Ref. 1
The material in the contribution is worthy of publication, and only small corrections are required.

The Author should be encouraged, however, to provide further information as suggested by the Content Reviewer, given they have almost an entire page remaining.

Additional minor comments/questions are below: abstract:
high energy ... -> high-energy ... "high energy neutrino" -> "high-energy neutrinos"
Introduction: "very performant" -> "high performance" "is the responsible" -> "is responsible"
Done

SECTION 2 What is meant by "3 divided 6" in the second dot-point under section 2?
"entire bubbles volume" -> "entire bubbles' volume"
"also neutrinos will be produced" -> "will neutrinos also be produced"
", the solid angle..." -> ", and the solid angle..."
Done
SECTION 3 The first sentence here implies that KM3NeT is already built. Since it is not, please change the phrasing. This also applies to the whole section, e.g. do not write that the DUs "are" anchored, but rather than they "will be". "muon neutrino" -> "muon neutrinos" "DUs which are connected" -> "DUs will be connected" "consists of a 31" -> "consists of 31" "PMT" -> "PMTs"
SECTION 4 "and PMT position" -> "and PMT positions" Also, on this line, the Author mentions it is possible to reconstruct the 'muon neutrino track directions'. I assu meant 'muon track directions'?
Done
Fig 1: Can the Author explain why the distribution of MC events inside the bubbles differs so much? I assume this is mostly a visibility effect - but looking at the scale, the difference between the brightest regions and lest bright is a factor of two, which seems rather high. Perhaps an expanded caption would be appropriate?

The distribution of the number of generated events inside the bubble regions in Fig. 1, reported in arbitrary units, reflects the visibility of our detector. The average visibility for the bubble north is of 58% of the time and for the bubble south is of 80%. The values reported in the first version were not correct. Taking into account the new values the fact that the difference between the brightest regions and lest bright is a factor of two seems to me reasonable.
The Caption of Fig. 1 has been modified.

"this background represent" -> "this background represents"
Done

Can the Author please explain the terms \lambda and N_{\rm hit} [note the use of \rm in Latex] in the maximisation of the discovery potential at the bottom of the first column of p3? Indeed, general subscripts in math mode using text should be written $X_{\rm text}$.

The two terms N_hit and \lamba are explained at pag 2 where the reconstruction algorithm is introduced. The latex corrections have been taken into account

Does the Author also have results for the discovery potential of a source spectrum without the 100 TeV cut-off? Such a flux is discussed, but no analysis is presented for it.
The last phrase of section 4 has been better explained.

Ref. 2
The neutrino emission model investigated in the paper has not been made by the authors. However, more information on the analysis result would help to understand how sensitive the presented analysis is to variations in the model assumptions. E.g. the energy distribution of the signal events would help to estimate robustness against changes in the spectral cutoff.

A more exhaustive analysis is not presented in the present proceeding because, with the agreement of the Publication Committee of our collaboration, we intend submit a more exhaustive paper to Astrop. Phys. where the energy distribution of the signal events will be shown.

* What quantity is represented by the color scale in Figure 1?

The number of generated MC events in arbitrary units is reported in Fig: 1. the caption of Fig. 1 has been modified.

Minor comments
* The paper would profit from proof reading by a native speaker
* The references should be formatted consistently (field separators, journal abbreviations, trailing period)
* Typos:
- Section 4: MPD -> MDP
- Ref. 18: ReV -> Rev
- Ref. 21: Aharens -> Ahrens

Done