14072 Igal

This proposal is well-organized and interesting to review. In addition to line edits, I have made suggestions throughout that I hope will increase your chances for success. Best of luck!

Comments

1. I compacted the text throughout to save space for future text, if necessary.

2. I suggest being as quantitative as possible by avoiding words like several, few, some, etc. If you can state a quantity, it will be clearer for reviewers.

3. Line 35. Are fish attracted to oil pollution, or do they tolerate oil pollution? If I understand correctly, the hypotheses are that the fish avoid oil or stay in place and tolerate it.

4. For the proposal, "I" is used for intellectual aspects, like hypotheses. But I presume a group will do the actual experiments. Perhaps for consistency, "we" could be used throughout. If there is one PI, the hypothesis and ideas are clearly from that individual. I changed "I" to "we" throughout. My apologies if I am incorrect.

5. Reviewers will appreciate Figure 1 outlining the overall proposal. This is nice!

6. Figure 1 legend. I suggest definitions for CRW, BCRW, and SRW, as these are not defined in the text to this point.

7. Research Design and Methods. For this section, I strongly suggest numbering the subsections. As written, the sections are only defined by their subheading. Numbered sections will make it easier for reviewers to refer to sections and to align those sections with the list of Aims.

8. Line 140, 242, 293. Italicizing subheadings does not seem to stand out visually. I suggest underlining instead.

9. Throughout, I tried to make the proposal first person, "we will conduct experiments" rather than "experiments will be conducted", which is the more typical style these days.

10. Line 193. As a friendly reviewer, is there a logic to the 10-meter separation of your installations that can be stated? For example, is this a known or accepted distance where the PAH is absent in the control traps? If you get similar numbers of larvae in the traps, is this due to cross-contamination or the true lack of avoidance behavior? Perhaps this is answered at line 216, where PAH concentrations are discussed.

11. To distinguish your table and figure legends from the main text, you may wish to consider italicizing the legend text.

12. In the Research Design and Methods section, I suggest at lines 140, 240, and 289 using the same titles as in your list of Aims (lines 99-116). This cue will help reviewers follow the organization.

13. Line 365. As a friendly reviewer, I suggest you phrase this sentence differently. As written, it is saying that you will need more preliminary results to validate your preliminary results. It will invite reviewers to suggest you complete your preliminary results before funding. Perhaps you can state that your proposed research plan will address the mixed results of your trial. Furthermore, even if this intermediate result is validated, you will add this to your model because your goal is to model the true behavior of larval fish. This argument is just an example to illustrate the point. The actual text is for the PI to decide.

14. Line 407. There is sufficient space after compacting the text to add a final statement to the section stating the broad significance of the research to bring reviewers back to your overall goal. It is a statement of the expected results in a broader sense.

15. As a friendly reviewer, I don't quite understand the title. Is it not "Swim or die"?