Dear Jeff,

Thank you for the feedback on the draft technical report that we submitted for review in June. I was very glad to receive such positive reviews and trust that this work can now be published in its revised form.

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 and co-authors

**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.
* More details were given about the standardisation of catch data by trawled distance, and an additional table detailing the vessels and fishing gears was added to the document.
* The taxonomic groupings used for the 104
* 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 of this species as category LI is correct.

**Responses to reviewer 2 (anonymous)**

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

* The term “environmental preferences” was changed to “environmental associations”
* 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 1 and Figure 3 were modified, and some text was added to section 2.2 to address the reviewer’s comments about color-coding the strata map by depth, and the mixed depths encountered in strata 443, 444, 445 and 459. The revised map in Figure 3 is inspired by Figure 1 in Cook and Bundy (2012) and strata with mixed depths are now clearly identified.
* Two sentences were added to section 2.3 to document the change from spring scales to electronic balances, and how it changed the error structure of weight measurements.
* 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.
* The caption for IDW figures now describes what P(occ) represents. Note that P(occ) is also described in section 2.5.1.
* The caption for the temporal evolution of distribution indices now describes the loess smoother. Note that this is also described in section 2.5.2.
* The condition plots were modified based on the reviewer’s comments, and are now clearer. The figure captions now describe all aspects of the plot.
* The “Perry & Smith plots” (), were indeed labelled incorrectly, the survey-level and the species-specific empirical cumulative distributions are now correctly labelled.
* The caption of the density-dependent habitat selection plots now defines what the red and black lines represent.
* Line 484, the report by Serdynska et al. did use quintiles, and we have updated the reference as it was recently published.

To include some suggestions made by reviewer #3, the figure showing the indices of distribution was modified from the one that appeared in the draft document.