

I reviewed the previous version of the manuscript, and I am satisfied with the authors' explanation of their chosen structure and the changes they have made. That addresses my substantive previous issues, and I am happy to recommend acceptance of the paper.

There are just two minor issues:

- 1) In Figure 1a, the line illustrating the transient behaviour appears to go towards HIGHER N:C ratios before trending back to point B. I assume the line should actually go straight up without ever having increasing N:C ratios. It would be better if that could be drawn in such a way that the curve does never actually go to higher N:C. This is less apparent in Fig. 1b, but applies there as well.
- 2) Just a small presentation issue. In Fig. 5, the lines have some sharp discontinuities. I assume that is just a result of a coarse resolution in deriving the underlying data. It would be better if smoother lines could be generated, instead.

### **Responses:**

We thank the reviewer for the positive comment on our manuscript. We have revised our figures with the specific comments the reviewer suggested. Specifically, the indicative line in Figure 1a is simply a graphical indication of the likely model behaviors; we have revised the line to make it go straight up, as suggested by the reviewer. Furthermore, the discontinuity issue in Figure 5 was revised with finer resolutions of N:C ratios as well. We therefore believe that we have sufficiently addressed all issues raised by the reviewer. We thank the reviewer and the editor again for the careful review of our manuscript.