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Summary Comments

1. Overall, this is an understandable, well-organized, and informative review. I learned a lot! The review is extensive, so I edited it to streamline the writing by simplifying sentences and reducing wordiness. I hope this has reduced the word count and enhanced its clarity. Please read carefully to be sure that I have not altered any of your intent. I have noted that in the margin regions, I edited more heavily, so you may check more carefully. I tried to preserve your writing style as much as possible while trying to give the manuscript a consistent flow, style, and language.

2. Abstract. I edited it to increase clarity and reduce wordiness. The word count has been reduced as a result. The author guide does not indicate a specific word limit. Also, you list six keywords, but only five are permitted.

3. Parenthetic statements. Where possible, I tried to remove such statements. I suggest that they interrupt the reading flow unless essential. In many cases, such statements can be integrated into the sentence text. Or an additional sentence will remove them. Also, parenthetical statements are often a sign that too much information is contained in a single sentence.

4. Being as quantitative as possible. I suggest being quantitative for readers where possible to provide a sense of scale. Not all readers are experts, especially for a review, and such information helps them understand the scope of the discussion. For example, at lines 102 and 103, at line 103, how much larger are the groupers in a weight such Kgs, and how much did the number of groupers increase? At line 105, you do include useful numbers. I noted other locations in the margin where it might be useful to be quantitative.

5. Tense (line 115, for example). When discussing results and conclusions that are published, I suggest writing in the present tense because, for the purposes of writing, published results are considered facts.

6. Table. At lines 129-136, there is an extensive list of declining lobster families and species. You may wish to consider a table instead. The species can be sorted by family, and the references can be cited in the table.

7. End of Introduction (line 137). This paragraph is a nice transition to the review itself. However, I would suggest stating what you hope to achieve in the review along with the major question/challenge for the field. In this case, I would think that the review will offer some observations and potential solutions. With this in mind, I edited the last two sentences to focus readers on the challenge plus what the review hopes to achieve. I hope this makes sense!

8. Generic statements. For example, at lines 210 and 195. I suggest avoiding statements like "a few countries" and "some countries" that refer to geography related to endangered lobster species. I recommend stating explicitly what some of those countries are. Being more specific about geography is important because location will help readers to organize the information mentally. As written, experts will connect species and geography, which is fine. But non-experts may have a harder time. I suggest that non-experts are your target audience for a wider readership as they turn to reviews like yours to learn about your field from an expert. I hope this helps.

9. Heading locations (see, for example, lines 45, 145, and 233). Perhaps a minor aesthetic point, but all headings should be aligned to the left margin. When using automatic bulleting in MS Word, the spacing is often too far right, leaving a large space between the number and the heading. Perhaps there is a way to correct this I am not aware of, but the issue can be avoided by turning off automatic lists and entering the numbers manually. Also, based on example reviewers from the journal, the subheadings should be aligned beneath the main headings, not indented as MS Word has done. I will leave it to you to fix this aspect; Word made a mess of the format when I tried.

10. Reference citations. There is no need to write "e.g." at the beginning of a reference citation.

11. Many sentences begin with an author's name. This may become tedious for readers, so I rearranged selected sentences to limit this sentence form.

12. Spillover (line 466 and thereafter). "Spillover" does not need to be hyphenated. In a web search for discussions of spillover, the term appears without hyphenation. However, we could alter the heading to read "Spillover and spill-in effects", which would retain the hyphen in the heading title. I edited other instances to "spillover".

13. The mind of a lobster (line 513. Perhaps this is a bit existential, but can lobsters "judge conditions", strictly speaking? Judging means to form an opinion after careful consideration. These seem like human traits or traits beyond lobsters, at least. Perhaps, "sense more favorable conditions"?

14. Is this number correct (line 819)? Maybe I misunderstand, but 0.0039 km2 is 3.9 m2 with an SD of 1.4 m2. It seems nonsensical that only 25% of MPAs are more than twice this size. Does this measurement mean that 75% is 3.9 m2 or less?

15. Sentences starting with author names. Throughout the review, many sentences start with author names. While this is fine, their overuse can add to wordiness and become tedious to read. I tried to intersperse this sentence form with others where references are placed in the middle or end of the sentence for more variety. I indicated in the margins where such changes were made.

16. Conclusions (line 965). Because your conclusions are a list, it may be more readable to number the items rather than making each point a paragraph. I suspect the publisher will not object.

I hope these suggestions improve the review. I wish you success in publishing the article and hope it will attract new scientists to your field.