Chapman et al. provide results from hydrographic/nutrient/oxygen surveys of Texas coastal waters following Hurricane Harvey in 2017. Episodic events are often thought to have disproportionate environmental impacts, so this sort of study is welcome. The authors were fortunate to have done some coastal surveys before the storm. And, while one might have wished for a more detailed time series after the storm, the limits of obtaining funding, supplies, and shiptime meant that their first post-storm cruise occurred several weeks after the storm. Having been in a similar situation myself, I can appreciate their predicament. Furthermore, their results basically indicate that nothing ‘big’ happened offshore biogeochemically. That is, there didn’t appear to be a big enrichment of nutrients nor any resulting hypoxia (though, if something big and brief happened before they could get out sampling, they would have missed it). Nonetheless, observing a muted response to a major stimulus is an important result. So, this is ultimately publishable and will be of interest to the community.

My main quibble with this manuscript is that it is too lengthy (~9000 words) for what is shown. For instance, there’s a presentation of satellite chlorophyll images with a couple pages of discussion and then field fluorescence data and then finally an acknowledgment that the discrepancy between satellite and inferred in situ chlorophyll likely reflects CDOM interference on the images. Likewise there’s a fair bit of text about why no hypoxia was observed on the shelf following the storm....since this is all fairly speculative, I think it could and should be condensed. That said, one topic that could use a little commentary (i.e., just a few sentences) is comparisons with other post-hurricane coastal studies. Just a brief ‘what’s similar/what’s different’ summation could be of interest.

Some additional comments:
1. At various spots in the text, including tables, numbers are presented with two much implied precision (significant figures). In some cases this may have resulted from a conversion from English units to metric (e.g., the <1.29 µM PO4 in Table 3 which was probably originally <40 µg-P/L).
2. A number of the figures have text in too small a font to be able to read. Even ODV can
have its default font settings changed (and, you can even get it to show a µ rather than a u). Also, for the figures that have multiple parts representing different cruises, it would be nice if the dates were shown on each sub-plot rather than making the reader go to the caption.

3. A minor point, but in Table 1, the caption starts with "Precipitation rates (cm)". I am afraid that cm is an amount, not a rate. I suspect these numbers are cm/mo.

4. On Fig. 4, there are some contour wobbles near the coastline that are not supported by data. Adjusting the ODV contouring parameters or masking out the near shore might be helpful.

5. Table 2: no units are provided.

6. Lines 348-350: Ammonia was variable and in greater abundance than nitrate, but DIN follows nitrate? I am confused.

7. There are lots of little grammar and style errors. For instance, µM/L is used in a few spots (including the text, a table, and a figure)...it should either be µM or µmol/L.

8. Lines 425-432: The authors seem to be saying that nutrients were removed in the bays fairly rapidly by blooms. But also, they indicate that Galveston Bay was flushed with 3-5x its volume of freshwater. And, later in the paper they allude to a flushing or rate-limitation effect in which the initial runoff is high in nutrients and then the source gets depleted. So, couldn't the fall in bay nutrients have resulted from the rapid flushing of the bay by a diminishing nutrient source?

9. Lines 445-446: This is a little confusing. Previously you've said that you didn't see shelf hypoxia. Now you mention that some other nearby systems "similarly showed rapid short-term nutrient increases followed by hypoxia". I think this just needs some slight rewording because "similarly" implies that you did see hypoxia in your study area.

10. Figure 7: a location map would be helpful. Also, are these surface or bottom samples?

11. Lines 450-457: "This is not unexpected given the solubility of nitrate ions relative to the other two." Please provide a reference.

12. Line 544: chlorophyll a

13. Hopefully, the note in the acknowledgments that the data 'are being submitted' will be updated to 'the data are available at' by the time of any revisions to the manuscript.