

General comments:

We would like to thank the editor for the constructive comments that have vastly improved overall quality of this manuscript. All suggested comments have been addressed in text.

Your revised manuscript has been reviewed by myself and I determined that you have sufficiently addressed the comments of the reviewers. However, there are a few editorial changes needed that would be easier done now than at the proofing stage. They are:

(1) Please review the text that you have added. Some of the sentences need to be further clarified and the grammar checked.

We have gone through the text and altered sentences to improve clarity and grammar.

(2) Table 2 caption should better relate to the columns in the table. For example, there should be "dependent and independent variables" stated in the caption.

Table 1 and 2 captions have been altered.

(3) While you point out the missing information in the David et al. (2020) paper and therefore refuse to cite it, you should still cite it but in the Introduction or Discussion. It is a recent paper that is relevant to your study. You are not limited to citing it only if you can directly compare it to your methods and results - cite it in a more general way.

Line 39-40 We have added a sentence acknowledging that while our study is the first investigating relevant future CO₂ freshwater acidification that other studies like that of David et al. 2020 have used elevated CO₂ to investigate effects on physiology of calcifying invertebrates but at levels far higher than what could be expected in the future.