

Abstract

Line 23:overall effectiveness...

Lines 24-25: but, how many of the total susceptible spp?and effectiveness was not the same for all species, right?? Clarify in tis sentence.

Line 25: as the conclusion, emphasize that this is by far the most effective method to treat SCTL D diseased colonies today.

Introduction:

Lines 51-57: Please clarify if colonies selected belong to just one species, the most susceptible species or species with varying susceptibility. How many colonies of each of the different species were selected? This has bearings on the following experimental design. If the species was not considered as a factor, please explain why. It would be a confounding factor in the results and interpretation.

Lines 66-72: What is the difference between Base B and the New Base??

Line 78:0.5 cm covered infected live tissue.

Any considerations about how the antibiotic could affect the natural microbiome of the different species? Could it eliminate beneficial bacteria to the host?

Materials and Methods:

Please include a figure/map with the location of the experimental area

Results

Most results are presented in the context of success or failure of treatments with regards to lesions within colonies of different coral species. However, up to this point, the reader has no idea how many colonies/lesions in how many different species were used, or if the 5 step design was applied consistently to the seven different species used (balanced design).

From Fig.1 it is obvious that this is not the case. It would then be advisable that authors expand and clarify the experimental design and how the analysis was done. Number of lesions treated by colonies/species, variable (s) used (lesions/colony/or species), conditions for the Z-tests (proportions) used, etc. This not clearly stated in the methods. Maybe a table or diagram with the experimental design including species/colonies/ lesions and the treatments used could clarify this.

Results for seven different species are presented in figure 1, but two of these spp. are never mentioned in the results and discussion?

Line 101 -103: This summary sentence must be more specific: ... *Overall, Base 2B + amoxicillin effectiveness was 86% (54/63) for all colonies treated (all species), with P. strigosa showing the highest % of failures.*

An effectiveness of 73% for example, means that 11 colonies showed arresting disease signs from a total of 15 colonies treated (base + amoxicillin) right? Those 15 do not include controls and placebos, right? Maybe adding “antibiotic treated” ... beforecolonies..... in the results would clarify this. Results and discussion are a bit confusing because authors mix results for the total number of colonies (or lesions), and those for individual species (i.e. Lines 99-103; 106-108; 111-113; etc.).

Discussion:

Line 120: *The addition of.....* This should be in the results.

Discussion should present more detail with regards to what were the main differences across the different species, and treatments. Which species showed higher effectiveness and maybe, some explanation/speculation of why. Is there any phylogenetic relationship amongst those that responded better, or failed? Any considerations about how the antibiotic could affect the natural microbiome of the different species? Any suggestions to improve the logistics and efficiency of the methods in the field? These are important topics that could be included in the discussion and conclusions that would improve the manuscript.