Review of "Two different phytoplankton blooming mechanisms over the East

China Sea during El-Niño decaying summers" by Lee et al.

Comment on egusphere-2024-3406 | Editor Comment:

Two of the three reviewers (including the first round of review) were concerned with the

coarse resolutions of the model used. You responded in detail but failed to include any

relevant revisions in the manuscript. As readers may also raise similar concerns in the

future, please, in the manuscript, briefly discuss the potential weaknesses of the model

and explain why this model meets the requirements of your study.

Response: We are grateful to the editor for your time and support in reviewing our

work

In response to the editor's suggestion, we have added further explanation

regarding the limitations of the model resolution, as well as the validity of the model-

based results in the manuscript as follows:

(L447-454): In our study, we used a global climate model to investigate how large-scale

climate variability influences oceanic biogeochemical processes. The model has a relatively

coarse resolution of 1°×1° across the global domain, which limits its ability to resolve small-

scale eddies and coastal upwelling, potentially leading to an underestimation of SCHL

variability. Despite this limitation, the model reasonably captures the observed spatial and

temporal patterns of SCHL variability, allowing us to effectively examine the physical

mechanisms driving these variations. However, we acknowledge that the quantitative

contribution of each physical process could be resolution-dependent. Therefore, future studies

using higher-resolution models would be valuable for providing a more precise quantification

of these processes.

L112-113: Change "surface chlorophyll-a anomalies (SCHL) to "surface chlorophyll-a

(SCHL) anomalies".

Response: Corrected.

L164: Change "anomalous surface chlorophyll (SCHL) blooms" to "anomalous SCHL

blooms". SCHL has already been defined in L112-113.

Response: Corrected.