

The authors addressed all the comments raised in the previous round of review. I only have a few minor technical comments:

Line 35: I would change the ‘with’ in the sentence, to make the point clearer. ‘Therefore, supply and the associate response of...’ or something toward this direction

Line 38: ‘... of both.’ Could remove the “aerosol Fe deposition” and the “oceanic Fe supply”, already mentioned above.

Paragraph 2 of the introduction would need more attention in terms of writing, to make it more fluid as this part got quite some corrections.

Line 250 – Part 3.5 – maybe could be better combined as it is a bit redundant with the comparison with Kaneko study (line 250 and 253)

Line 294: Fe fertilization instead of iron fertilization, I would add *in situ* to be clearer
Problem with the overall sentence, need to add after ‘...bioavailable Fe assays

(Nodwell and Price, 2001; Hassler and Schoemann, 2009), were performed and proved the role of Fe for diatom growth. ‘

This paragraph would need more attention in terms of writing, to make it more fluid as this part got quite some corrections.

Line 394: ...’ to THE understanding of global oceanic biogeo...’ or ‘to understand...’