**The sentences in bold characters are the responses to the reviewers.**

Reviewer A

General comments:

The work described on this manuscript involves the different toxicities to the marine bacteria Vibrio fischeri between heavy metals and organics, and reasons were also issued in the study. The results of viability assay supported the importance of different contact time between metals and organics. The results of this work can have scientific interest regarding the future application of the assay. Regarding these, I believe this paper is relevant to JSCS. But there are some points that need substantial improvement before published as a final publication.

1. The TITLE describes the article and the ABSTRACT reflects the content.

Nothing to comment.

**Response: Thanks for the kind comment.**

1. RUNNING TITLE: could be changed into “different acute toxicities to Vibrio fischeri”.

**Response: We have changed the running tile according to the reviewer suggestion.**

1. I would recommend that authors are more concise and present “MATERIAL AND METHOD”, and improve the English written.

**Response: Thanks for the suggestion. The Material and method have been shortened, and we ask the native English speaker to go through the paper written, and make sure the English written improved as reviewer’s request.**

1. MATERIAL AND METHOD: describe the reasons why select these metals and organics, why not others?

**Response: The reason has been added in the manuscript, Line 23-24, page 3.**

1. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: In the Table I and II, what the P value stand for? Give further explain of this.

**Response: Thanks for the comments. The P value represents that whether the toxicities of chemicals were significant different between different contact time. The further explain has been added under the table.**

1. In the page 6, line 1-3, does any more reference suggested that the toxicities to bacteria was rarely related to the anion of these chemicals (ZnSO4, CuSO4, CdCl2, K2Cr2O4)

**Response: According to the Microtox test, these chemicals (ZnSO4, CuSO4, CdCl2, K2Cr2O4) could represent the toxicities of metals ions, and reasons have been stated in the material and method. Page 3, line 19-21.**

1. Page 8, Line 19-22, confused by the sentence. Does the metals cause cell death or not? In my understanding, they should cause partly cell death after exposure to the chemicals. Please improve the English written.

**Response: Thanks for the comment. As the reviewer’s suggestion, metals cause partly cell death. The English written have been changed and make it more clearly in the line 18-23, page 8.**

In my opinion, this manuscript should: be published after language correction by the author(s)

If manuscript is suitable for publishing, referees recommendation: Short communication

------------------------------------------------------

------------------------------------------------------

Reviewer B:

Does the manuscript contain enough significant original material?:

yes

Is the manuscript clearly and concisely written?:

yes

Are the conclusions adequately supported by the data?:

yes

Does the manuscript give appropriate credit to related recent publications?:

yes

Are the references appropriate and free of important omissions?:

yes

Is the length of the manuscript appropriate?:

yes

Does the manuscript need condensation or extension?:

no

Is the quality of the figures (including legends and axes labelling) satisfactory?:

yes

Are the nomenclature and units in accordance with SI?:

yes

Are the English grammar and syntax satisfactory?:

no

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Please indicate the page numbers for suggested corrections.

Please, be as specific as possible if major correction by the author(s) is recommended! :

not necessary

REPORT:

The paper is publishable. There are some typos, and the English should be improved

In my opinion, this manuscript should: be published after language correction by the author(s)

If manuscript is suitable for publishing, referees recommendation: Short communication

**Response: Thanks a lot for the kind comments.**

------------------------------------------------------

------------------------------------------------------

Reviewer C:

Does the manuscript contain enough significant original material?:

yes

Is the manuscript clearly and concisely written?:

yes

Are the conclusions adequately supported by the data?:

yes

Does the manuscript give appropriate credit to related recent publications?:

yes

Are the references appropriate and free of important omissions?:

yes

Is the length of the manuscript appropriate?:

yes

Does the manuscript need condensation or extension?:

no

Is the quality of the figures (including legends and axes labelling) satisfactory?:

yes

Are the nomenclature and units in accordance with SI?:

yes

Are the English grammar and syntax satisfactory?:

no

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Please indicate the page numbers for suggested corrections.

Please, be as specific as possible if major correction by the author(s) is recommended!:

The manuscript entitled: "Comparison of Organics and Heavy Metals Acute Toxicities to Vibrio Fischeri" fulfils the aim and the scopes of the journal and I think that paper is suitable for publishing in the JSCS. Paper provides data which contribute to optimization of the protocol of the Microtox test. Although the study is carried out well, manuscript suffers from many imperfections regarding English grammar and typewriting. Therefore, before making final verdict I would advise that native English speaker should review the manuscript. Also I would only suggest some minor changes in manuscript:

Specific comments:

In tables 1, 2 and 3 indicate if values represent mean ± SE or SD.

**Response: Thanks for the comment. The values represent mean ± SD, and have indicated under the table in the revised manuscript.**

Terms ‟Toxicity‟ and ‟Viability inhibition‟ have practically the same meaning but the assays can show different mode of action. Therefore I would suggest change of terminology and redefining the names of the assays.

**Response: Thanks for the comment. “Viability inhibition assay” have been changed as “The relative cell death rate detection”. And all of the “viability assay” in the manuscript have been changed, aims to avoid the confusion.**

In my opinion, this manuscript should: be published after language correction by the author(s)

If manuscript is suitable for publishing, referees recommendation : Original scientific paper