

Overall, The manuscript was significantly improved, the language was corrected. The unnecessary methodological details were removed. The goals of this study are now clearly stated.

What is confusing is the application of past and present tense; I think this should be carefully checked.

Abstract is improved significantly; it is clear what authors investigated.

Introduction

Line 44: "for us" is not necessary

Ln 58-64: too long sentence

Line 74: not necessary to put citation twice

Line 82: "fresh and arid waters are distributed due to its morphology": reformulate this sentence

Line 88: "little studied has" should be either "little study has" or "little studies have"

The goals of this study are now emphasized and formulated properly

Materials and methods

Improved significantly, clear now.

Line 117: reformulate the sentence "After the ice..."

Line 121-122: reformulate the sentence "In the laboratory..."

Line 133-135: missing reference for turbidity?

Line 152: "it is necessary" change to "it was necessary"

Line 196-198 this sentence belongs rather to introduction

Results and discussion

Overall, there could be more discussion with the recent literature and less results in this section

Line 228-237: It is not necessary to describe what is already in Table 1. For example, line 231- pH 8.55- this information is already in Table 1.

Line 246-248: reformulate the sentence

Line 253-254: not necessary sentence here, this belongs to methods

Line 280-300: this paragraph should be reduced significantly, it is not necessary to describe the components and their maxima if this information is already in the Table 2.

Line 318: not clear, What do authors mean by "other organisms"?

Line 355: I think "matters" is not appropriate here. Do you mean "material"?

Line 386-408: it is not necessary to repeat results which are already presented in Table 3.