29 July 2022  
  
Dear Mr. Meyers:  
  
Thank you for submitting your revised manuscript entitled "“Landscape characteristics influence projected growth rates of stream-resident juvenile salmon in the face of climate change in the Kenai River watershed, southcentral Alaska" to Transactions of the American Fisheries Society (TAFS). Comments on your manuscript were received from one peer reviewer and the Associate Editor (AE) assigned to your manuscript. Both individuals had reviewed your original submission.  
  
The review team, including myself, agreed that, subject to a revision, your study and resulting revised manuscript could provide a useful contribution to the fisheries literature that is of interest to the readership of this journal. The review team provided a number of comments, questions, and concerns that will serve you and your co-authors well in guiding your revision (the comments are included at the bottom of this letter).   
  
I would like to reiterate my original concern from the initial submission which largely has not been resolved in this revision – manuscript length. While the manuscript is slightly shorter, it is still much too long for a TAFS publication and still reads very much like a master’s thesis. I fully agree with the AE that the appendix, which is 13 pages long, needs to be converted to supplementary material which will only be published online. While appendices of this nature are fine for theses and dissertations, it does come across as not necessary in this context. I also encourage the author team to continue to work on streamlining the manuscript, which will not only make for a shorter document but will also make it more readable. Finally, the reference section is till much too long (13 pages!). Please cut this down in length and remove the less necessary citations. A shorter, more streamlined manuscript will be necessary for publications in TAFS.

Converted appendix to supp …

Ref section shortened to …

Main manuscript doc shortened by ….

For us to evaluate your revision, I highlight the requirement to prepare a point-by-point response to the comments and questions. It is important to note that to be considered for publication in TAFS, the manuscript will need to meet each of these stipulations. To start the revision, please click on the link below:  
  
\*\*\* PLEASE NOTE: This is a two-step process. After clicking on the link, you will be directed to a webpage to confirm. \*\*\*   
  
<https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tafs?URL_MASK=a3e89b7d81c24523ae8cfafbda1579b0>  
  
This will take you directly to the section of the site where you can submit your revision. Please (1) update the information provided as needed, (2) upload the file(s) containing your revised manuscript, and (3) upload a separate file containing detailed, point-by-point responses to the reviewers’ and editors’ comments. Using the drop-down menu, designate the manuscript files according to type (“Main Document,” and so forth); designate the file containing your responses as “Response to Decision Letter.”  
  
This link will remain active until you have submitted your revised manuscript. If you begin a revision and intend to finish it at a later time, please note that your draft will appear in the “Revised Manuscripts in Draft” queue in your Author Center.  
  
If the link above does not work, please log into your author center at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tafs> and click on "Manuscripts Awaiting Revision" to submit your revision.  
  
IMPORTANT:  Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript.  Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.  
  
Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to Transactions of the American Fisheries Society, your revised manuscript must be uploaded within 30 days (no later than 28 August 2022).  If it is not possible for you to submit your revision by this date, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.  
  
Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to Transactions of the American Fisheries Society. I look forward to receiving your revision of this manuscript.  
  
Sincerely,  
Trent Sutton  
Editor, Transactions of the American Fisheries Society  
[tmsutton@alaska.edu](mailto:tmsutton@alaska.edu)  
  
  
Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:  
  
Reviewer: 1  
Comments:  
The authors did a great job addressing the reviewer comments and the manuscript appears to be in good shape for publication after some minor copy editing.  
  
  
Associate Editor  
Comments to the Author:  
We have now received a review from one of the original reviewers for the manuscript (ID TAFS-2022-0016.R1) entitled “Landscape characteristics influence projected growth rates of stream-resident juvenile salmon in the face of climate change in the Kenai River watershed, southcentral Alaska.” The reviewer indicated that the original comments from reviewers were addressed, but the reviewer indicated a need for further copy editing. I generally agree with the reviewer’s assessment of the original comments, except I think the need for copy editing is a major issue. Specific to the previous concerns, continuing to use the method for incorporating temperature in the model is acceptable and incorporating wet-weight to recalculate diets is an improvement. Using 'a constant ration of g/d or a specific ration of % body weight’ would be a robust approach, but I agree would not change the conclusion and does not need to be changed in the manuscript. For improving the presentation, the primary issue is length and formatting to a research article.

See earlier comments for changes to length; shortened length better matches formatting needs of a research article …

My suggestions to reduce length are:  
-       Overall, move the appendix to supplementary information and have it in the online version only. Specifically, Appendix A, B, and D could be move to the supplemental online only version. Appendix C should be moved to the supplemental information or removed. In the text, citing the reference is sufficient for the information in Appendix C.

Appendices A, B, C, and D have been converted to Supplementary material sections

-       Line 152-155: Is this sentence necessary? This information does not seem relevant and could be removed to make the manuscript more concise.

The reviewer suggests removing the following sentence:

“We sampled fish from main channel and off-channel habitat at each site. Sites were visited approximately monthly (31 ± 5 days, mean ± SD) throughout May to August 2015 and May to September 2016 (summarized in Supplemental Information Section B, Figure B1).”

It is unclear which aspects of this information are unnecessary or redundant. Without this statement it would be unknown if we sampled only from the main channel (as can be common in some studies); wht the site visit frequency was, or in what years the fieldwork occurred. These elements are basic information that past reviewers have expected and required to be present.

I have left the sentence as is for now but remain open to suggestion.

-       Line 370: This sentence is unnecessary.

The reviewer suggest removing the following sentence:

“Age-0 Chinook Salmon and age-0 and age-1 Coho Salmon were captured throughout the three study tributaries and main stem of the Kenai River (Table 3).”

Consider another way to introduce / reference Table 3 ????

-       Lines 497-504: These sentences can be removed as spelling out the details is unnecessary and line 495-497 is sufficient.

Removed the suggested text.

-       Line 629-637: This paragraph is outside the data presented in the manuscript and the paragraph could be removed to reduce the amount of text.

Removed the suggested text.

-       Supplemental Information Section A. The Wisconsin Bioenergetics Model: this section is unnecessary for the publication as references in the main text provide the information.

Removed the supplementary information section on bioenergetics modeling.

Other comments:  
Line 20: There is a missing parenthesis in this sentence.

Parenthesis added.

Line 26: I do not think ‘potentially’ is necessary in the sentence.

Removed “potentially” from sentence

Line 104: See author guide for how to reference Figures and Tables in text and be consistent in manuscript.

Replaced “Fig. 1” with “Figure 1”

Line 524: This sentence is unclear as to what makes this acceptable as model inputs.

Reduced text in this section to clarify point. Now reads, “

Line 542: Remove extra parentheses.

Response

Figure 2: More information is needed in the caption for the figure to stand alone.

Response

Figure 5: The punctuation in the caption needs to be fixed. The response to Reviewer #1 that “Figure 5 indicates that for the simulations using projected temperatures, we used monthly water temperature values, run at a daily time step” needs to be further addressed. This information needs to be in the main text.

Response

Figure 6: More details are necessary for this figure to stand alone

Response