

Dr. Alexey Mishonov,

We are grateful for highlighting the presence of Argentine oceanographic data from BaRDO in the World Ocean Database (WOD).

Indeed, INIDEP bottle and CTD data collected before 1999 were incorporated into the WOD under catalogue accession numbers 0089784, 0020559, 0115150, and 0143331.

Following your suggestion, we have added a clarification in the manuscript indicating that part of the BaRDO holdings has been contributed to the WOD, and we have included the corresponding reference.

It should be noted that this contribution corresponds only to a subset of the BaRDO database and does not represent the complete collection described in this manuscript.

We would like to clarify that the Argentine data contributed to the WOD originate from BaRDO and correspond to the same quality-controlled records presented in this publication. Therefore, for the subset of data transferred to the WOD, both databases contain the same underlying information.

Fig.1: Please add explanation for 'ZCP' abbreviation found in line 27 to the Fig.1 capture

Revised and corrected

Fig.2: Please use English for the axis's titles (e.g., Station Counts and Year).

Revised and corrected

Fig.5: The comparison with very old climatology (WOA01) is mentioned here. I would recommend to use WOA23 (refs below) for QC2 Climatology checks.

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. The QC2 climatological checks described in the manuscript correspond to the procedures originally applied during the quality-control process of the dataset, which relied on the climatological reference available at that time. To ensure consistency throughout the entire dataset, the same quality-control criteria and reference climatology were applied to all observations included in this version of the database.

We agree that the use of a more recent climatology, such as WOA23, would be beneficial. In fact, we are currently working on a new version of the dataset in which not only a more up-to-date climatological reference is being implemented, but the thresholds used in the different profile quality-control tests are also being revised and adjusted based on the experience gained from previous dataset releases.

Since the objective of this manuscript is to document the procedures applied to the dataset version described herein, the original QC methodology has been retained in the manuscript.

Table 2: I believe the very right empty column in this table could be removed

This error had already been identified during the revision process and has been corrected in a newer version of the manuscript prepared in response to comments from another reviewer. The corrected table will be included in the revised manuscript submitted to the journal.

Table 3: Since used QCF are recommended by the international body (GTSP/IODE) and not invented by authors, the reference should be added to reflect the source of this QCF scheme.

This reference has already been completed into a revised version of the manuscript prepared in response to comments from another reviewer and will be included in the next submitted version.

Table 4: Please use standard notation for Density, e.g., 'kg m⁻³'

Revised and corrected

Fig.9: Please add a title for 3rd pie-chart – it's unclear what it represents – total? Or something else?

We thank you for this observation. The third pie chart has been labeled as "**Total**", and the corresponding text has been updated accordingly to clarify that it represents the entire dataset.

Fig. 10: Marking needs to be added for 'levels [%]' axis – is it not clear what is %% of sampled data is flagged: 1, 2, 3%... or 10, 20, 30% or else?

The figure has already been revised during the review process, and the axis markings have been added in the updated version.

Fig. 11: It would be more understandable if TS profiles will be shown as a line-with-dots not just dots.

We thank you for this suggestion. To improve the readability of the TS profiles, a thin line connecting the data points has been added to Figure 11.

Lines 338-349: comparison with more up-to-date climatology (e.g., WOA23 instead of Levitus 2005 – see refs below) could be more appropriate and interesting since lots of data have been added after WOA05.

As explained in our response to the previous comment on QC2 climatological checks, the methodology described in the manuscript reflects the procedures originally applied to this dataset version and was kept unchanged to ensure consistency across the entire data collection. We agree that the use of WOA23 would be more appropriate for future releases, particularly given the significant increase in available observations since WOA05.

Finally, we thank you for your careful review of the references and for pointing out these citation inconsistencies. The references have been revised and corrected in the manuscript.