed paper with results and discussion. We would be pleased to send this paper to you for a review next year.

All figures need work. Many are lacking axis labels and legends.
AUTHORS: You could overlook legends, they were submitted and stand separately of the figures themselves. All captions include necessary (and not redundant) information including information about axes (it would not be wise, for example, to label all identical axes in Fig. 5, this information is included in the caption to this figure). If we have overlooked something, please, please indicate more specifically.

The font sizes are often too small. Many captions are incomplete.
AUTHORS: You probably mean Fig. 4. We have enlarged the text. In Fig 5, dots look as if they have different size; that is not true: this is the effect of our Word version, we will discuss with the production department the picture format and proceed accordingly.

A point should be used to indicate decimal places (please also check the tables for this).
AUTHORS: Yes, the commas to indicate decimal places are now replaced with the points in Fig. 5 and Table 3. It is our fault, because traditional Russian format uses commas.

Minor comments:

Table 1: A table detailing the site of the locations and depth range has now been added. Why did you not include Chl concentrations, temperature? This would allow other scientists to build on your data.

AUTHORS: Now the required information added.

L22: “I doing so”. Please change.
AUTHORS: removed

L25: Fish are not plankton, so I do not think you need to specifically mention them. Also, you exclude them from most of your data analyses.
AUTHORS: We have removed most of references except few ones, which are necessary for a general discussion.

L27: This sentence is a bit awkward as it mixes two ideas: vertical structure and trophic structure. I suggest rephrasing it to avoid confusion.
AUTHORS: corrected

L28: You are not discussion biogeochemical cycles. Maybe better: “These findings, […], suggest that the importance of deep-ocean pelagic fauna for biogeochemical cycles maybe more important than previously thought”, or similar. Also, biogeochemical cycles are not mentioned anywhere else in the manuscript (except for in the abstract)!
AUTHORS: done as recommended

L80: I would move this paragraph into the method section.
AUTHORS: done as recommended

L98: “Samples have been taken following the same protocol”
AUTHORS: corrected

L120: What is the upper size that is reliably caught with these nets? This should be mentioned as it especially important for the interpretation of the fish biomass.
AUTHORS: size interval now provided

L127ff: maybe nicer to say “dominated by…” rather than “mainly…”
AUTHORS: done as recommended

L137: How did you obtain the length of an individual specimen?
AUTHORS: measured with an ocular ruler, now explained

L163: “decapod decapods”, please correct
AUTHORS: sorry, corrected

L240: “quasiexponential decrease”. Is this just based on eye-balling? Please clarify. A simple regression fit (i.e. biomass vs average depth) would make this statement more robust.
AUTHORS: We have removed “quasiexponential” for clarity. Indeed, more date are necessary to obtain robust exponential regressions. This is a task for the next two years. The cited authors (Vinogradov, 1970) actually had had exponential regressions on a more extensive material.

L243-245: This sentence is awkward and does not add much. Please rephrase or delete.
AUTHORS: deleted

L256: It is interesting that you decided to average Chl over one year. Out of interest, have you tried correlations between biomass and Chl averaged over, for example, 6 months or 1 month prior to sampling? I suspect that the correlation would be a lot weaker (if any).

AUTHORS: A very intriguing question. As mentioned above, this year we plan to get an additional material (actually, to double material) and create a separate paper testing different time and space averaging. The cruises start very soon and last long.