The revised manuscript is an improvement from the previous version. I appreciate the changes made by the authors, especially in the introduction and methods’ sections. I find the manuscript interesting and I would recommend it for publication in Ocean Sciences. I have some relatively minor comments that I recommend to address before publication:

Line 39: replace ‘lives’ with ‘leaves’ (is this what you meant?)

Line 45: remove ‘a’ before implications

Line 85: ‘On regional scales, the circulation is important for water mass distribution, local dynamics, ecosystem assessments and air-sea interactions.’ This seems to be too generic, I suggest giving more details about the importance of your study for ecosystem assessments, for instance (just a few words).


Line 91: I suggest adding updated references about the arrays south of Africa (ASCA, CROSSROADS, GOOD HOPE). For instance Swart et al (JGR 2008), Hutchinson et al (2016 JGR). Some of the authors here are the same as in Hutchinson et al, but it is not clear to me why this study is not mentioned.

Line 161: ‘...in order to measure temperature and derive salinity and density.’ ... this reads weird. The CTD measures conductivity, temperature and depth. Salinity is derived from the measured conductivity while density needs to be calculated from temperature and salinity.

Lines 170-171: Standard error has units, please check this sentence.

Lines 221-223: I am not convinced about the conclusions from the analysis of the degree of correspondence between the ADCP in situ data and altimetry, given the moderate correlations found, but I’ll leave this to the editor’s judgment.

Line 376: Please add ‘record from the’ after pressure

Title section 3.4: I think it is ‘three’ case studies based on the section above (I also recommend typing ‘three’ instead of ‘3’ in the title)

Line 434; I think you refer to the SAMBA-east array ‘region’?