



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJPSS_16063
Title of the Manuscript:	The lowermost Chara locality in the world near Dead Sea, Israel
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - English is now much improved; Here are however still serious errors concerning methodology and interpretation found ... - There are however MANY points I raised in my review, which are still not considered and/or not answered in a correct way. Most important ones: - "analysing NaCl concentrations with a refractometer". These refractometers are used e.g. for seawater. YOU FIRST NEED TO KNOW THE COMPOSITION OF THE WATER, IF YOU WANT TO APPLY THIS METHOD!!! Please refer to basic chemistry textbooks (you will get also NaCl values with a sugar solution...). All information in the manuscript related to this method is definitely wrong! - Table 3: a N-NO3 value of "0.00" cannot be measured, this is rubbish. Each method has an upper and lower limit! USE MY EXPRESSION I RECOMMENDED ALREADY IN THE REVIEW! - Although you state that you corrected the period of the study (2012), 2014 is still mentioned in the abstract – this gives a wrong impression – CORRECT TO 2012! - Abstract: TAXA, NOT SPECIES! - Fig. 2 is of low quality and does not provide additional info. - Table 3: "TAXA not SPECIES! Eg. is Anabaena sp. a species? No, this is on the genus level! Species means that you are identifying down to the species level! - Table 3: mS cm-1 - "alkaliphilic species prevailed" – please refer to textbooks, what alkaliphilic means AND CORRECT. You may have a look into Gimmler & Degenhardt (2001) Alkaliphilic and Alkalitolerant algae; Mesbah NM, Wiegand J (2011) Halophiles exposed concomitantly to multiple stressors: adaptive mechanisms of halophilic alkalithermophiles!!! By the way: you did not cite Hustedt in this context, but Komarek & Fott... - AGAIN: Krause did not mention the sun exposition, but deeper, persistent water bodies (preferred by <i>C. contraria</i>) and shallow, ephemeric ponds (<i>C. vulgaris</i>) THIS IS 	<p>English was twice corrected by native speakers.</p> <p>Methodical part after revision in respect of present reviewer comments now is represent so large part of paper. Therefore we cannot to give more volume for addition information about widely used methods that are accompanied by references.</p> <p>NaCl equipment is widely used in the field trips express analysis, name of it is cited.</p> <p>Nitric-nitrogen data represent 5-time data of measurements with Standard Deviation but not real concentration that can be revealed with other methods and may be other equipments. In any case this data used for water quality rank classification only and this is enough precision.</p> <p>We do field trips in 2012 but in the authors instructions mentioned not only date of samplings but also time that we spent for community data analysis, which is until 2014. If The Journal Editor will clarify Journal instruction – it will be for his responsibility, I agree.</p> <p>Revealed taxa were represented by species level. If we don't sure in identified taxa until its species name, we give the name of genus and species as sp. Can be seen in Table that only two taxa has been identified until sp. If we will have more unidentified species from this genus, we will mention sp1. , sp2 ... But it not happened.</p> <p>Fig 2 is quality that can be inserted in the Template of Paper as given in the Journal Instruction.</p> <p>Table 3 – response as above. Table 3. corrected as mS cm-1</p> <p>Categorized by Hustedt, 1957 (Hustedt F. 1957. Die Diatomeenflora des Flußsystems der Weser im Gebiet der Hansestadt Bremen. Abhandlungen Naturwissenschaftlicher, Verein, 34: 181-440). As well other indicator systems are not cited here because all described in the one cited Barinova et al., 2006. We used widely used systems for which collected large data (about few thousand records) and compiled as freshwater ecological database mostly published in the site and in cited book.</p> <p>Krause describe each species preferences as shadowed for <i>C. contraria</i> and not preferred for <i>C.</i></p>



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

<p>CONTRARY TO YOUR FINDINGS! Your answer to the problem:" ...this sentence confirm of Krause because UV decreased in water very rapid..." is not related to the problem! Another problem is arising here: did you measure UV prenetration into the water column? No, and therefore this statement is not justified!</p> <p>- Repair/protection mechanisms of stoneworts against UV radiation: AGAIN, STONEWORTS PROBABLY DID NOT DEVELOP SUCH STRATEGY, your citation/interpretation is wrong! SEE e.g. de Bakker et al 2001, Plant Ecology; de Bakker et al 2005, New Phytologist; Gröniger et al. 2000, Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology B; Rozema et al. 2002 Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology</p>	<p>vulgaris. That mean that shadowed habitats have lower UV radiation but sunny habitats received more it. Our conclusion is logically followed.</p> <p>We only cited this sentence in the discussion part as one of the possible mechanism.</p>
--	--