

## Answers to scientific editor and referees

### Editor

Abstract file

**Answer:** Corrections suggested by the editor in the abstract file have been taken into account.

Manuscript file :

**Answer:** Corrections suggested by the editor in the ms. file have been taken into account.

### Referee 1

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

I have found one minor change required: the definition of the DDN was not in the introduction, as the authors mention in their response, but it is defined only in the abstract.

**Answer:** Definition of DDN is now included in the introduction.

### Referee 2

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

Some examples of remarks that should be considered by the authors throughout the manuscript: inconsistency in taxonomic groups naming (English vs Latin names, uppercases use, etc), punctuation/spacing errors, differences in naming (e.g. Chla-a vs chla), omission of anions and cations' charges, missing the use of bold font when naming some figures and tables within the text, etc.

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

In the revised version of this manuscript, the authors were taken into consideration the comments and the manuscript has improved in coherence and readability. The paper is more balanced now, and the structure and study objectives are clearer for the reader. However, some reviews are still needed. The manuscript is still missing consistency and need editing work.

Just some examples:

inconsistency in taxonomic groups naming (English vs Latin names, uppercases use, etc), **Answer:** We **homogenized as well as possible the taxonomic groups naming in relation to table S1**

punctuation/spacing errors, **Answer:** This has been homogenized

differences in naming (e.g. Chla-a vs chla), : **Answer:** This has been homogenized

omission of anions and cations' charges, **Answer:** Charges have been added for all quoted anions and **cations**

missing the use of bold font when naming some figures and tables within the text, etc. **Answer:** This **has been homogenized**

I only recommend the publication of the present manuscript after extensive proofreading and spellchecks. **Answer:** The ms has been checked by an native English speaker M. M. Paul.

Please find some remarks below:

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS

P1L25: Please delete the word “south” — it is redundant after 20° S. **Answer: “South” has been deleted**

P2 and throughout the text: NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> and PO<sub>4</sub><sup>3-</sup> are a charged cation and an anion, respectively. Although the authors said in their responses to my comments that they had changed it, they actually didn't. Please correct. **Answer: It has been changed at all places where these symbols occur**

P4L10: I realise you corrected the Ñ throughout the document after my previous comments. Please correct to “La Niña” also here. **Answer: “La Niña’event” has been corrected with the right editing**

P8L29: Please delete “a” — “a constant values” is grammatically incorrect. **Answer: “a” has been deleted**

P9L29: To avoid overworking and improve readability, please rewrite to “ We estimated the potential contribution of zooplankton excretion to nitrogen and phosphorous requirements for phytoplankton from primary production using Redfields’s ratios.” **Answer: The sentence has been changed as requested.**

P10L5-6: Please reword for the sake of clarity. **Answer: The sentence has been simplified :” A Bray Curtis matrix ‘species – stations’ of square root transformed abundance data was used to estimate station similarity”**

P14L11: Please remind the reader which are the 3 long duration stations. **Answer: The abbreviations of stations have been added : “3 long duration stations (LD-A, LD-B and LD-C)”**

P19L5: Over worded; please rewrite. **Answer: The sentence as been splitted in two shorter sentences.**

P20L9: Please correct “that” (change to “than”) and “considered” (“consider”). **Answer: These words have been corrected**

Table 1: Salinity should not have units. Please correct. **Answer: Salinity unit has been deleted**

Table 5 (and throughout the whole manuscript): Appendicularia is not a species, same as nauplii, Thecosomata, Chaetognatha and Ostracoda. Please correct accordingly. **Answer: “Taxa” has been written instead of “species”**

Fig 3B: Please use italics for all copepod species. **Answer: It has been changed with all copepod species oin italics**

Table S1: Please correct “Doliolo” to Doliolida. Chaetognaths should be within the Gelatinous Zooplankton group. **Answer: The two corrections have been done in Table S1.**