Dear Jeff,

Thank you for the feedback on the draft technical report that we submitted. I am very glad to receive such positive reviews and trust that this work can now be published.

We believe that all the comments and issues raised by reviewers have been addressed in the revised document that is being resubmitted for publication. Responses to individual reviewers appear below.

If you feel like the report is ready for publication, please let me know once the DFO Library issues a report number and I will include it in the final PDF.

All the best.

Daniel

**Responses to reviewer 1 (Koen-Alonso)**

We thank reviewer 1 for his constructive comments and for his encouraging words.

* Figures 1 and 2 are now appearing in the same order as they are cited in the report.
* Table 1 was modified to also include the depth range of each stratum in meters.
* The density-dependence habitat selection model equation in section 2.4.7 was corrected.
* The duplicated sentence in section 2.5.1 was removed.
* “Compliment” changed to “complement” in section 4.1
* The classification of cusk (Brosme brosme) as category LI is based on the number of records (between 200 and 1000 records), not on its distribution. So the classification LI is correct.

**Responses to reviewer 2 (anonymous)**

We thank reviewer 2 for his/her constructive comments and for his/her encouraging words.

* The relative fish condition defined in section 2.4.5 now cites LeCren (1951)
* Rewording in section 2.4.7 to “we implemented a generalized linear model” as suggested
* The density-dependence habitat selection model equation in section 2.4.7 was corrected.
* “wasd” changed to “was” in section 4.2

**Responses to reviewer 3 (Cook)**

We thank reviewer 3 for his constructive comments and for his encouraging words.

* Table 2 was changed so that category LI is described as “between 200 and 1000 catch records”
* The density-dependence habitat selection model equation in section 2.4.7 was corrected.