On the whole, the authors have made good modifications to comments, but there are still some deficiencies. It is suggested to continue to improve it:

1. Although the title has been modified in this version, it is still not standard enough. It is necessary to continue to modify it.

We kept the title according to the last modification, as the second reviewer in the „state“ marked i tas an excat goal and directly with the goal

Before: Project of ecologically important territotries and selected natural resources in the lcoal system of ecological stability of the commune Dolný Lopašov

Now: Evaluation of positive socio-economic phenomena in territorial systems of ecological stability (Case study)

2. The abstract part is not standard enough, generally, there is no need to split it into three paragraphs. And from the normative point of view, it is generally put the objective, requirement, and background of the manuscript at the beginning of the abstract, rather than at the end... It is suggested that the author make a good reference to some normative paper writing guide to modifying.

We fully accepted the commnet. We have unified, supplemented and modified the abstract according to the propositions of the LAND editorial staff.

3. For the table part, table 1 from a to h, I see that the table headers are basically the same. Why not make just one table? Now it has been split into so many sub-tables, but I think it is not so easy to read.

Tables do not have the same content, i tis not possible to make a common single header for all tables.

4. For the part of theory and study Methods, I still haven't seen the specific introduction of the adopted methods. The paragraph (Line 200-204) added by the author in this version is far from making readers understand what the method is? Why do you choose this method? What are the advantages? And the second part syntheses, I still don't understand why it is necessary to introduce these variables, X1 minus X14? For what purpose? If it's just descriptive, then you don't have to do that, right?

They based on the methodological procedure – LANDEP methodology (Ružička, Miklós, 1982).

Yes, it´s just descriptive. Several factors enter into the syntheses which are better labeled for the sequence of work, in this case the individual PSEP were labeled and synthesized on their own in this order. Each synthese has it own procedure, in our case we chose it as follows in the study.

5. Regarding Results, Discussion, and Conclusion, the author has indeed made considerable improvements.

Thank you.

6. The reference section is not standardized enough, so it is suggested to revise it according to the guide of this journal.

We accept the comment and adjust the whole part according to the editorial instructions.