

We extend our gratitude to the topic editor, Sabine Schmidt, for her meticulous review and constructive feedback, which have significantly enhanced the readability and comprehension of our work. We have thoroughly addressed all comments, as detailed in the attached document.

The editor's comments are presented in italics below, while our responses are in regular text. Any modifications to the manuscript, due to the reordering of some figures and tables, will be marked in a track changes version of the manuscript.

=====

*The revised version of your manuscript correctly incorporates the corrections and clarifications requested by the two reviewers. The definition of the regional areas, as defined by Manna et al. (2004), is a useful addition. However, I am **not convinced by the approach taken of creating an additional figure and table. Furthermore, readers have to wait until Figure 2 to find out where the sampling was done, which is inconvenient.** In fact, this is the first information that a further data user looks for, even before the data workflow. One final change would be to reorder the figures so that **Figure 2 becomes Figure 1 and Figure 1 becomes Figure 2.***

Thanks for the suggestion. We have changed the figures as commented.

Secondly, there is no need to include a map in the supplementary information. A more efficient approach would be to replace the upper map in Figure 2 with the map in Figure S3, since they depict the same information. To improve readability, you should also increase the size of the two maps in Figure 2.

Thanks for the suggestion. The new Figure 1 contains just one map with the areas. However, we kept Figure S3 as it contains only the stations that fulfil the depth criteria commented in Section 5.1, that is why bathymetric lines are showed.

Table S3 could also be included in the main text. For clarity, I would suggest regrouping the different sub-areas by indicating where there are several sub-regions (which would require adding a first column).

Thanks for the suggestion. We deleted Table S3 and introduced it as Table 2 in the main manuscript, reordering the other tables.

Figure 1 could include the enlarged maps (the upper one indicating the areas), and below the two figures, with the letter corresponding to the figure caption, always on the left, and the list of regions added to the right.

Thanks for the suggestion. We hope the new Figure 1 is satisfactory for the editor.

The article will be accepted as soon as these changes have been made.

Best regards

SAbine Schmidt

Thanks for your assistance and help. We hope the manuscript is now ready for acceptance.

Best regards

Marta Álvarez