Abstract:

Specify what you mean by 'ambivalent' nature of the OMZ

Introduction:

Line 171: here depths are trap depths, not water depths.

Line 123: '..in the shadow of oceanic fronts ..' can you specify?

Methods section:

Take Table 3 closer to line 176.

The transfer of dried material from polycarbonate filters to agate mortar, may not be 100% efficient for the small particles fraction. Have you an estimate of this transfer efficiency?

Results section:

Reposition the Figure 4 showing with POC fluxes. Now it appears in a section were PP data are shown. Move the figure closer to line 281? Specify in legend of Fig.4 that data shown are for moored traps.

Discussion section:

Line 281: 'However, our time series *in the sBUS* is still too short ..'

Line 325: ..'the commonly used equation for describing the POC flux ..' refer to Eq. 1 and Martin et al.

Line 329: the choice of taking 10m as the MLD seems somehow arbitrary considering that Temp profiles indicate MLD's between 30 and 14m. For instance using an MLD of 14m instead of 10m will increase Fz values by some 30%. Can you convince the reader of you choosing a 10m MLD? FMLD values should be shown without decimals (Lines 331, 344), considering the variabilities involved.

Line 349: '.. despite the enormous deviation..' replace by 'despite the large variations'

Figure 9 legend: mention M153 is during summer; 4th line: .. that the MLD *at St7* showed ..

Figure 10 legend: 2nd line: '.. which is identical' replace by 'which is similar' (idem for Line 381)

Lines 381 – 383: sentence is unclear. Reformulate please.

Summary:

Line 406-407: '..and a much higher zooplankton abundance *in the sBUS* implies that ..