

Review of Holder and Gnanadesikan (round 2)

The authors have taken great care to implement the many suggestions made by the reviewers in the first round of revision. Thank you for implementing these. As a result, I find that the manuscript is much easier to follow and the presentation of the results (figures and tables) is clear – a fantastic improvement. I would also like to commend the authors for including results that may not appear to be a “success”. I have added my comments below. They are only technical corrections. Suggested insertions are shown as italics.

L241: hours-days → *hours to days*

L401: “essentially captured all of it” could be strengthened with a quantitative addition of ($R^2 > 0.99$).

L487: capitalized “No” should be de-capitalized

Fig3, 7, 8: Would it be possible to show the same y-scale for the subplots? A suggestion. If the authors feel that this dilutes the message they are trying to convey (the shape of the curve), then do not change.

Fig7: A comment that might be useful for future experiments. The underestimation of biomass is the largest for irradiance. Could using the daytime-equivalent irradiance improve estimates? (i.e., do not include nighttime for averaging)