

I think this paper looks much improved and I like how you got rid of the small impoundment size grouping for analysis.

My only comment is I think you are still stuck in the writing on specifying “small impoundments” in the Results. The entire manuscript is about small impoundments. You have already established that and now there is no need to point out small impoundments multiple times in the Results. I think this is a residual of how you wrote the Results for the original analysis. With that said, I think it would read much better to simply say impoundments in the Results or treated and control impoundments. You mostly did this for Methods, and did it some in the Results, but Results are still mostly saying small impoundments numerous times. Then when you get to Discussion, you can go back and say how your findings mean or compare to what others have found specifically for small or large impoundments. Some suggestions below:

Line 224: Change “Small impoundments treated with” to “Impoundments treated with”

Line 233: Change “control small impoundments” to “impoundments”

Line 241: Change “in treatment small impoundments” to “In treatment impoundments”

Line 251: I think you can just say “Largemouth Bass MLA-1 significantly increased on average”

Line 255: I think you can just say “We found Largemouth Bass recruitment” to start the sentence.

You may want to pay attention to other places in the manuscript that you may have had the same type of language left over from the originally separation of “small and large” small impoundments analysis. Nothing stood out for me like it did in the Results, but would be good to give it a thorough review on your end too.