

Review of revised manuscript “Active and passive fluxes of carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus in the northern South China Sea” (bg-2021-17)

General comments:

Overall, the authors have addressed my original comments and I find the manuscript has improved. However, I have one general comment. As the paper now stands, there is little comparison of this study with the flux results from other marginal sea studies in the Discussion, even though there are different marginal seas described in the Introduction. Ultimately, the authors compare the data in this study to the Costa Rica dome, BATS and the open Pacific Ocean. Are there no other studies regarding passive and active fluxes in marginal seas that can be discussed? Particularly other Pacific marginal seas, such as the Bering Sea, Japan Sea, East China Sea and California gulf, as well as any other published data from the South China Sea. The Discussion would benefit from a more in-depth comparison of the fluxes from different marginal seas. I also noticed a few lines within the manuscript that would still require English proofreading.

Specific comments:

Fig 9: perhaps the datum from a different source should be labeled somehow. Also, is the black line a fit for all the points in the figure, or just data with a certain color? Please clarify in the caption.