

Response to Author Comments

I thank the author for the response and for the revisions made to the manuscript. The corrections and additions are appreciated and have contributed positively to the manuscript.

Below are my comments regarding the present version of the manuscript:

1. I am pleased to see that the author has made a serious effort to revise the structure, language, and citations. Unfortunately, I was unable to locate or download the revised version of the manuscript. In other words, I could not access the updated text as a PDF reflecting these changes. Reviewing the revised manuscript itself would have been considerably more helpful than evaluating the revisions in the abstract.
2. Although I still do not agree with the preference for using “Türkiye” instead of “Turkey,” I understand the author’s concern, particularly given his status as a public official and the possible personal risks associated with this choice. I therefore leave this issue to the discretion of the editorial board. If the editorial board approves the use of “Türkiye,” the author may retain this usage consistently throughout the manuscript.
3. In Line 399, the author disagrees with my statement that the natural gas prospects of the Black Sea were known decades ago. One illustrative example which endorses this fact is:

Aydemir, V., Sefunç, A., Abalıoğlu, İ., & Efeoğlu, T. (2001). Hydrocarbon potential of Western Black Sea Offshore, Turkey. Proceedings of the 13th International Petroleum Congress and Exhibition of Turkey (June 4–6, 2001, Ankara), pp. 14–20.

Just like the Gabar Oil Field, the Sakarya Gas Field is merely the most recent outcome of previously known and ongoing exploration activities. Yet the manuscript is framed in a way that suggests an absence of exploration efforts from Taşman’s death until the present government, implying that his legacy has only now been realized—an implication I do not agree with. In my assessment, the recent investments in the Sakarya Gas Field and the Gabar Oil Field have no direct relation to Taşman’s dedicated and patriotic efforts during the early years of Kemalist Turkey. From the most straightforward perspective, the severe public financial losses associated with these investments would not have been tolerated by individuals with Taşman’s patriotic principles.

If the author nevertheless insists on linking Taşman directly with these investments, this must be clearly stated as the author’s own interpretation.

4. In Line 401, if the author intends to state that Türkiye meets 9.8% of its hydrocarbon demand from domestic resources, this claim must be supported by an appropriate reference, such as the “TPAO Sector Report 2024”, which should be cited in the text and added to the reference list.
5. In Lines 402–403, the author explains that “*geology is the primary constraint in petroleum exploration*”, “*no amount of technology, investment, or human determination can create commercial hydrocarbon reserves where suitable source rocks, reservoirs, traps, and seals do not exist*”, and “*Turkey’s overall petroleum geology is challenging compared to global super-basins*”. **This is precisely the point I was making in my earlier comment.** However, the

current wording in the manuscript implies that Turkey has significant hydrocarbon potential to meet its own needs but only lacks the necessary technology or determination to exploit it. While I appreciate the author's enthusiasm for reminding me of basic petroleum geology, the only revision required here is a correction of the misleading implication created by the current wording (the sentence needs to be rephrased to convey the correct meaning).

I thank the author once again for preparing this important manuscript on Cevat Eyüp Taşman. I would like to see the revised final version of the manuscript, and I request that the ambiguity in Lines 399–403 be resolved.