

Dear Koji Suzuki, Dear Editorial Team,

Thank you for your message and for the opportunity to submit a revised version of the manuscript.

We have clearly marked the change in the author list in the track-changes version of the manuscript. The additional co-author was included because, during the revision process, their contribution became directly relevant to the interpretation of the manuscript. In addition, the revised discussion now includes a short paragraph addressing the apparent difference between the present manuscript and a related manuscript (in review process) concerning the sensitivity of water-column biogenic silica dynamics to carbonate-chemistry perturbations. This clarification was required to ensure that the differences in methodological and analytical approaches between the two studies are presented accurately and transparently.

Now lines 541 – 547:

... Similarly, a related analysis of the present experiment did not detect a clear $f\text{CO}_2$ effect on bloom-phase water-column BSi concentrations. This is not necessarily inconsistent with our results, as that analysis used a broader suite of water-column parameters to define bloom phases, resulting in different bloom-phase windows, and retained the initial dilution-scenario grouping. In addition, $f\text{CO}_2$ and pH emphasize different aspects of the OAE perturbation, reflecting e.g., carbon-availability constraints for phytoplankton or pH-dependent chemical processes such as silica dissolution, respectively. These differences further emphasize that the detectability of silica-related OAE responses can depend on both temporal and analytical framing. ...

The author list has been updated accordingly, and the revised files have been uploaded. Everything else regarding the point-by-point response to the reviewers, which was uploaded last Thursday, remains unchanged.

Thank you for the very smooth review process so far.

Kind regards,

Philipp Suessle
on behalf of all co-authors