Notes for Meeting with Roger

3/13/24

* Be consistent about assimilation and absorption, and whether yolk is food for embryos. Roger favors using “assimilation” so we would change instances of “yolk absorption” to “assimilation”.
* Should AICc be in section 2.3 or 2.5? Roger added “Model selection, both for normoxia and hypoxia (Section 2.5), is achieved through Akaike’s information criterion...”. We don’t give the equation for AICc so its fine like that, but I also don’t think model selection should even be mentioned in this section. Maybe bring up in meeting.
  + Section 2.3 isn’t model selection – can remove the sentence about it and the other reference to aicc at end of pg.
* Sentence about fixing all parameters to estimate mu\_emb and mu\_lar doesn’t make sense. Maybe I can just leave out the part about initial values – no need to say that because we already said above that we did that for all of them.
* Roger added three sentences around line 338 and another sentence that help clarify our logic about damage and inhibition – very helpful.
* Roger removed/rearranged 3rd paragraph of section 2.4 but I want to keep it the same to point out why we don’t count feeding as an explanatory mechanism. Maybe it doesn’t need to be pointed out though. I thought a reviewer or reader might wonder why we didn’t manipulate food consumption but in this model assimilation has the same effect I think?
* Sentence about ventilation increasing under hypoxia Roger asked “how does this relate to the maintenance rate in DEB” – it increases energy demand, but should go in previous paragraph after behavior.
* Paragraph in discussion about how we couldn’t apply the correction factor to both assimilation and yVA simultaneously that Roger didn’t understand the message of. Maybe it makes more sense to say we can’t quantify the relative contribution or test for the possibility that they are both contributing simultaneously.
  + Roger tried to do algebra to see if perfect collinearity between the two parameters,
  + The important message is that even though we found yVA to be top choice based on AICc, that doesn’t mean Jaam isn’t contributing at all (move last sentence to beginning).
* New paragraphs
* Conclusions section: the journal requires it, but I can rework the abstract and highlights to avoid overlap. They say a “short” conclusions section so I can make it shorter and move some to abstract.
  + “The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions.” Must be able to stand alone.

Roger’s email said these are the points we may want to discuss over zoom:

* There is one para in the Discussion where I suspect I may have missed your message.
* As I previously proposed, I have added a couple of paras at the end of the Discussion on the importance for future work of getting more sub-organismal data.
* I seldom end papers with a separate Conclusions section because I'm never sure how the content differs from the Abstract.  You need to decide how to end the paper and to update the abstract.  This may affect the placing and wording of my new end paras.

Get it to Roger a few days before the deadline, with Janet’s suggestions incorporated.

Would want to see it before March 22nd if possible, because leaving March 23rd