

We thank you for your constructive suggestions and comments.

Both reviewers found the paper too descriptive and requested that more results should be presented in order to show how the project allowed some progress on the scientific questions. A dedicated section is now available highlighting the main results. Also, since the initial submission of our paper, the following progress was made regarding the papers from PEACETIME results:

- 2 papers have been accepted to the Special Issue (Tovar-Sanchez et al. and Taillandier et al.)
- 4 papers have been submitted to the Special Issue (Freney et al., Trueblood et al., Feliu et al., Gazeau et al.)
- 4 papers are published in other journals (Bressac et al., Nat. Geosc. and Whitby et al., in GRL, Garel et al., 2019, Menna et al., 2019)
- 1 paper has been submitted to PNAS (Sellegrì et al.)
- 14 other papers are still in preparation for this special issue with submissions in June and July.
- We decided also to remove from this list the papers that are in prep for a different journal

We choose in our first version to provide a full description of the decision tools and we agree that leaving that section and adding a long new section summarizing the content of the papers that are/will be presented in the SI would make a too long paper. That section (along with 5 figures) is now presented as Supplementary Material. Because we removed part of the text, the outline changed a bit also. A marked-up manuscript version is also available.

Irrespective of whether a broader overview manuscript is planned, I note that there were a number of places where additional details might have been provided which were unlikely to compromise other publications. For example, how large was the observed rain deposition event (Line 475)?

Please note that the rain rates are depicted on Figure 5. The following sentence was added: “This rain was part of a massive rain front covering ~80 000 km². This front extended from the coast of Spain to the south of the FAST station area, with rain rate reaching 10 mm h⁻¹ (Figure 5)”

Related to this section, what does ‘lowest most intense’ (Line 481) mean?

According to the classification of Vincent et al. (2016), the most intense dust deposition (MIDD) event is defined by considering all the samples for which the weekly deposition flux is greater than the geometric mean + the geometric standard deviation for a given station. Here, we considered the “Majorca Island” station of Vincent et al. as a reference station because it is the closest from the FAST station: comparing with that reference, our sampled wet dust deposition was in the low range of MIDD reported in the region. So we replaced by “in the low range of most intense dust deposition event (MIDD)”

Some additional general points: It would be useful to have station locations indicated on more of the figures, in particular figures 7, 8, 9 & 11.

Those figures are now in SI. The position of the FAST station is now reported on each.

It might also be worth compositing these figures as subpanels to enable easier comparison across them. Indeed I found I spent a lot of time moving backwards and forwards between different figures and the text and I think it would help readability if both the set of figures used and the formatting of these be reconsidered. There were also a few places where referencing could have been improved. For example, the Okubo-Weiss parameter and Finite Size Lyapunov Exponents are not explained or referenced (Lines 408-409).

We believe that the reading will be easier now that the whole section and the associated figures are moved to SI.

Minor corrections: There are a large number of minor typographic and/or grammatical errors throughout the manuscript. Some of these are listed (often as suggested alternative) below, but I will likely have missed many others and the whole manuscript requires a thorough proof read and edit.

Thank you for your editing. We did a careful proofread and we hope this aspect was improved.

Line 22: ‘: : :we provide a state of the art regarding..’ state of the art review?
Same as Rev1, this sentence was changed

Line 25: rephrase

The whole abstract was modified. Those sentences have been changed

Line 32: ‘in contrasted areas’

The whole abstract was modified. Those sentences have been changed

Line 51: ‘in addition to these continuous’

Changed

Line 67: between less than 10% ?

This was rephrased,

Line 74 & 74: ‘: : :also allow quantification of export below: : : for the marine biosphere: : :’

The whole sentence was rephrased

Line 124: ‘water column’

Done

Line 148: ‘the probability of catching’

Done

Line 165: ‘associated with the rainy period’

done

Line 218: ‘lead to changing the planned’

Done

Line 236: ‘the relevance of following the initial track was discussed in view of several’

This sentence was removed

Line 253: sentence appears incomplete
[Corrected](#)

Line 283: maybe 'leading to the decision to start the'
[Done](#)

Line 332: 'every 15 minute'?
[Done \(this section is now in SI\)](#)

Line 398: ': : : strategy, with the aim of avoiding regions of: : :'
[Done](#)

Line 409: 'exponent'
[Done](#)

Line 420: 'the presence of a dust plume'
[A part of that section was shortened](#)

Line 436: 'On the 31st of May: : : between the islands of Sicily and Sardinia'
[Done](#)

Line 446: 'On the 1st of June'
[Done](#)

Line 454: during the first half of June 5th
[Done](#)

Line 458: 'richer in'
[Sentence was rephrased](#)

Line 489: MVP is not defined here on first use
[Done](#)

Line 526: ': : :due to the rainfall: : :'
[Done](#)

Line 528: needs rephrasing
[Done](#)

Line 546: intermittent signals
[Done](#)

Line 592: ': : :productivity and high probability of wet dust deposition.'
[Done](#)

Line 1246: 'allowing detection of'
[Done](#)