

Suggest writing scientific names for Largemouth Bass and Bluegill in abstract?

Line 18: You specifically say “in 20 Alabama small impoundments”, but one of the largest components of your study is the comparison of small vs. large impoundments. You don’t mention any kind of impoundment size in abstract. You even mention small and large in the Management Implications. I know you defined them in your Study Site, but I think your abstract should address two classes considering there was so much emphasis in your analysis, results, and discussion.

Line 66: I’d change “in bass in some systems” to “in bass at some systems”

Line 67-70: With the statement of bass fecundity leading into the overcrowding and reduced growth potential, I’m thinking that overcrowding and reduced growth would impact fecundity, but not sure I’d go with the other way as much. A lot of that may depend on post-hatch survival. Not saying to take it out, but questioning if it should be here or is needed. I think you can go straight into catch and release over last 30 years, how that may have impacted numbers based on fishing mortality, how it can change composition of species and then ways to maintain balanced populations.

Why is < 10 ha important to mention on line 87? I was looking for that in methods and you have small (< 12 ha) and large (> 33 ha) impoundments. Seems like you are making an argument in Intro about it not being done and there being a need, but then for your methods, you aren’t using that size qualification.

I’m a little surprised not to see Davie et al. (1982) cited anywhere. Prey-dependent recruitment of Largemouth Bass: A conceptual model. It talks directly at use of rotenone and seems very relevant to this paper.

Overall, the Introduction is extremely well written. Really good job. I actually tried to be a bit picky with some of my comments. It’s really well written.

Lines 135-137: I’m a little lost with this sentence. I get the seining of treated impoundments at sunrise, but not so much the control impoundments immediately after you treated the treatment impoundment? You mean the same exact day and you rotenone an impoundment, you went to another and seined a control?

In Methods, a lot of your analysis description gets redundant. You mention multiple times throughout, and sometime multiple times in one paragraph, that you could not use a random effect of year because of our sample size (Table 1) resulting in singular fit – and a fixed effect rotenone to meet assumption of normality. It just seems to add a bit to the overall methods that I don’t think is necessary to say over and over again. Why not say what analysis you did and say that type of statement once if you had to do the same thing over and over again for growth, CPUE, recruitment, etc.? If it changes for one because of sample size, then be specific with that one.

Line 251: Do you think you need to mention the “even though an additional reduction was observed”? It’s not significant.

Results: I’d like to see a Figure reference as soon as you give the first result, or at least at the end of that first sentence that is related to a figure. I think this starts off in the first paragraph, when you give your first stats. You follow up it up with the sentence “In other words....”, and reference the figure, but I’d like to see it from the start. For me, this became really noticeable when you get down to your paragraph

dealing with Figure 6. You mention all of these results, but don't reference the Figure until the end. I suggest changing throughout.

Just thinking about how to reduce some of the redundancy, when you get to Bass MLA-1 and you don't find any significant difference between one versus two years of treatment for both small and large impoundments, why not make that one sentence? Something like "However, we did not find a significant difference between bass MLA-1 between one versus two years of treatment for small ($F_{1,24}=19.15$; $p=0.69$) or large impoundments ($F_{1,9}=3.83$; $p=0.84$; Figure 7)."

Lines 332-335: I'm glad you mention this here. I thought about that immediately considering it is summer and you have new YOY Bluegill coming in throughout the study, but probably not so many bass.

Paragraph 347-357: Anything you can reference here for comparison? I know you mentioned not much work being done on bass recruitment in impoundments <10 ha, but may be good to have something to bounce off of.

Table 1. – I'm guessing c.f. is Confer? Not sure I'd use it here. Maybe just have "and year(s) of shoreline roteline application, if any."

Figure 6: Consider going 3 to 5 on y-axis for and keep decimal place out like others. I guess you would only have 3, 4, and 5 on y-axis, but makes it more the same as other figures.

Figure 7: Was going to suggest same thing with getting rid of decimals, but your scale is much shorter. May just keep it as is.

Figure 8: Keep the y-axis scale the same for Small and Large Impoundments.