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The authors are pioneers in the field and the publication of this technical overview is worthwhile and timely.

I agree with the other reviewers in all of their comments, particularly those that ask for more detail of the energy budget and how it was optimized. Other satcomms solutions could also usefully be mentioned, and the reasons for their rejection described. Overall I believe the paper to be well worth of publication.

My specific comments:

P1262 line 18 I would be inclined to replace ‘scarce’ by ‘scarce or absent’: these tags are returning data from areas never previously sampled.

P1263 line 11 a key deficiency of the current distribution of Argo floats, addressed in part by the CTD-SRDLs, is the lack of cover in the Southern Ocean – maybe the authors should make this point?

P1264 line 4 CTD-SRDLs are the first animal tags to report CTD profiles, not the first instruments!

P1264 line 8 typo: subpo-lar

P1266 line 12 maybe ‘harm’ should be replaced by ‘detectable harm’?

P1266 line 19 the words ‘almost no power’ are meaningless: better to quote mW, and/or compare to the power demand of a familiar device such as an Ipod!

P1266 line 21 as noted by other reviewers, an un-pumped resistive sensor should perform well, and should not suffer from the proximity effects that are a feature of most inductive sensors, except for the zero external field models

P1268 line 8 comma after ‘surface’ and not after ‘taken’

P1270 line 3 the salinity error introduced by proximity of the inductive sensor to the animal is a crucial issue that needs to be tackled. I would like to have seen some discussion of this, rather than a bland reference to ‘post-processing’. 

P1271 line 16 ‘are’ rather than ‘is’

P1276 line 22 ‘System’ not ‘Systems’