

Response to Reviewer #3

Firstly I would like to thank the Referee for his/her suggestions on the paper. We have addressed each of the comments, see below.

The 2011 and 2012 datasets have now been submitted to CDIAC. The EXPO CODES are included in the tables. The quality control results (precision, accuracy, CRM results, etc) are given for all four surveys.

The correct references were used for DIC and TA analysis. Page 393.

We did not test storage capacity of HDPE bottles for TA; we plan to carry this out in the future. We do not expect there should be a problem with storage of TA samples in these bottles, however as unlike DIC, TA does not change with exchange of CO₂ with the atmosphere. Also samples were taken in winter so biological activity is expected to be at a minimum. Finally, only 13 samples (out of 95) from CE10002 were taken in HDPE bottles, from a range of locations and depths in the water column. These samples were not outliers in the vertical profiles of this survey (or other surveys). All other samples taken in the Rockall Trough between 2009 and 2012 were sampled in Duran 500ml bottles. I have clarified this in the text.

We added a section (Section 3.2) to describe the order of sampling, etc.

A section on secondary QC was added (Section 3.7).

We have updated the acknowledgements.