



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
- English is now much improved; 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. It is upon the editor's decision to keep it. - 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 C. contraria) and shallow, ephemeric ponds (C.vulgaris) THIS IS	



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

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! - 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 ...	
--	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Austria