Response to the reviews:

We have added some additional information about the problem using distilled water. In general, all samples were always treated equal, which means they were all washed with the same volume of distilled water. Therefore, any potential impact that may have arisen from using distilled water had the same effect on all samples. But we worked very carefully (because it is not the first time) and therefore no tests were burst, which means no cytoplasm were extracted or lost.

Line 57: is correct now.

Line 57 to 59: Reference was added.

Line 85: corrected.

Line 167: We have not done any genetic studies. But after a morphological analysis (which is quite common to identify foraminifera) our used foraminifera look quite similar to that S5 type (called *E. selseyense* ) of Darlin et al. 2016. But further in all common literature, this foraminifer is called *E. excavatum* (see references in the manuscript). Therefore, we decided to use *E. excavatum* also in our manuscript. After the last review process, we added a very detailed REM picture which allows further readers to check which foraminifera we are dealing with. This was really important, due to the fact that foraminiferal names change at the moment dramatically fast. So, we added to the manuscript: "After Darling et al. (2016) our tested foraminifera are called *E. selseyense*. Actually *E. selseyense* is officially accepted as *Cribroelphidium selseyense* (WORMS - Heron-Allen & Earland, 1911). But due to the high importance of the "older" name we used for this manuscript the most common and more often cited name *E. excavatum*."

Statistics: We used now the non-parametric test (Kruskal-Wallis) and can show (of course) the same output.

Units of salinity: To avoid further misunderstandings, we modified the text after the suggestions of the reviewer.

Table 3: Table 3 is now Figure 3 and shows the data via box plot. The values are now presented in the appendix.