

The authors present a long-term dataset of hydrological and dynamical observations in the Levante Canyon located in the Eastern Ligurian Sea. These data are particularly precious and relevant as they are collected in a deep canyon, which hosts important and rare marine species. Moreover, these observations can well support sound investigations about deep canyon dynamics. Nevertheless, as the main objective of the paper is the dataset presentation, more information and discussion about meta-data and quality check results must be provided to the reader.

a) Meta information also including sampling interval of each sensor, water column covered by the ADCP, mooring deployment and maintenance ... should be resumed in a table;

No information can be found about the sedimentary trap; Time series of ADCP backscatter are also relevant data to be included in the data set;

b) Fig.3 provide a 2D plot (temporal evolution of profiles) of T and S. The distance between the layers is too high to allow for a reliable interpolation, thus introducing misleading results. Temperature and Salinity are well represented in fig.2 and fig.4. It is a nice representation but I would suggest to eliminate it.

c) Even if data at 88 m depth still present a clear seasonal cycle and inter-annual variability, surface signals are strongly attenuated and filtered out when reaching this depth. Moreover, different dynamic can be found between the surface and this layer, so I would suggest not to assume that they are representative of the upper thermocline, modifying the sentence (paragraph line 203).

d) Salinity data at 350 m depth seem unreasonable for the investigated area and not consistent with the values at the other depths. To this end, I suggest to plot computed density in order to check for the stability of water column or to go back to fig.5 which indicates the LIW denser than waters at higher depths, which is not possible. Even this problem is addressed at the end of ch.4, it still requires a deeper discussion.

As these data were no checked against laboratory salinometer analysis of in situ samples nor compared with CTD profiles and do not seem to satisfy vertical stability, it should be better not to make them available to the scientific community.

e) ADCPs ancillary data provide relevant information about the collected data quality; pressure sensors allow to check for the vertical position of the entire mooring line: add some comments and show something (e.g. show an average profile of the echo intensity to check for the signal attenuation, plot time series of pressure or pitch roll tilt)

Did the other parts of the mooring line affect the ADCP measurements?

How is the correlation between each bin time series?

Are data from the two ADCPs consistent?

Nothing is mentioned about vertical currents, why?

A Northward prevailing current component is evidenced by the reported scatter plots close to the bottom. Add a comment about the role of the topography of the deep canyon in modifying the current direction close to the bottom.

The sampling time resolution of ADCPs (2 h and 1 hours) seems quite low. Two-hours resolution is unable not only to solve the main processes of interest occurring in a canyon (vertical dynamics, internal waves, density currents) but even the analysis of the general circulation features of the region such as tidal and inertial currents cannot be properly addressed. I understand the need to reduce the power consumption to guarantee a longer temporal coverage of the time series, but the objectives of the monitoring and the consequent sampling strategy defined to achieve these objectives must be clear indicated and discussed in the paper.