

Dear authors,

I have read through the reviewers' assessments and your answers to their questions. I believe your manuscript is now fit for publication in BG. Going closely through your revised manuscript, I have a number of suggestions to improve your manuscript.

Sincerely,

Lennart de Nooijer

Dear Mr. de Nooijer,

thank you for your quick response and the suggestions for improvement. Please find our revision below.

Best regards

Finn Mielck

Abstract

line 25: '... characteristics is unlikely.'

Changed

line 26: please change 'natural' into 'original' or 'pre-dredging' or something.

We used the term "pre-dredging" and added an "also" to the sentence, because the word "unlikely" already occurs in the previous sentence.

Line: 27/28: I suggest to remove the idea that a new ice age may restore the pre-dredging situation. It is not wrong, but irrelevant for this paper. I know that reviewer #1 hinted on this, but upon reading the abstract, I found it a out of place (at least here).

I agree with you. We removed the ice age from the manuscript.

Introduction

Line 63: '...differ considerably from those...'

changed

Material and Methods

Figure 1: I think the scalebar in the inset can be removed.

We removed the scalebar in the inset.

Line 147: 'Van Veen grab'

corrected

Results

Caption Figure 3, last line: 'hydroacoustics'

corrected

Line 201: 'the dredged area compared...' (I assume)

Indeed. We added "area" to the sentence.

Line 215: *N. cirrosa* in italics

Changed to italics:

"Nephtys cirrosa" and also *"Notomastus latericeus"* in the next line.

Discussion

Line 236: replace 'more and more' by 'increasingly'

replaced