

Point by Point response to reviewers.

Peterborough, 05/07/2023

Dear Editor,

We thank you and the reviewers for evaluating our manuscript. Here, we have explained the modifications made to our manuscript according to the reviewers' suggestions, and we provide point-by-point responses (in **bold**) for each comment.

A revised version of the manuscript labelled "Marked Up Manuscript" is attached. In this version, we have marked in yellow the parts of the text that have been changed according to the comments of the reviewer. In the same file, we further highlight in track change the correction after proofreading. The Clean Copy of the manuscript is provided as well.

Reviewer 1

- I am not sure why lines 97-116 of the revised paper are highlighted in blue. I still think all of this text can be deleted, and maybe that is what blue indicates. If the authors desire to keep this text, I suggest keeping Venice Lagoon segment (Line 99-104) and deleting the rest.

We did delete lines 104-108 as suggested, but we have retained the example from Venice lagoon as indicated by the reviewer, and we kept the text form 109-116 because it describes Figure 2, which provides support of oxygen fluctuation at benthic and surface level.

-I think the text on lines 194-198 should be moved to the beginning of the next section as an introductory sentence.

Moved as suggested.