

Re-review of **Thermal summation model and instar determination of all developmental stages of necrophagous beetle, *Sciodrepoides watsoni* (Spence) (Coleoptera: Leiodidae: Cholevinae).** Pavel Jakubec

**Verse 36:** unfinished sentence

**Verse 44:** add , before 2014

**Verse 60:** “body size distributions” : unclear

Logan et al- lack in references

**Verse 67/68:** still actual comment: There are many previous studies on larval morphology with head width measurements and it is clear that one of good characters for determining larval instars is head width ,especially in groups with poor chaetotaxy. It would be good to underline this well-known rule and support references. (and not only discredit previous studies).

**Verse 79:** delete dot

**Verse 91/92** Therefore identification of this species in every stage of development is not an issue.

The author did not change, it is unclear (is not an issue of author thesis or an issue of cited paper?) and my comment is still actual:

” I can’t agree with this statement. Description of larval stages has the same main purpose as description new species- to enable other people to discriminate, determine. In most examples, only detailed observations make possible of determination of larval instars.”

**Verse 93:** “its natural variability was not covered”

Unclear. Is there conclusion about natural variability, which studied the author or cited authors? If it is author’ conclusion- should be provided in discussion.

**Verse 112:** “Romadur”. Do not need providing ®?

**Verse 116.** Sexed the... what for “the”?

**Verse 154:** How photographed? Provide microscope, camera.

**Verse 156 and verse 279 :** how author determine each larva, keeping track of change ? if author separate each larva at the beginning of development/ it is still unprecise statement.

**Verse 177:** were made

**Verse 290-297.** Why still author write about determination instar I from II? why not also instar II from instar III? Author should provide in conclusion detailed practical way how to determine instars in cases of extreme values of head width (for example, prepare slides, use precise morphological characters, or other measurements) or may be, in legal investigation, just omit such extreme data? I can't find in result or discussion exact explanation, summary of this method and providing combination of size based and morphological characters. How author decide in case of extreme of measurements, which instar it is? It should be given in methods. I ask about it previously. Verse 221-227 could be explanation but are unclear: if author used these way of determination, which characters exactly.

**Verse 338:** change authors onto capitalic

**Verse 415, 418, 421:** shouldn't 2010 be the first?

**Other comments:**

author still does not provide detail information in which points, exactly, head width have been measured. It should be given in methods (the widest point, below antenna ?).