Text says 145 samples, but I had 142.

Lake Terrasovoje Mawson Escarpment Mount Menzies

55 64 23

55+64+23 = 142

of which I discarded 5 due to lack of soil data, so 137 complete samples:

53 at Lake Terrasovoe; 63 at Mawson; 21 at Menzies 21 + 63 + 53 = 137

See the attached presences table. Has that disappeared from the supplementary material? I have added the total number of samples at each site in the header.

1000 bootstrap samples, not 10,000

**Pie chart or???** Whatever you do, please not a pie chart!

**Michel, what would be a good number of samples you’d like to see to get good predictive power for all variables we had at hand?**

That is hard to say. Post-hoc power calculations are not recommended. At this point, I would just say that the sample size was small for the number of predictors.

For example, we have observed 35 samples with tardigrades. The 1 in 10 rule says you can reliably fit 35/10=4 predictors. I don’t know how good the 1 in 10 rule is, but we are fitting 16 predictors, so that is probably too many. To fit 16 predictors, we should have 160 samples with tardigrades, so perhaps about 4 times that many samples (because they occur in about one in four samples)

**Improving Figure 2, this was a tough one. What do we think about new figure two and cross-reference to it? Sufficient? Open to suggestion though, but difficult to improve – Michel anything that can come easily from your code?**

I don’t understand figure 2. What are the red balls and the numbers in them? I am not sure what you are asking me here.

My affilations, please change:

Department of Biostatistics, to: Biostatistics Centre.

And please add:

Airmed ltd. Level 2, Consultancy House, 7 Bond St, Dunedin 9016