

the authors did a satisfactory job in responding to my comments and rewriting their earlier draft. Minor revisions are needed and English might be improved, still.

Line 24: rephrase “all six SSS products share a common challenge to represent fresh water masses”

Line 82: four SMOS products have been previously mentioned. Specify the two that are considered.

Line 88: add ocean to reanalysis products

Line 89: Uotila et al. presented temperature and salinity fields in the Arctic. Do you refer here to the seasonal cycle of both variables? Why the ten reanalysis are so different in the Arctic salinity, and all probably wrong? Topaz is part of the inter-comparison, add a more specific comment on results by Uotila et al.

Line 112: “ can it also give...” is here the evaluation against in situ data, the subject?

Line 210: BGEP is available from CMEMS too, as required by the title of section 2.2?

Caption for Figure 1: only four sub-regions are in the Arctic Ocean, the others are located in the Nordic Seas and North Atlantic. Please add in the manuscript a clear definition of the Arctic domain, North Atlantic domain. The two are often mistaken in the text.

Line 243: the 35 psu isoline marks the Atlantic water that does only marginally reach the Arctic ocean. I suggest to add a lower-salinity isoline to the plot to better highlight also the inflow within the Arctic, something between 33 and 34 psu for example

Figure 2: the minimum salinity is not clearly shown, the blue saturates at 30 psu?
subplot e and f: are the salinity fields correct close to North Pole? It seems there is an issues in the interpolation at very high latitude for these two products

Line 252: The comparison is between BEC/CEC with all the other products, or BEC against CEC?

Line 255: I do not see that the 4 products agree in the North Atlantic. Rephrase

Line 260: what is exactly a universal reference?

Line 267: the Beaufort Sea is almost all ice-covered in CEC. The area that you consider here is unclear.

Line 268: CEC presents positive deviation in the Kara Sea close to coast line, probably due to the land-ocean interaction. Please add a line on that.

Line 273: I suggest to add a line on the missing low salinity related to the polar water that travels southward from the Arctic

Line 276: near and below the sea-ice cover reproduced by TP4?

Line 285: how is sea ice cover treated in all products in computing the deviations in Fig 6?

Line 293-294: is that evident in fig 6b?

Line 379: Rephrase. The range is larger, the salinity lower.

Line 447: rewrite “if it to be assimilated into”