

Dear Dr. Natascha Töpfer,

Thank you for your kind letters of May 19, 2015, our manuscript (bg-2014-542), and comments from the two reviewers.

I am enclosing herewith two copies of our further revised manuscript. Revised portions are marked in green in the paper. Our reactions to the reviewers' suggestions are as follows.

Reviewer #1

1. Revised manuscript has to be proof-read for its English quality to improve on the flow and clarity of the paper as there are still some ambiguities in the revised ms.

Response: Our revised manuscript has been checked by Prof. Walter Berry from the US Environmental Protection Agency.

2. References in the text should be in chronological order, and should be consistent throughout.

Response: Thanks, the references have been revised.

3. Legends for some of the figures have to be expanded and improved. For example, Figure 3, the statistics (asterisk) in panel B in regard to the p value and what it is relative to is missing.

Response: Legends of all figures have been expanded and improved. In figure 3, the duration of embryonic stage, egg survival and embryonic heart rate of marine medaka were significantly unaffected by acidification water with pH 7.6 and pH 7.2, so the statistics (asterisk) is missing.

4. In some of the responses to Reviewers' comments, author(s) have merely responded with either - "reworded" or "we have made corresponding revisions" without the details being shown.

Response: As those comments mainly focused on the grammar or spelling, so the changes were directly made in the revised paper.

Reviewer #2

1. P2 Line 3, "the present study" should be "the this study".

Response: the text was changed to address this comment.

2. P3, line 36, direct ?

Response: "the direct" should be "the direct responses", the text was changed to address this comment.

3. P3, line 39, please check "otholiths" spelling

Response: otholiths should be otoliths, it is spelling mistake. The text was changed to address this comment.

4. P4, line 70, "investigating the embryonic, larval and otolith development.

Response: Thanks, the text was changed to address this comment.

5. P4, line 73, "thekey" should be "the key".

Response: Thanks, the text was changed to address this comment.

6. P6, line 108, ones should be eggs.

Response: The text was changed to address this comment.

7. P9, line203, "Were" should be "was".

Response: The text was changed to address this comment.

8. In Figure 4, I think there is no need to place symbol "ab" above 7.2 since the error bars clearly show the differences. Also, statistics are provided in the Results section.

Response: To better understanding of the differences among the three pH levels, we suggested that the symbols "a or b" should be place in Figure 4.

9. In Figure 6, Try using letters to denote similarities or dissimilarities among treatments. With just the asterisk, there is no information whether 7.2 pH is similar or not to 8.2 or 7.6 pH. Include in the Results section as well, the statistics of the comparison 8.2vs7.2 and 7.6vs7.2.

Response: Good points, the figure has been revised.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers' warm work earnestly, and do hope the 2nd revised manuscript will be acceptable for publications in BG.

Best wishes

Sincerely yours

Dr. Jingli Mu