Dear Editor,

Thank you and the reviewers for such attention to detail. I have modified the manuscript based on the reviewer comments below.

Please let me know if I can do anything more.

Sincerely,

Cody

Reviewer comments are in black, my responses are in light blue.

#=======================================================================

Reviewer #2: Author has improved the manuscript presentation following the previous review comments and suggestions and the manuscript is in a better shape now. However, it needs some (minor) revisions for clarity.  I will address those in the Specific comments section below.  
  
Specific Comments:  
  
Abstract  
This section is concise and conveys summary of the manuscript.  
  
Introduction  
This section satisfactorily introduces the subject and scope of the work. However,  
  
Lines# 62-69: The statements in this paragraph need a supporting reference.

Added Szuwalski, 2021 (SAFE document)  
  
Line# 84: The notations, F35% and B35%, need to be defined at first mention.

Removed them here and let ‘management quantities’ stand on its own merits.  
  
Methods  
This section satisfactorily explains the methodology used in the analysis. However,  
  
Line# 93: Readers won't understand what you mean by "(subject to a fairly informative prior)" Please either reword it or explain a bit more for readers to understand.

Removed reference to the prior.  
  
Line# 121: Did you mean additional years of data are peeled? (not added)

Changed to ‘removed’.  
  
Lines# 138-139: Equation (1):  
  
Please modify the middle formula inequality part from   
  "   ….  if 0.25 < MMB/MMB35 < 1"   to  
if 0.25 < MMB/MMB35 <= 1.  
without "<= ", the formula will not produce a result at MMB=MMB35.

Done! Thank you.

Results  
This section adequately summarizes the results. A few suggestions though:  
  
Line# 157: Please revise the value from 0.36 to 0.34 in "(Mohn's rho = 0.36)"

Fixed.  
  
Line# 165: I can't locate the size range 70-90 mm CW in Figure 7. The top panel of Figure 7 needs an X axis label.

Fixed.  
  
Line# 176: "(see supplementary figures)" is a vague phrase. Please provide specific figure numbers.

Specified.  
  
Discussion  
This section adequately discusses the results with findings from published literatures and suggestions for further work.  
  
Line# 233: What do you mean by "knock-on-effect"? Please expand this for readers to understand the meaning.

Removed the phrase.  
  
References  
The references are complete and referred to in the text. However,  
  
Line# 273: Please expand Hilborn, R. et al. 2021.  
  
Line# 281: Please expand Johnson, K.F. et al. 2014.  
  
Perhaps the editor can determine whether the suggested expansions are necessary or not.

Expanded, but seems like a lot of space!

Appendix A  
This section provides the necessary formulas and I have no further comments.  
  
Tables  
Two tables are adequate. No further comments.  
  
Figures  
Eight figures are adequate for the manuscript. I have some suggestions for improvement though:  
  
Figure 1: Please define the confidence bars in the Figure caption. Are they 95% or one standard deviation or….Same suggestion applies to Figures 3, 4, and 5.

Now defined.  
  
Figure 6: Please define the colored horizontal dotted lines.

It says in the caption that the ‘dotted horizontal lines are targets biomasses’? I’m not sure what the reviewer is asking here.  
  
Figure 7: Please provide X axes titles and units (for the top panel).

Done!  
  
Figure 8: Please define the Y axis for Natural mortality. It ranges from 0 to 5. I am bit confused here. Or you may explain the meaning of the M range in the figure caption.

The units are provided on the axis. I added the word ‘instantaneous’ in the caption, perhaps that will help?