

**Reviews, and response to reviews, of the essay on:  
Arctic Marine Fishes**

**Reviewer #1**

		<b>8. Marine Fish</b>
Page No.	Line No.	Comment

General comments: The editors note that no general comments were provided. Nor did the reviewer provide any specific comments in the table.

**Reviewer #2**

		<b>8. Marine Fish</b>
Page No.	Line No.	Comment

General comments: The editors note that no general comments were provided. Nor did the reviewer provide any specific comments in the table.

**Reviewer #3**

		<b>8. Marine Fish</b>
Page No.	Line No.	Comment
		<p>This is a much to long chapter, and not very focused. There is a lot of information on what species are present, and relatively little focus on the development. I'm not an expert on all areas, but what surprise me about the Northeast Atlantic (start on page 48), is that nothing is mentioned on World record in northerly distribution of cod and haddock in 2012, and that the cod stock is all time high. Also the distribution of capelin should also have been mentioned.</p> <p>The poleward movement of capelin is now mentioned, and the reference to Christiansen et al. (2012a) has been modified to indicate that it contains references to poleward movement of numerous fishes. Information about Atlantic cod records has been added, too.</p> <p>My recommendation is that this chapter is reduced in length by 50%, and that the authors focus on the key development. This chapter is much less focused than other chapter. May be some of the authors do not know the topic well enough?</p> <p>The editors agree that the Marine Fish essay is long, but not "much to long", as indicated by the reviewer. The editors consider the length to be appropriate for the first comprehensive essay on Marine Fish ever to appear in the Arctic Report Card, and the approach taken in this essay to be appropriate and of value to the Report Card audience. The editors choose to ignore the gratuitous statement about the authors' knowledge of the topic.</p>
48	1394	<p>Atlantic Arctic Gateway (AAG). I have been work in this area for years, but this is the first time I see the expression. Saying that that this area is often termed AAG, is to me a surprising statement.</p> <p>The text has been modified to say that the area in question is increasingly referred to as the Atlantic Arctic Gateway. For example, in</p>

		the response to the editor's request for clarification, the authors note that the term is widely used in the recent literature (including marine science literature) as, for example, in the Arctic Council's Arctic Biodiversity Assessment.
--	--	---

General comments: The editors note that no general comments were provided.

#### Reviewer #4

		<b>8. Marine Fish</b>
Page No.	Line No.	Comment

General comments: The editors note that no general comments were provided. Nor did the reviewer provide any specific comments in the table.

#### Reviewer #5

		<b>8. Marine Fish</b>
Page No.	Line No.	Comment

General comments: Far too long text. Does not match the expected style of the report card. The editors agree that the Marine Fish essay is long, but not "Far too long ...", as indicated by the reviewer. The editors consider the length to be appropriate for the first comprehensive essay on Marine Fish ever to appear in the Arctic Report Card. If by "expected style of the report card" the reviewer means that there is no examination of long-term observations, then he/she is correct and has identified a challenge faced by many ecosystem contributors, i.e., the lack of continuous, long-term observational records. In the absence of such records, the editors consider the approach taken in this essay to be appropriate and of value to the Report Card audience. The editors note that no comments were provided in the table.

#### Reviewer #6

		<b>8. Marine Fish</b>
Page No.	Line No.	Comment

General comments: The editors note that no general comments were provided. Nor did the reviewer provide any specific comments in the table.