

**Dear editor, dear Jack,**

We are pleased to hear that our manuscript is now accepted for publication. We have applied all technical revision as requested in your letter below. The in-text reference formatting has been corrected as requested.

Best regards,  
Friederike Hoffmann

All technical corrections were applied as requested below:

All through, the reference formatting needs attention; the references should be chronologically when part of a series).

p. 4, line 5: year of Brusca and Brusca reference is missing

All through, use consistently Arctic rather than arctic.

p. 8, line 14: reformulate: from less than 1 and 2 mg L<sup>-1</sup>... does not make sense.

p. 10, line 9. Floating , and .

p. 13, line 8-10. This is unclear. Did you run 3 samples per sponge species for sediments?

p. 14, line 9: delete 'in these'

p. 19, line 8: delete in ch. 2.3.

p. 21, line 4: six key sponge species

p. 22, line 17: ...section), because we did not have control...

p. 23, line 9: replace O with 0 (already alluded to by referee).

p. 23, line 13-16: do not use bold to emphasize conclusions  
same applies to page. 24, line 12-13

p. 24, line 4: and should not be italic

p. 24, line 25: 15N should be superscript

p. 26, line 5, line 9, line 16: do include the units!

p. 27, line 17: reference list issue

p. 28, line 5: delete main

p. 29, line 11: Measurements... were done...

Table 1: As the referee suggested, lower number of digits, they are not significant.

Table 1. Explain ND (as Not Detected).

Table 1: units per sponge is not right for sediment