Dear Authors
Thank-you for your further revisions. I am now asking for “Technical Corrections” as in the “Detailed comments” below. Then please upload your final version to the Copernicus / OS editorial system for publication. There should be proof reading but there will be no copy-editing by Copernicus.
Thank-you for publishing in Ocean Science.
Yours sincerely
John Huthnance (editor)

Detailed comments.
Line 35 “Consequently, critical shear stress and resuspension potential vary across space and time . .” You use the expression “resuspension potential” several times; this first (?) use suggests that it may be something different from “critical shear stress” but you don’t define it. In view of Referee 1’s concern I think you should provide clarification.
Line 70. Could omit first “and”
Line 72. Better “higher” –> “finer”?
Line 74. “up to” –> “as fine as”.
Figure 3 caption 2nd line. “high” –> “long”
Line 114. “higher” –> “larger”.
Line 146. “is” –> “was”? “have been” –> “were”?
Title Line “Table 2. . .”, line 196 etc. “The value for chlorophyll a is . .” and “a” should be upper or lower case independent of whether “chlorophyll” is abbreviated/
Line 183. “. .greater bulk density . .” I do not understand “higher fines”. Do you mean “. . greater proportions of fines and organic carbon.”?
Lines 247-248. Better “. . moderately larger shear stress values, the largest instantaneous maxima . .” [Or “stronger”, “strongest”}
Line 250. Better “low” –> “small” or “weak”
Line 261. “. . include . .”
Line 277. “beyond” –> “exceeding”
Line 279. Better “highest” –> “strongest”
Line 303. Right justify
Line 318. “are” –> “is”
Line 326. “. . enough to” or delete “be enough to”
Line 329. “emerged” –> “emerge”
Line 348. “meter” –> “metre”
Line 351. Add Holthuijsen (2007) reference as you say in your response.
Line 378. “in” –> “and”
In your response to the .pdf referee comments “Figure 3 is concerning. . .”, you state “Figure C1 in Appendix C show that when the significant wave height was over 0.30 m the agreement between the modelled and measured peak period was good.” However, the reader does not know which points in Figure C1 have significant wave height over 0.30 m. What is the distinction between the red and black points (please explain in the caption)?

Our response:

Thank you for your detailed and constructive comments. We have carefully addressed all the technical corrections listed above in the revised manuscript.

Specifically, we have:

- clarified the definition of resuspension potential at its first occurrence (lines 23-24 and 26-28),
- implemented all suggested wording changes,
- revised figure captions of Figures C1 and C2 by explaining the distinction between the plotted data points and lines,
- and added the requested reference (Holthuijsen, 2007).