Do you want to be the corresponding author or should I?

If you are up for submitting the manuscript and following it through you can be the corresponding author. If you don’t want this burden (as this can sometime take months) then I am happy to do it. Your choice.

* Line 51 & Line 81: You commented: "What was done for the entry rates for 5 and 7 experiments?" - I went back through the code and checked. The entry rates were fixed to equal at each of the sampling times. For 10 sampling times B\_j=1/10=0.1, For 7 sampling times B\_j=1/7, For 5 sampling times B\_j=1/5=0.2.

Ok, this is great, we just have to mention it in the text somewhere.

- Line 52: You commented: "Rewrite: explain details need 1) no loss on capture for simulation study" - the no loss on capture for simulation study is explained on Lines 63-64. Sufficient? Anything else you meant by that?

Can’t remember, I will have a look when I read through it again.

- Line 62: You commented: "Explain how % double tagged affects the likelihood" - I still need to incorporate this somehow...

Ok, I can look at this again.

- Line 62: You commented: "Explain parameter in mode"? - I'm not sure what was meant by this...

Hmm, in model? Again, I will have another look.

- Line 62: I generally feel like this equation could use a better explanation since we removed so much of the notation to the appendix... Either that or move this equation to an appendix also.

- Lines 108-111: Average Parameter Estimates, Relative Bias of the Estimates were reported in the figures of the paper/appendix. Should we remove the other we didn't discuss?

Yes, if it wasn’t discussed in the paper, then remove it or just say that it is discussed in the appendix.

- In the style guidelines it states: "Authors should use the [{( )}] convention in delimiting equations" - I'm not sure what is meant by this...

When writing equations the first/inner bracket used should be (), then {}, then []. So an equation might look as follows: f(x)=[12+{x(x+1)}^2]^3

- I'm still working on the Appendix/"Web-Based Supplementary Materials".  I'm trying to change around the orderings of some of the variables like we did on the figures.

- The manuscript is still a RMarkdown file which I think is okay for our initial submission (we just need to submit a PDF with certain guidelines). However if it gets accepted,  I will likely need to convert it to a LaTeX file at some point so that I can incorporate the "biom" document class file as they want for final submission. As far as I can tell there isn't a way to do it in Markdown but I'll keep looking. I don't think it should be too much work, but definitely another step in the process.

Ok, I agree, let’s submit it as a .pdf file. If we are rejected then you save yourself a bit of time and work converting it to that style. Let me have a look at the paper with your questions in mind and then get back to you. This is exciting as I feel we are close to submission! It is worth a try to biometrics as long as we address their submission guidelines. I think our paper fits best under point number 2: “(ii) They creatively illustrate the proper use of different methods under various explicit/implicit assumptions. Consequently, clearer guidance and understanding of the use of different methods is offered.”

So, making sure we are offering clearer guidance and understanding would be key here. Again, I will have a read of the paper and get back to you on your points.

Thanks for working with me on this!