

by [Chiara Borrelli](#)

**Public justification (visible to the public if the article is accepted and published):**

The authors addressed the last suggestions provided in a satisfactory manner. The manuscript is now ready for publication in BG.

We are pleased to learn that our study can be published in BG and hope that the technical corrections we made are sufficient.

I only have two technical corrections, as specified below:

Line 145: please briefly mention the criteria used distinguish living individuals while counting, if different from the specimens being attached to the substrate.

We modified the text to explain more precisely how live individuals were counted, and the associated bias:

“Each week, live individuals were counted in each environment. As the species under study remains attached to the substrate when alive, individuals that no longer adhered to the Petri dishes, and therefore floated, were considered dead and not counted. However, it should be noted that rare dead individuals, which can sometimes be identified as unequivocally empty tests or as individuals without reticulopodial activity and/or change in color for several days (Bernhard, 2000), may remain attached and might have been counted as alive. At the same time, a few living adults may also have become detached from the substrate, and were therefore not counted as alive. As these cases are rare, the error generated by these two phenomena is largely covered by the error bar on the count in growing samples, while in samples not growing from the inoculum, living cells remain estimated.”

Suppl. File: please add a caption to every figure and table included.

We made the following changes :

Fig. C1 : We added the size of the scale bar in the caption

Figure D1 : We specified that dots color indicate each sulfate concentration

Table D1 to D6 (Excell additional file): a caption was written for each table