

(#100369 version 3) Evaluating techniques for determining elasmobranch body size: a review of current methodologies.

Overview

I am very pleased with the changes that the authors have made and this makes the manuscript almost ready for publication. I do not see any need for me to present a detailed written analysis in submitting this review.

Recommendation

Accepted after very minor revision.

Details of changes required:

Line 157: Please note that the study conducted by Delacy et al (2017) on *Carcharhinus longimanus* was not performed in controlled conditions. The authors did perform some control tests using objects of known size, which they photographed in tanks/aquaria. The sharks were studied in the wild. This particular species is rarely, if ever, kept in captivity.

Changes suggested

Table 1: some of the text is written in full sentences and some is abbreviated. Some consistency is advised and I suggest using abbreviated text. For example:

It involves estimating the size and shape of elasmobranchs by measuring the distance from the camera to the individual.

This could be shortened to:

Estimating size and shape of elasmobranchs by measuring distance from camera to individual.

Table 2:

Here I suggest a subheading listing each of the techniques, rather than using a superscript after the details of each author to indicate the technique used. My suggestion:

Publication	Species studied
PHOTOGRAMMETRY USING DISTANCE TO THE INDIVIDUAL	
Lacey et al. (2010)	<i>Cetorhinus maximus</i>
BAR PHOTOGRAMMETRY	
Govender et al. (1991)	<i>Carcharias taurus</i>
LASER PHOTOGRAMMETRY	
Araujo et al. (2014)	<i>Rhincodon typus</i>
Bansemer & Bennett (2009)	<i>Carcharias taurus</i>