Comments V3

The proposal reads as complete and organized. I hope you like it as well.

1. There are a lot of figures in the proposal. This is fine, but as noted previously, the legends are sometimes hard to distinguish from the main text, especially where figures directly precede one another. For example, Fig 3 has a long legend and abuts Fig 4. Fig 5 has one paragraph of the main text before Fig 6. Fig 7 and 8 abut each other. These figures are all in the last three or four pages, so the pages look busy. I suggest the legends need to be more distinct from the main text. This means either using a distinct font or italicizing the legends. Currently, there is reduced spacing in the legends, but this may be too subtle. Perhaps another option is to box the figures and the accompanying legends to make them more distinct. Also, Figures 1 - 3 have a generous amount of space. You may be able to shrink them to make more space for the later figures.

2. I know you are out of space, but as a friendly reviewer concerning Fig 8, I would raise the issue that if these proteins are known to be involved in immune response, what be learned in tilapia that is new? This confirms that you can differentially identify immune-related genes in tilapia. Perhaps as a rationale, this is a starting place that says you are on the right track technically and intellectually to find novel components or known components that may behave in novel ways in your system. This requires that you understand even known genes in tilapia to discover the basis for resistance.

3. You note in the legend for Fig 8 that you will target calreticulin and enolase for further work like MALDI. You may want to put that in the main text and clarify what you mean by targeting them and how that may be significant.