**Associate Editor comments to author:**  
  
I agree with both reviewers of CJFAS-2023-0164 that this manuscript provides a method for demonstrating AFSC is collecting too many length samples, but perhaps not enough age samples, in its surveys. Both reviewers noted places where the wording could be improved to facilitate understanding by readers not familiar with the AFSC surveys. I especially liked the suggestion to link the steps with the flowchart using numbers or some other approach.  
  
My main concern is one raised by both reviewers, that the work is so AFSC-centric that it is difficult for readers to draw conclusions for their own situation. I agree with the reviewers that broadening the discussion to provide details that readers should consider if they want to perform a similar analysis on their survey would help. One example is to compare the results when samples are collected in 1, 2, and 5 cm bins to demonstrate how this influences the conclusions, if at all.  
  
Another aspect of the work that deserves more attention is the assumption that the original sample is sufficient for use in the bootstrapping procedure. Some guidance to readers for what to consider when making this determination would be useful. For example, is it OK to have nearly all the lengths come from one small portion of the survey area, are there minimum sample sizes needed to conduct the analysis, and does the approach used to collect the ages (random vs stratified) matter are all questions that could be addressed in the discussion.  
  
One aspect of survey sampling that was not addressed by either reviewer is the opportunity cost of not collecting samples. By this, I mean that once the survey is done there is no possibility of increasing the sample size if a new question arises, such as spatial changes to a stock definition. I would welcome the authors’ thoughts on this aspect of data collection during surveys.  
  
I agree with the reviewers that the title of the manuscript is a bit misleading given how little attention is paid to workforce health and efficiency. I suggest either modifying the title and abstract, or else providing some (even hypothetical) calculations demonstrating actual trade-offs at different levels of sampling. Currently, a reader could infer that the authors prefer no data collection at all to avoid workforce health issues, something I am sure they do not support.  
  
The use of ISS as the only metric is a bit troubling to me, despite the excellent introduction supporting it. I wonder if some discussion about other possible metrics could be included, with some notes about why they were not selected for this work. This would help readers put the work into context of other possible ways to analyze survey data. Additionally, given the rise of self-weighting error distributions for age and length composition data in stock assessments, is ISS still a relevant metric to use when comparing length-sampling strategies? Finally, could there be important factors hidden by the use of ISS?  
  
Thanks to the authors for submitting this work to CJFAS. I look forward to reading the revision.