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Dear Academic Editor

Dr. James Reimer

We received your evaluation on our revised manuscript on June the 27th, with the minor revisions as concerned by the editor in charge of our MS.

Please, find below our replies to each comment, in *italic*. Also, all concerns regarding English grammar and spell were addressed in this revised version of the manuscript, highlighted in yellow.

Also, we had incorporated other issues, not addressed before, as we realized these only after resubmission, in the dataset\_S2.xslx file, concerning the numbering of each sampling location (1-8 as replacement for A-H, finally in accordance to the Figure\_S1.png file).

We hope that the present version fits all requirements for publishing with PeerJ.

On behalf of the authors,
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Editor Decision

Your manuscript is almost ready to be published, and there are just a very few small issues to address. I have listed these below.

A. *Thank you very much for your time and patience on this matter. We honestly hope this new, enhanced version of the manuscript fits all requirements for publishing with PeerJ*

1. I have heard back from one reviewer, who now finds your paper acceptable for publication except for the ANCOVA figure.

A. *Please, find statement below*

In a previous round of reviews, this reviewer mentioned:

"After checking Figure 2 (ANCOVA), there is something missed. Red and both green groups don’t follow lines plotted, and have a greater slope."

Your response indicated that the lines were generated by the software utilized, and are correct.

I wish to confirm with you that this is the case, as the reviewer has again mentioned ANCOVA figure in their review. If you can confirm this for me, then I will leave the figure as is and this issue has been dealt with.

A. *We do confirm our previous statement, and such reference lines are now indicated along with the script for the ANCOVA test, in the Dataset\_S2.xlsx file. Please, find such commands within the “ANCOVA\_R script” datasheet.*

2. Regarding the issue of different sample preservation among different specimens, you must at least address this with one or two sentences as a "caveat emptor". I have marked the PDF with a possible suitable location, please check the attached file.

A. *These were addressed in the location as recommended by the editor.*

3. There are some small English edits to be done - these are also visible in the attached PDF file.

A. *Checked as recommended by the editor.*