Comments V2

1. The proposal is reading as much more refined!

2. For clarity, I bolded all instances where a figure or section is cited throughout, namely, (see **Preliminary results**) and (**Fig.X**).

3. You might consider italicizing the font for the figure legends. Figure 3 (line 471) is an example of an extensive legend that can be hard to distinguish from the main text even though you have decreased the line spacing. In Fig. 3, it is harder to delineate the legend because it comes just before a new subheading.

4. I suggest changing the title to be more specific. The reviewer has a point that it is possible the mechanism is specific to your species. It is stated explicitly in the fifth sentence that you propose this as a model, so the point will not be lost. You could also change the title to reflect the potential as a model, which seems to be your broader goal. For example, “Understanding the mechanism of tilapia gill infection by *Myxobolus benjeranoi* as a (potential?) model for parasite-host interactions.” This title is both species-specific and states the broader aim of using the species as a parasite-host model.

5. There are many references to Preliminary results in the Research design and methods section, which asks readers to look ahead in the proposal. Based on the organization, I understand that it is necessary to refer readers to the later section. However, the removal of any non-essential references will help the reading flow. I found several potentially unnecessary references, as noted in the margin.