

Reviewer Instructions: Thank you for agreeing to review this manuscript under consideration for publication in *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* (TAFS). In an effort to standardize the review process and obtain reviews that are of the greatest value to authors and editors, we are providing this scoresheet for your use. In some instances, simply checking one of the responses provided will be sufficient, but we have also provided comment boxes for cases in which more detailed responses are necessary. Please be constructive and concise in your detailed responses; identify your concerns and, when possible, suggest appropriate remedies for the problems that you perceive. Although we welcome general comments about grammar, structure, and other such matters, accepted papers will be thoroughly copyedited before publication; hence, we ask you to focus on the scientific merits of the manuscript.

*** How would you rate this manuscript's science in terms of breadth and novelty:**

- Excellent; very broad and novel
- Good; less breadth or novelty, but appropriate for TAFS
- Fair; significantly lacking in either breadth or novelty
- Poor; neither novel nor of broad interest

*** How would you rate the scientific importance and relevance of this manuscript:**

- Highly important; subject of significant potential impact
- Reasonably important; subject of topical or regional significance
- Useful, but only in a specific context (e.g., species, location, or method)
- Of limited importance to TAFS readers

*** The introduction develops a logical and justifiable basis for the work and includes appropriate context.**

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

*** The methods are appropriate to address study objectives, and sufficient methodological detail is provided.**

Strongly agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

*** The statistical analyses are appropriate (this question focuses not on what might have been done, but whether what was done is appropriate).**

Strongly agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

*** The discussion provides adequate explanation and interpretation of the findings, and integrates the results with the broader literature on the topic.**

Strongly agree

Agree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

*** Recommendation**

- Publish as-is (i.e., no revision is necessary)
 - Reconsider following revision based on review team comments
 - Reject from further consideration
 - Redirect to (please provide suggested alternative outlets in the comment box below)
-

Optional: Confidential Comments to the Editors

ΩSpecial Characters

Optional: Comments to the Author

ΩSpecial Characters

Attach Files