

### Tzortzis et al. Review 3

This is my third time reviewing the manuscript of Tzortzis et al. Overall, I think the authors have done a great job implementing my previous comments and I'm happy to see the manuscript reach the stage it is currently in. I appreciate the efforts of the authors and their attention to improving the grammar of the manuscript. With the implementation of some minor revisions (see below), I believe the manuscript constitutes a useful contribution to Biogeosciences.

#### Abstract:

Line 9. Would rephrase to “at a high spatial resolution”

Line 13. “**Different concentrations of** chlorophyll-a and O2”?

Line 13. Comma after “Here”

#### Introduction:

Line 31. Remove “**fields and**”?

Line 44. Remove “-well” in “well-known”?

Line 88/89. “**data set**” should be “dataset”

#### Methods:

Line 120. Comma after “**During the cruise**”.

#### Results:

Line 220. Correct spelling of “**Substancially**” to “Substantially”.

Line 247. “**which as**” should be “which has”.

Line 303. “**these latter**” to “the latter”.

#### Conclusions:

Line 464. I think you need the word “**Because**”.

Line 469. Please correct the spelling of “**recommanded**” to “recommended”.

Line 475. Remove “**in**” after “for both”.

Line 484-485, I would rephrase to “which will provide a unique opportunity for a more detailed study of physical-biological fine-scale coupling”.