

This is a much improved manuscript, and all of my comments and those of the reviewers have been satisfactorily addressed. I have only a few additional comments that I would like the authors to attend to in a minor revision:

1. The reported accuracy and precision of the HOBO temperature data loggers is ± 0.5 C and ± 0.1 C, respectively (lines 90-91). Thus, the temperature data in results should reflect this accuracy and precision. For example, in lines 135ff, the authors report mean daily temperatures ranging from -1.71 to 2.98 C (a range of 4.69 C). As the precision of the dataloggers is 0.1 C, the 2nd decimal digit is certainly excessive. I would suggest reporting means of -1.7 to 3 C. Furthermore, with an accuracy of 0.5 C, presumably the range could be from as low as -2.2 (or -1.2) to as high as 3.5 (or 2.5); the overall range, therefore, could be as large as 5.7 C or small as 3.7 C. Both of these are small, but the uncertainty in estimated range, given the accuracy of the datalogger, is 2C. The authors should clearly state this level of uncertainty. Finally, the authors should report the sample standard deviation (not standard error). Comparable changes should be made wherever temperature data are reported (lines 135-139, 145-147, Table 1).
2. Lines 159-160. Is this the first yearlong record of seawater temperatures anywhere in the Palmer Archipelago or just of shallow temperatures on this particular island? (this sentence should be consistent with sentence in the Introduction, lines 70-74) and elsewhere in the Discussion (line 183-186).
3. Please check through R code and data for filename consistency as noted in the responses to reviewers.

Grammar/spelling:

Line 12: "stenothermal" or "stenothermic", but not "stenotherm"

Line 125: "R code", not "Rcodes"

Line 186: "there *are* some", not "there *is* some..."