**Case Study WP (from Kendra)**

Status from Salmon Scanner vs. status on spawner abundances

In addition to Carrie’s note above, within the case study paper, we have changed some wording about Salmon Scanner outputs to be more specific. Instead of using “the Salmon Scanner outputs” as we did previously, we now say “the multidimensional status estimates derived from the decision tree used within the Salmon Scanner (e.g., Green, Amber, Red)” – or, sometimes we just say “multidimensional status estimates from the Salmon Scanning tool”. We are also explicit in saying that “While estimates of CU status relative to a single LBM such as Sgen is a readily available output from the Salmon Scanner tool, we calculated these metrics external to the tool for our case studies.”

Rationale for Projected LRPs

When applying the Projected LRP method, the assessment of CU status is not based on projected future abundances. Rather, we’re using projections to generate simulated data that allow us to realize the underlying relationship between aggregate abundance and the probability that all CUs > LBM. Projections are parameterized based on currently available information, and are run to equilibrium conditions, so they are not meant to be predictions of future abundance or status. We do mention the potential to include hypotheses about new and emerging trends in productivity, covariation, etc as a way to represent uncertainty, but this is meant to capture key structural uncertainties in our understanding of stock dynamics. We have updated our description of this method to better describe this.

Application of criteria for assessing whether the status of data-deficient CUs could be inferred from data-rich CUs to our case studies

Our rationale for applying these criteria to our case studies was twofold: (i) to demonstrate how they could be applied, and (ii) specific to coho: to see how the results from the a priori decision about whether CUs are representative of each other compared to the results of our leave-one-out analysis. We have added some additional text that better explains this comparison for coho, and have included a comparison of the a priori criteria and the leave-one-out analysis at the end of the coho section. We also moved the bulk of the text describing the application of these criteria for coho to an appendix so that they do not distract from the main case study description. While there is some circularity in the development of the guidelines and the case study applications as you suggest (i.e., which is meant to inform which?), this is a result of the iterative nature of the development of this work.

Comments on re-structuring the Intro and Discussion sections

We have made substantial revisions to these two sections, including re-structuring the discussion to focus on 6 specific lessons learned from the case studies that feed into the guidelines document.