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1. Has pertinent literature been used effectively and convincingly? If not, provide specific recommendations.

Yes – the literature appears sufficient.

MANUSCRIPT REVIEW

This manuscript applies a modeling technique (integral projection models, IPM) to gizzard shad populations from the Mississippi River basin. Applications of IPMs are relatively new to the fisheries field and appear to be beneficial, especially when length (a continuous variable) is used as a discriminating characteristic. The model builds on previous population projections by incorporating a density dependent survival component in the recruitment function. The model was developed using literature values and data from the LTRM database (sites along the Mississippi River) and validated using data from the LTRM database (site from the Illinois River). The model does a nice job of predicting size distributions through time, although slightly overestimates densities of larger individuals. The authors provide reasonable explanations for the differences between predicted and observed densities. This manuscript will be a valuable contribution to the population modeling and fisheries management literature.

REVIEW COMMENTS

General Comments:

The manuscript is interesting, well written, and will be a valuable contribution to the population modeling and fisheries management literature. There are no major flaws that would prohibit moving forward with publication. There are two areas where suggested edits might improve clarity of the modeling description, and the studies impact on future readers. For example:

Model description – The authors state that the IPM technique is relatively new to the fisheries field. Future readers, I included, may be more familiar with Leslie matrix population models. It may benefit future readers if the authors juxtaposed the two approaches in some minimal way to help readers make the mental transition and get onboard with IPM. I have provided some thoughts in the accompanying .pdf. These are just suggestions for the authors to consider.

Study impact – Currently, the model does not include environmental or invasive species factors or predictors; however, in several locations they authors note that the model could be used to infer the impact of each. This is a reasonable next step, and it might be helpful if the authors provided some concrete examples/suggestions for how the model could be adapted in the future. This might be a beneficial addition to the discussion.

Specific Comments:

See .pdf for specific and detailed comments.