The authors have adequately responded to all of the reviewers comments and thereby considerably improved the manuscript.

We thank the handling editor for their positive feedback on the latest version of the manuscript.

I am satisfied with the revised version, except for the following points that require a minor revision:

p.3 first line: suggest to replace ‘how OAE deployment will’ by ‘how OAE deployments would’

Thank you, we changed the wording accordingly.

line 70 small tests doesn’t provide the reader with a clear picture of a scale. I suggest to replace test by something with a better define regional scale.

Thank you, we changed the wording to “small-scale field experiments”.

line 86: I don’t think it’s generally correct that mesocosms are ‘not requiring permits to operate’. I don’t think you can deploy a mesocosm in most coastal waters without a permit. Suggest to rephrase, e.g. ‘not requiring field-trial permits’ or similar.

Thank you, we adjusted the wording accordingly.

line 176 typo: seawater

Thank you, fixed.

general: use consistent spelling of Earth system throughout the manuscript.

Thank you, fixed.

A section with “Key recommendations for researching natural analogs to OAE” (or similar section title with key recommendations in it) at the end is missing.
(See email by Angela of 23 August: Don't forget to include a "key recommendations" section at the end of your chapter. See p.63 of the OA Guide for a good example.)

We had included recommendations in the abstract, and have now included them explicitly in the conclusion as well.