

The authors have done a thorough job at revising the manuscript. Overall readability is improved, and it is now much more clear how the results align/contrast themselves to previous work. I also appreciate the clarifications regarding e.g. particle sampling errors and the Labrador Current components. I would be happy to see the manuscript accepted (I only have a few very minor comments):

1. l. 78: 'while not excluding the southward upper ocean flow east of Greenland.' Phrasing not entirely accurate considering the East Greenland Current is not a part of the release section?
2. l.130: 'variously calculated'?
3. l.228: 26 Sv not 26 m.
4. l.572: check citation parenthesis.
5. L.574: 'a positive anomaly in the net surface heat flux into the Labrador Sea (i.e. reduced heat flux out of the Labrador Sea)'. Unclear if you don't define the direction of positive/negative heat flux. Perhaps just formulate as 'reduced surface heat loss' (which is used in the following section anyways).
6. This might be slightly beyond the scope, but in identifying reduced surface heat loss between 2000 and 2013 as the 'trigger' for the cooling/freshening in the following years, a natural question is what caused the reduced heat loss. If you look at the accumulated NAO index (over the 10 years prior) you will see a peak of positive NAO values around 2000 and a peak of negative NAO values around 2011-12 – meaning that for the years in-between there has been a tendency for more negative NAO states (typically accompanied by reduced heat loss over the SPNA). Perhaps you have some reflections on this (NAO, heat loss etc.) for the conclusions.