

**Review of resubmitted manuscript:** *Transient Attracting Profiles in the Great Pacific Garbage Patch*, by Kunz et al.

The authors have done a good job at responding to earlier comments, however, I feel the manuscript requires more polish regarding the sentence structure and grammar. I am happy to recommend the manuscript for publication provided additional editing for grammar and sentence structure is completed, and a few comments on word choice are addressed. I provide a *non-exhaustive* list of my concerns below. I feel an exhaustive list of my concerns is unhelpful, rather, I suggest the authors go through the manuscript thoroughly to polish the presentation quality.

**Minor editorial comments:**

1. Line 6 – “we here take ...” to “here, we take ...” (and on line 59).
2. Line 21 – “... and can benefit even more offshore operations, ...”, this is a little ambiguous. Do you mean to say that offshore operations are benefitted by a better understanding of TRAPs? Or, that a more (in the numerical sense) offshore operations are benefitted?
3. Line 37 – “that exhibit” to “which exhibit” since it’s a non-restrictive sentence.
4. Line 39 – “at [a] global scale”.
5. Line 40 – “has been” to “have been” since “experiments” is plural.
6. Line 48 – “..., which eventually allow to derive ...” to “from which ... can be derived”.
7. Line 61 – “... provides answers to this since it ...” is unclear. Is ‘it’ refereeing to the “concept of [TRAPs]” or simply the “[TRAPs]”?
8. Line 64 – “the ocean surface” to “a two-dimensional surface, such as the ocean surface,” since, as I understand, TRAPs are not confined to just the ocean surface, but could be computed at depth or along a density surface.
9. Line 71 – “more” can be removed as no direct comparison on robustness is being made.
10. Line 79 (and elsewhere) – “geostrophic + Ekman current velocities”, I would refrain from using “+” in a sentence like this, rather, “the combined near-surface geostrophic and Ekman current velocities”.
11. Line 85 – I’m not sure I understand what you mean by “altimetry acts like a filter”. This can be clearer.
12. Line 87 – “We investigate how these coherent structures relate”, unless you define a coherent structure, I would refrain from calling TRAPs “coherent”, not to conflate with the typical Lagrangian coherent structures. Additionally, “relate” to what? Perhaps “We investigate the relation between TRAPs and mesoscale eddies in order to...”?