

Editor's Comment:

My decision is as follows below.

After answering the QUESTIONS (with proper amendments made) and correcting the misprints, which should be done by the authors, the paper may be finally accepted.

The revised paper is publishable; however, in this revised version there are TWO unclear points to be answered (see below) and a number of linguistic flaws to be corrected (listed below). Thus, a new minor revision is necessary.

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED:

1) It is unclear how the pesticides were added (as acetone solutions, 3 ml, as mentioned for the control on page 3, line 3?). This should be explicitly mentioned.

2) (Fig.2) What are the absorbance units (up to 160)?? Usually, absorbance (= optical density, a logarithmic ratio of the radiation falling upon a material, to the radiation transmitted through the material) are of the order up to 1.0 or 2.0 maximum (the latter, OD = 2.0, shows that the radiation transmitted through the material is 100 times weaker than the falling radiation). If the authors used any arbitrary units, this should be explicitly mentioned on the Figure axis (e.g., "Absorbance, arb. units"). Which concentrations were used for measurements in Fig. 2?

MISPRINTS/LINGUISTIC FLAWS:

(Abstract) Examination endocrine (correct: Examination of endocrine);

(page 2) "enter in", "enter to" (no preposition with "enter");

(Sec. 2.1, page 2)

"each per group" (per each group?) - 2 cases;

"was free any pesticides" (correct: was free from any pesticides) - 2 cases;

"respectively for 21." (?? "respectively, for 21 days" ?);

"were divide" (correct: were divided);

(Page 3, sec. 2.4)

"by triplicate" (correct: in triplicate);

(Captions to Figs. 3-5) "absorbance lectures" (?? "absorbance readings" or "absorbance values" ?)

(Page 6, line 2) "there is not bioaccumulation factor" (correct: "there was no bioaccumulation")

(Page 6, line 4 from bottom) "as cutthroat trout, response to" (correct: "such as cutthroat trout, responding to")

(Page 7)

(line 1) "can be concluded" (correct: it can be concluded);

(line 2) "such growing" (correct: such as growing);

Author's feedback:-

QUESTIONS

1)We agree with the reviewer's question; therefore the following fragment was added

The pesticide solutions were prepared dissolving each one in acetone, and 3 ml of each solution was added to aquariums

2)The reviewer's question is right. We made the correction, i.e., in vertical axis, we wrote:

Absorbance (Units X 10⁻²)

Concerning to question: Which concentrations were used for measurements in Fig. 2?

The concentration is indicated in Fig. 2 legend; (0.5 ng/ml).Also it is indicate in

2.2 Hormones in blood plasma. Line 90

MISPRINTS/LINGUISTIC FLAWS

All comments and corrections indicated by the reviewer were attended, but please note that many of these were written such as the previous indications of reviewers.