



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJPSS_16063
Title of the Manuscript:	The lowermost Chara locality in the world near Dead Sea, Israel
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The article structure should be reconsidered. The title and introduction lead us toward to an article about a new occurrence of Chara. However the material and methods, results and discussion and conclusion lead us toward to bioindication of environmental condition by the whole photosynthetic community that for me are the mainly results of the article. The author(s) should think the article structure to explain the importance of bioindication studies. The Material and Methods should be reorganized how explained below (topics). The author(s) didn't explore the results correctly. The option to show only tables with the results was not useful. To show the community answer to the environmental condition is required at least two different periods (e.g. summer and winter) and show that the community changed according to the conditions in each season (if possible using statistical analysis). After these corrections the discussion must be rewritten keeping the focus on the results and not in the dust storm, which doesn't have enough results and analysis to show that it is changing the community. In conclusion, the author(s) has/have enough results to publish the article but is required reconsider how these results will be shown. An English review should be considered.</p> <p>Some punctual suggestions are listed below:</p>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>Title: you need reconsider this title. You do not have enough analyses of <i>Chara</i> as suggested by the title (e.g. taxonomic features) and I can not imagine that you used the whole community as bio indicator.</p> <p>Line 31 and 64: I suggest you first a description of study area and after the sampling and laboratory studies to follow a logical sequence</p> <p>Line 32-34: you need make clearer how many samples per field trip and why did you collect each one. And why did you sample only these two months?</p> <p>Line 45-48: I can not understand what kind of "studies" you performed to algae and cyanobacteria. Have you identified the community or you have you also counted? In any case you need explain how you achieve the sampling sufficiency. How many individuals (cells, filaments or colonies) have you counted? Where are the bibliographies used to identify algae and cyanobacteria? You must cite them.</p> <p>Tab 1: how many data to calculate the average? Always you show average you must show standard deviation. Furthermore to show average and standard deviation you need at least triplicates.</p> <p>Tab 2: the information here is interesting and in my opinion it is your main result. You need explore more but as a table is difficult realise what your results are showing. Maybe you can try plot these results in graphics. For example, how many organisms of each habit did you found during the summer and winter? Apply the same to saprobity, pH and etc. If you split your physical chemical data in summer and winter (not both together as in the table 1) you can compare the community of each season with the physical chemical factors.</p> <p>Line 116: "dominated" means that the number of individuals (cell or chains to diatoms) represents more</p>	<p>corrected.</p> <p>done.</p> <p>Methodical part corrected. Samples were taken when pool exist.</p> <p>Both research – community and abundance were done. MM part corrected. Table of abundance scores is given.</p> <p>Table corrected, STDEV given.</p> <p>Tab2 included data of abundance scores of each species in summer and winter community. Graphs are added and described.</p> <p>We are identify and calculate, Table of scores is added, scores of each species are</p>
--	--	---



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p>than 50% of the community. You can not use the word “dominated” to talk about richness. By the way, I have not understood if you analysed abundance/relative abundance of the community or if you have just identified the species.</p> <p>Line 129: This entire topic will be clearer if you reconsider other way to show your table 2.</p> <p>Line 133: Take care about conclusions considering the presence of one species to indicate some condition. Cyanobacteria are microorganisms with a very flexible metabolism. You can’t conclude that the community is indicating an environmental condition unless you have found enough species indicating this condition.</p> <p>Line 154: “abundance” again.</p> <p>Line 169-191: there are many repeated information in this paragraph, mainly about the dust storms and you didn’t analyse it. You do not have results about sun light or even results comparing the community with more or less light. This information is important to characterize your study area, but it is not your result. You should keep your focus on the bioindication.</p> <p>Line 192-206: Most of your conclusions are not related with your results, you must conclude what your results (discussed with other articles) are showing.</p>	<p>presented in table.</p> <p>Graphs are added and described.</p> <p>We don’t know how species is enough, but used all revealed indicators in each community.</p> <p>Scores table are given.</p> <p>Bio-indication results are described carefully. Influence of nutrients from the sand storms are presented and described in Discussion part.</p> <p>Bio-indication described.</p>
--	---	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>Line 13-17: do not use personal information (e.g. "we studied", "we revealed") at least in the introduction</p> <p>Line 65: coordinates you must write by this way: 30° 57.221' N and 35° 21.450' E. Pay attention, ' is not apostrophe, you can find this symbol searching for Symbols in the Microsoft Word.</p> <p>Line 71: monthly average?</p> <p>Line 74-75: if the mid-day is the main period of the day affected by the dust storm, why did you write "even in the mid-day"?</p> <p>Line 119-116: <i>C. contraria</i> is better than "species".</p> <p>Line: 115: what does AFLP means?</p> <p>Line 120: Have you found some article about maximum time of dormancy to oospores of Chara? By the way, what do you think about the importance of the dust storms to oospores dispersion?</p>	<p>In this references present our own results, that because we used "we".</p> <p>corrected.</p> <p>Averaged December for long term. Corrected.</p> <p>Because in the midday is the highest light intensity, nevertheless we see low sunlight and dust in the air when sandstorm come. The light intensity decreasing can by recognize visible.</p> <p>Corrected.</p> <p>Given.</p> <p>Our own experiences are cited.</p>
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>		