

I greatly appreciate the quality of the corrections made in a manuscript by the authors and I am happy that some of my suggestions were found useful. In general, a presented article describes the dataset and the project in concise, interesting and satisfactory manner, in my opinion the provided description should be sufficient for external users to understand the data design, value and potential.

However, even though it was 'promised' in a response to reviewers, to clarify a relation to the first data description paper –published by Massicotte et al. in 2020, I could not find it in a revised version. A clear explanation and reference to the content and difference with this data description paper should be added to avoid further confusion.

Table 3 is a great effort to make it easier to localize specific data, but the provided http links do not work. Moreover, the authors did not comment on the mistakes pointed by me within some, exemplary datasets. I hope they have been fixed, wherever possible.

Some technical details should be double-checked/verified by specific data owners to eliminate potential technical errors, e.g.:

- a unit at Figure 11 – is it possible that biovolume of copepods was 8000 cm³/m³.
- Table 2 – there is some confusion between the title and content, as the header for the 1st column is "Sensor", so it should not be 'particles', but UVP5. It could be "Particles" or rather "particles & plankton", if the Table contained also a column with 'parameter' or 'Variable'