To the Editor, the referees and all readers of my paper(s),

I would like to take advantage of the opportunity offerred by OS to post additional comments that will allow the review process to continue.

I think that both referees did not (enough) emphasize the fact that the main interest of my paper(s) is not in my own analyzes, furthermore I underlined my overall attitude (l. 109-111) with "... the reader is thus proposed, all along our trilogy, to make his/her own point of view about the characteristics of the MO heterogeneity, our personal results and analyzes being only proposed as guidelines ...".

As for this Part 1 paper, and on the basis of my relatively long (I am now retired after more than 45 years spent to publish more than 100 papers) experience, I think I very rarely had the chance to demonstrate something with only a set of raw data and without any need for either theoretical analyzes or numerical simulations. And I had the chance twice with the data sets presented in Fig.2 and Fig.4a that can be considered without any color or additional information.

Figure 2 demonstrates (sic) that the MO is heterogeneous at 6°05'W, that is in the western part of the Strait, which contradicts the assertions expressed in the most recent papers published about the Strait (Naranjo et al. (2015) and Garcia-Lafuente et al. (2017)).

Figure 4a demonstrates (sic) that the MO is heterogeneous just ~3km upstream from the Camarinal sills, being composed there of a set of homogeneous layers obviously associated with a set of generic MWs that can be identified only in density (neither in temperature nor salinity), hence contradicting what has been assumed up to now about the MWs identification.

Finally, I think that both referees did not (enough) emphasize the interest of performing yo-yo CTD time series at the Strait entrance in particular, furthermore this can be done in a relatively easy way, and did not (enough) stress the necessity of performing dedicated theoretical analyzes and numerical simulations.