

The authors with their revised manuscript have addressed all points raised during the initial process. The structure is much improved and makes the manuscript easier to read. The inclusion of a validation for the drifting model, detailed aspects for the choice of windage, better particle initialisation across a larger time window, and a nutrient component in the growth model, make the results more robust.

All these changes (% windage, nutrient component, repeated particle-release across time) lead to a better representation of the bloom, with the attenuation/killing of the eastern propagation of the bloom from 28th July onwards for 2014, despite still not capturing the southern tail present in the observations mid-end July. Much like 2014, a better attenuation/killing of the bloom is obtained early August.

The changes also affect the level of biomass for the short-term monitoring experiments, with the revised growth model showing a much better fit with observations by being less dynamic (+ 10.10⁴ tons in two weeks for the 15 and 23rd of June 2014 experiments, respectively – compared to +50.10⁴ tons, and +35.10⁴ tons in the initial setup). These results show a clear influence of the added components (nutrients?), yet I feel this could be discussed a bit more; an extension of this study may include some parameter fitting (I understand this may not be in the scope of this study), as It remains difficult to disentangle the impact of biotic (nutrients) and abiotic (temperature) factors on the bloom spatial and temporal dynamics e.g. propagation/attenuation of the bloom.

The quality of the writing has vastly improved, but some typos remain.