

We appreciate both reviewers for raising last minor technical comments. We have taking them into account and incorporated the suggested revisions, including rephrased specific sentences. Here we repeat reviewers' comments in bold and provide our response when needed below in normal font.

Reviewer 1

I think that the authors have adequately addressed the reviewers' comments and that the ms is almost ready to be accepted for publication in the journal. I have only a few comments that should be considered before final acceptance.

L.480-481. The maximum repeatability of AT and CT measurements from the SNAPO-CO₂, flagged as “2: acceptable”, reaches the uncertainty level of 0.15%. I am not sure if you are assuming that your measurements have an assessment higher of 0.15% if as I suppose is not the case you should rephrase the statement.

Yes, this was not clear in the text. The measurements have an assessment that remains below the uncertainty level 0.15%. It is under the 0.4% criteria so they meet the “weather” quality objectives but not the “climate” one (0.1%).

L. 654. At first sight, it is important to consider the importance of valid salinity high-frequency data, which induces directly a lack of estimated At.

Change the caption in order to avoid the redundancy of similar terms.

Ok we simplify the caption of Figure 7 in order to avoid redundancy of similar terms.

L. 684-686. Figure 8: Monthly distribution of seawater saturation state with respect to aragonite (Ω Aragonite) in the six study sites for farming 685 (red) and oceanic (blue) areas. Pie charts represent the fraction of time spent below threshold 1 (represented as a horizontal dotted line).

Since the threshold was set at 1.5 therefore it would be congruent if also the pie charts represented the time spent below the saturation state threshold of 1.5 instead of 1.

Thank you for pointing out this mistake in the caption. The threshold used for the pie charts is indeed 1.5.

Reviewer 2

I really appreciate the authors' detailed replies explaining the areas of the manuscript that were initially unclear to me. Line numbers in my comments below are from the ATC1 file. In particular, I think the changes made to the QC and metadata practices strengthen the paper and will benefit end users. I appreciated hearing what they are learning about the evolving pH sensor availability situation.

I wanted to clarify my comment about using the data set for calcification rates. I thought the sites would be too far apart for this use, as they confirmed, but I intended the comment to be more a “future analysis” topic, perhaps deserving a mention but not a full treatment in this ESSD paper.

Thank you for the clarification regarding the potential use of the dataset for calcification rates. We understand your intention now, and we agree that it would be a valuable topic for future analysis.

Just a few other minor replies:

L194-195: I suggest that this wording might be clearer: “The Bay is an important area for oyster farming, characterized by having the most abundant larval oyster larvae recruitment in France.”

Included, thank you for this suggestion.

233-238: Thanks for adding these details—it's helpful for understanding the results.

423-425: Thank you for the explanation. I appreciate you taking the time to spell it out. I think I was just looking at the table too quickly and misinterpreted a few things. I'll leave to the editor whether the added text is necessary.

We have decided to retain this explanation in the manuscript as we consider it valuable for readers to understand the choice of the stepwise method.

673-682 and Fig 8: I really like these changes! Much more regionally relevant this way.