Aquaculture Research

Decision Letter (ARE-RA-20-Mar-280)

From: AREeditorialoffice@wiley.com

To: lhs3@uw.edu

CC: lhs3@uw.edu, julimar@uw.edu, guatemal@uw.edu, ryan@restorationfund.org, Brady.Blake@dfw.wa.gov, hlopes@uw.edu, chelwood@uw.edu

Subject: Aquaculture Research - Decision on ARE-RA-20-Mar-280

Body: 06-May-2020

Dear Ms. Spencer,

We recognise that the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic may affect your ability to return your revised manuscript to us within the requested timeframe. If this is the case, please let us know.

Manuscript ID ARE-RA-20-Mar-280 entitled "The risks of shell-boring polychaetes to shellfish aquaculture in Washington, USA: A mini-review to inform mitigation actions" which you submitted to Aquaculture Research, has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewers are included at the bottom of this letter.

After considering the reviewers? comments, the Editorial decision is that some major revisions are required before publication of your manuscript in Aquaculture Research can be reconsidered. I encourage you to consider, and respond to, the reviewer(s)' comments and submit a revised manuscript.

If you would like help with English language editing, or other article preparation support, Wiley Editing Services offers expert help with English Language Editing, as well as translation, manuscript formatting, and figure formatting at www.wileyauthors.com/eeo/preparation. You can also check out our resources for Preparing Your Article for general guidance about writing and preparing your manuscript at www.wileyauthors.com/eeo/prepresources.

Before submitting your revisions, please prepare the following documents:

1. A cover letter giving a point-by-point response to the reviewers' concerns. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response.

2. A revised manuscript (word document), highlighting all the changes made in the document. Please try to address all of the concerns raised by the reviewers within the manuscript. Should you disagree with the reviewers' comments, please provide explanations.

3. A ?clean? version of your revised manuscript where the changes are not marked.

To submit your revised manuscript:

1. Log in by clicking 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/are?URL_MASK=b3f4abd474784a0fbf12d2dae4484339

OR

Log into https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/are and click on Author Center. You will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions". Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision. PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT YOUR REVISIONS AS A NEW MANUSCRIPT.

2. Follow the on-screen instructions. First you will be asked to provide your ?Response to Decision Letter??this is the response to reviewer comments that you prepared earlier. Please be aware that this text will be accessible to both the Editor and the reviewers. (If you have any confidential comments for the Editor, please put them in the Author's Covering Letter box.)

3. Click through the next few screens to verify that all previously provided information is correct.

4. File Upload: Delete any files that you will be replacing (this includes your old manuscript). Upload your new revised manuscript file with changes highlighted, a ?clean? copy of your revised manuscript file, any replacement figures/tables, or any new files. Once this is complete, the list of files in the ?My Files? section should ONLY contain the final versions of everything.

5. Review and submit: please be sure to double-check everything carefully so that your manuscript can be processed as quickly as possible.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to Aquaculture Research, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. The deadline for your submission is 04-Aug-2020. If you feel that you will be unable to submit your revision within the time allowed please contact the editorial office to discuss the possibility of extending the revision time.

Thank you for submitting to Aquaculture Research and I look forward to receiving the revised manuscript.

Kind regards,

Aquaculture Research
AREeditorialoffice@wiley.com

****

Please note:
-Once you begin to submit the revision, the 'create a revision' link disappears and the manuscript moves into your Revised Manuscripts in Drafts list. The option reappears if you delete the revision before it is actually submitted.
- In Step 1, the decision letter for your original submission is displayed.

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Associate Editor
Comments to the Author:
(There are no comments.)

Reviewer: 1

Positive Comments to the Author
A really nice contribution - thanks for your efforts!

Reviewer: 2

Positive Comments to the Author
This is an important paper for mollusc farmers in Washington State and probably further afield on the west coast of the USA. On the whole, I think that all relevant information is included, but just need to be better organised. Please refer to the attached document.

Reviewer: 1
Constructive Comments to the Author: I very much enjoyed reading this review paper. While the goal is to provide specific advice for Washington state, the review does a great job of synthesizing globally-relevant information. The review is very well written, well structured, and will be a nice addition to the literature. I have some fairly minor comments for the authors to consider, but I think this paper is certainly worthy of publication in Aquaculture Research.

If the authors have any questions or wish to discuss any of my comments they should feel free to contact me directly at jeffery.clements@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Well done!

Regards,
Jeff Clements

Specific comments:

1. Line 44: Perhaps note that NB and BC are in Canada; I would think many people have never heard of New Brunswick and may conflate it with New Brunswick, NJ in the USA.

2. Lines 46-47: Is it possible that they were never identified because of sampling methods and a

lack of awareness?

3. Lines 163-173: A focus is placed on salinity here, but there are other environmental (biotic and abiotic) conditions that can influence Polydora abundances. Indeed, some of these factors are mentioned later in the text. I think it would be beneficial to provide a review of environmental parameters and Polydora here. If this section gets large, perhaps an additional sub-section would be warranted.

Some examples: siltation (Clements et al. 2017a), pH (Clements et al. 2017b), oyster density (Smith 1984), and tidal height.

References:

Brown SW (2012) Salinity tolerance of the oyster mudworm Polydora websteri. BSc honours thesis, University of Maine, USA. https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1040&context=honors

Clements JC et al. (2017a) Siltation increases the susceptibility of surface–cultured eastern oysters (Crassostrea virginica) to parasitism by the mudworm Polydora websteri. Aquaculture Research 48: 4707-4717. https://doi.org/10.1111/are.13292

Clements JC et al. (2017b) Extreme ocean acidification reduces the susceptibility ofeastern oyster shells to a polydorid parasite. Journal of Fish Diseases 40: 1573-1585. https://doi.org/10.1111/jfd.12626

Medcof JC (1946) The mud-blister worm, Polydora, in Canadian oysters. Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada 6, 498-505. https://doi.org/10.1139/f42-060

Smith IR (1984) Diseases important in the culture of the Sydney rock oyster. Report of the Brackish Water Fish Culture Research Station of the New South Wales

4. Line 192: Just as a heads-up, I suspect there will be a publication coming out soon documenting some interesting Polydora species in Maine using molecular tools that may be applicable for Washington.

5. Lines 197-201: I'm curious as to whether or not the outbreak has been sustained in recent years? The. outbreak we saw in eastern Canada back in 2016 only lasted a single year, and we have not had any reported issues since (we were lucky!). Has this been the case in WA, or has the outbreak remained across multiple years?

6. Lines 202-208: This paragraph feels a bit out of place here. Perhaps it would be better suited near the beginning of this section?

7. Lines 252-253: Off-bottom methods do not always slow oyster growth rates. In fact, depending on localized conditions, they can actually increase growth rates as they do in Atlantic Canada.

8. Lines 260-262: And perhaps other potential foulers such as tunicates or hydroids at sites where these pests are problematic

9. Lines 323-324: This is an excellent suggestion! I agree.

10. Lines 357 onward: I very much like this progression from global to regional with respect to mitigation - nice job! I wonder if it might be better (from an organizational standpoint) to include the sections from here onward (or perhaps the next 3 sections) as subsections in a larger, overarching "Mitigation" section.

11. Lines 440-441: Thanks for this suggestion. We are working on a manuscript which presents a qualitative assessment tool for growers to identify and risk-assess Polydora, which is more or less a score sheet-style assessment that will also be useful for researchers. This will be a good justification for that publication :)

Reviewer: 2
Constructive Comments to the Author: See attached document.

Reviewer: 1
Positive Comments to the Author:

Reviewer: 2
Positive Comments to the Author:

** The application was unable to attach manuscript files to this email, because one or more of the files exceeded the allowable attachment size (6MB). **

Date Sent: 06-May-2020

File 1: - ARE-RA-20-Mar-280_Proof_hi.pdf

File 2: - ARE-RA-20-Mar-280_review.pdf

Files attached

ARE-RA-20-Mar-280_Proof_hi.pdf
ARE-RA-20-Mar-280_review.pdf

Close Window