

Review of manuscript “Eddy enhanced primary production sustains heterotrophic microbial activities in the Eastern Tropical North Atlantic”

The authors have made a great effort revising the original manuscript and have adequately addressed all my concerns. I only have a few minor revisions/suggestions.

Line 335 and elsewhere. The term nutricline is not correctly used here at several other parts of the manuscript. I suggest changing it to “nutrient isolines”.

Line 384. Revise this maximum value for integrated Chl-a (and also in Table 1) as the value is not coherent with figure 3, where the maximum values in the map is 160 mg m⁻²

Line 524. Revise this fragment “coupled but differently” for clarity. I guess the authors mean that both variables were more coupled than in the stations outside the eddy (correlation coefficient is higher)

Lines 603-606. The authors could extend a bit more this discussion adding relevant references dealing with variation of PER along productivity gradients and/or in relation to phytoplankton size.

Line 651. Please consider revising the expression “makes sense” as it seems to colloquial.

Line 652. I suggest changing “favourable” to “utilizable” or “available”.

Lines 655-656. Very low BGEs could be related to nutrient limitation. If bacteria have C available but not inorganic nutrients, the building of biomass (i.e BP) may be limited.