Dear Editor,

Thank you for your consideration and review efforts on our manuscript. We have addressed most of the concerns raised by the reviewers, especially those about the lack of detail and distinction between hypotheses and conclusions. I was hoping to get your advice on how to proceed from here after I clarify some aspects of our work.

We recognize that this manuscript is indeed unusual in nature since the novel deliverables it presents are of three kinds: (1) a theoretical framework with which to measure and compare attributes of salp colonies, (2) hypotheses generated from observations on salp colony development, and (3) descriptive empirical findings based on such observations. It is not exactly a traditional research article with a pre-existing hypothesis being assessed through data analyses. Given the largely unexplored nature of salp colonial architecture, this manuscript aims to lay the hypothesis-generating foundation from which to begin the hypothesis-testing process.

We are willing to consider resubmitting the revised manuscript as a **Position Paper** like Reviewer 1 suggested, if you think it would be appropriate. In the response to the reviews, we elaborate further on this.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Alejandro Damian-Serrano, Ph.D.