One thought as I’m reading through methods and results: While it’s obviously standard to have the methods and results as two separate sections, I and some of my colleagues have had success having multiple methods & results chunks that address different questions. That is, the manuscript could introduce focal question one (how do temporal trends compare among the three sites?), then have statistical methods and associated results for that question, then move into focal question two (how do oyster counts vary among restoration projects in Ap Bay) with its own statistical methods and results, and so on so forth.   
  
This paper is loaded with great stats and results, but with so many analyses, it may be hard for a reader to keep track of every test that was performed and its alignment with each result. So just something to consider.

I implemented this in Stewart Merrill et al. 2019 Integrative Comparative Biology and the reviewers appreciated it. Spencer Hall does this routinely and it works quite well.

*Thanks for the idea. I'll consider this. Really there is only one framework used, a straightforward GLM model. There are different questions addressed with this framework I agree.*

Intro

Great content here. I did some light reordering and added a final sentence (not a great one – could be updated) that drives home the message that, if we are going to invest huge amounts of money into restoration (more than the value of oyster landings), then we need to assess whether those initiatives are working.

*I accepted most of these changes.*

Depending on the target journal a glossary or box with definitions of key terms could be useful

*Target journal is Marine and Coastal Fisheries (open access journal from American Fisheries Society). I'll see if a box can be developed. If we submit as a "perspective" then we may have more flexibility. I have published a couple of oyster articles in that journal in the last two years.*