While this study focused on evaluating the statistical consequences of effort reduction when collecting age and length samples on bottom trawl surveys, our stated goal was also to address the tradeoffs between stock assessment input data uncertainty and workforce health and efficiency. We showed that the combined sex and sex-specific length frequency sampling can be reduced from current sampling levels without major consequences to length composition uncertainty. While collecting total length frequency data is cheap in terms of effort required, determining sex from a fish requires additional effort. Collecting age samples requires additional effort beyond determining the sex of a fish, including extraction of the sagittal otoliths which are then prepared and read in an ageing laboratory. The cost of age reading for several stocks evaluated here is summarized in Lambert et al. (2017) and further evaluated in Siskey et al. (2023). In short, the monetary expense of each otolith is not inconsequential and the savings to an agency as a result of reduced age sampling could be in the tens of thousands of dollars (USD). However, Siskey et al. (2023) showed that there are downstream effects of increased uncertainty in assessment model estimates of the overfishing limit when age sampling is reduced, which would subsequently effect buffers in catch limits based on estimates of uncertainty in derived assessment quantities (e.g., Prager et al. 2003). In areas where these types of buffers are used, a reduction in age composition sampling could lead to greater assessment uncertainty and directly impact the value of fisheries through a reduction in catch. However, from a survey effort perspective when collecting otoliths, it may be more efficient to collect less otoliths from any given haul while at the same time increase the number of hauls from which otoliths are collected.

**Review:** *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.*