

Dear Marcel van der Meer,

Thank you for your positive response to our revised manuscript. We considered all your comments on minor revisions and changed/revised these parts. We also proof read the manuscript to eliminate typos and misleading phrases.

*I had one or two minor things. At the end of the abstract, is this specific for this area of the world? Perhaps add "in this area" all the way at the end.*

- We changed this sentence.

*Page 6 line 28, I would use increase rather than rise.*

- We changed the wording accordingly.

*Page 7 line 2, things are usually absent from and not in, if they were in they wouldn't be absent.*

- We corrected this.

*Page 7 line 11, total organic carbon content, lose the s.*

- We removed the s.

*Page 7 line 26, technically it's a monitoring gas, the external standard is your reference.*

- We corrected this.

*Page 11 line 8/9, conditions "for their producers" () "for their source diatoms". One or the other, not both.*

- We changed the wording.

*Page 17 line 19-29, this first sentence is a bit weird, normally you would start with the second sentence and then refer to the figure. Now it feels like a paragraph in the discussion starts with part of a figure legend? Personally I would try to avoid that, not a major issue.*

- We accordingly changed this paragraph.

*I would go through the text carefully again, make sure there are no typo's or other weird things, but I think this was it.*

- We read the manuscript again and corrected typos.