

This authors have done a good job at addressing most of reviewers comments and all of the major criticisms appear to have been addressed correctly. I note that a few of the reviewers' comments were dismissed as trivial, but I think these 'minor' comments should be reconsidered. For example:

- (1) **Reviewer 1, - P7 L4-7:** This reviewer indicates that there is not a reference to where the data are compiled (presumably within the manuscript). The authors respond that the data are presented in published papers (which are included in the manuscript) and Figure 2 (not referenced here). *I believe that the reviewer is simply requesting that the authors refer to Figure 2 on P7 L4-7.*
- (2) **Reviewer 2, - P6L7:** This reviewer does not see the relevance of presenting Rayleigh-type fractionation. The authors respond that this is to emphasize that sponge Si isotopic fractionation does not follow Raleigh (should be spelled Rayleigh) type fractionation observed in diatoms. Up until this point, the authors do present anything related to diatoms or Rayleigh-type fractionation, and thus the comment appears to be out of context. *I recommend that the authors either remove this comment about Rayleigh-type fractionation or provide a better argument within the text as to why it has been presented (e.g. explain the Rayleigh distillation model and why it is important for diatoms and paleoceanography).*
- (3) **Reviewer 3:** This reviewer wrote "Some question regarding the dissolved Si concentrations: why are the dissolved Si concentrations for e.g. samples of the GRM location always 15.96 uM although they have a distance of more than 250 km and a depth difference of 400m?" The authors responded: "Unfortunately, it was not always possible to collect co-located sponge and water samples: the water sample closed to the sponge location was analysed." *I think it would be good to mention this in the text under section 2.1 – Sample collection.*