Open Access

Earth System
Science
Data

Discussions

Interactive comment on "Trawl macrofauna of the Far-Eastern Seas and North Pacific: proportion of commercial species, potential product yield, and price range" *by* Igor V. Volvenko et al.

Michael Vecchione (Referee)

vecchiom@si.edu

Received and published: 30 July 2019

This review is unusual for me. Nominally, the manuscript, together with the data avail-abel from PANGAEA, is a data discussion rather than a presentation of research results and inferrences. The data in question, a massive set of survey-trawl data, have been summarized by these authors recently in Nature/Scientific Reports. Whereas the previous summary focussed on occurrence and relative abundance, this manuscript develops inferences about potential commercial value. There is considerable overlap between this manuscript and the previous publication, including some short passages that are reproduced verbatim. I think the data set considered here is immensely im-

portant. However, in my opinion the primary importance is what was covered in the Scientific Reports publication. Whether there are ethical issues relative to advocacy of expanded exploitation of living marine resources in this region is a question that might properly be raised by readers. However, as a scientific reviewer, I will leave that question to the editors. If the goal here is "to analyse the importance of trawl macrofauna to fisheries", I think that importance should include more than current or potential monetary value. Importance should include ecological relationships such as predator/prey and habitat structure. A unfished species may be important to to the food web support-ing fished species. Similarly a species with no commercial value may provide nursery habitat or protection from predators.

Specific comments l. 98 – A midwater tow to a depth of 2200 m is not mesopelagic. l. 104 – Re "known to occur", were these additional data only from trawl studies? If so, please state explicitly. ll. 106-107 – This sentence lacks a verb. l. 243 – "Coelenter-ates" is considered by some to include ctenophores (i.e., comb jellies in the following category). I think this it would be better for this category to be "Cnidarians". ll. 282-283 – Change "almost two times lower" to "approximately half of the respective numbers for fish species". l. 302 – "Shellfish" generally refers to crustaceans + molluscs. Therefore "crustaceans" are "shellfish". I think you mean "molluscs" rather than "shellfish". ll. 337, 342 (and elsewhere) – If "squid" refers to >1 species, it should be "squids". l. 384 – Change "shell" to "shelled". l. 395 (and elsewhere) – If "fish" and "shrimp" refer to >1 species, they should be "fishes" and "shrimps.