

Reviews « Methanethiol and dimethyl sulfide measurements in seawater and the atmosphere around the Antarctic Peninsula and in the Weddell Sea »

by Wohl et al.

- l. 149. Are potential contamination from the tubing supplying tap water possible? Additionally, were any measures taken to prevent biofouling in the tubing? Please clarify these points in the manuscript.
- l. 158. Could the daily cleaning procedure affect phytoplankton within the tubing and influence the measured concentrations? Additionally, were blank water measurements performed? If so, could the authors provide these data?
- l. 172. Please clarify how MeSH was calibrated using the permeation method. Was a permeation tube used in an oven, and if so, at what temperature? Additionally, was the concentration generated from the permeation tube diluted prior to measurement?
- l. 220. $1.6 \text{ nmol dm}^{-3} \pm \dots$? Please give the uncertainty (standard deviation?)
- l. 226. As for MeSH average concentration, give the uncertainty. Please check for all other values where uncertainty can be added (l.388 to 389 for example).
- l. 257. Change “)(“ as “;”
- l. 298. What are these values: “ $(0.011 \text{ nmol dm}^{-3})$ ”, “ $(0.0004 \text{ to } 0.059 \text{ nmol dm}^{-3})$ ”? Uncertainty?

Supplementary material:

- l. 110. It is stated that cleaning was performed with 3.7 % HCl. In Wohl et al. (2024), it was stated that was 10%. Please clarify.
- l. 169. Can you check the potential pollution by ship exhaust with SO₂ measurements?
- l. 171. Do the authors consider that nonanal and acetone may have a biological origin that could explain their interference with DMS and MeSH concentrations? Additionally, what are the correlations between these compounds during the excluded periods compared to the retained dataset?