

The following table reflects the responses to the comments from reviewer 2. The document was further edited by the co-authors after resolving the editorial changes suggested by Commenter 2

Comments from Reviewer 2

#	Action Taken	Resolved?
1	Will be completed at the end, requires general proofread of entire paper	completed
2	References/citations addressed in lit cited as well as rest of paper; focus was on consistency in formatting throughout the document	completed
3	Accepted change, altered title. If author has strong feelings about original title, think that would be fine as well	
4	Although both are acceptable, all references that use the term use it as two separate words. I searched throughout the document and changed all instances to salt marsh	
5	Comment incorporated	
6	Comment incorporated and changed throughout document	
7	Phrasing left as is; changed second part of comment in text	
8	Document was scanned in regards to these changes in terminology, and certain changes were made as deemed appropriate	
9	Comment incorporated	
10	Comment incorporated	
11	Incorporated new data from Nixon et al 2016 and added to the literature cited	
12	Comment incorporated	
13	Comment not incorporated, kept as is	
14	Macroinvertebrate chosen and corrected throughout document	
15	Changed to DWH in italics throughout document	
16	Additional papers have been added	
17	The Fleeger et al. paper had been submitted and was in review when this paper was submitted. The reference has been changed to 2017	
18	I think its appropriate to leave this information here, comment not accepted	
19	Comment incorporated	
20	Comment incorporated	
21	The information on oil spill impacts and the DWH related studies has been incorporated into the previous paragraphs and this paragraph has been deleted. Discussion of the DWH studies is provided in the discussion.	
22	The reference to Penning et al. 2016 has been deleted and discussion of the DWH related studies is provided in the discussion.	
23	Comment incorporated	

24	Comment incorporated	
25	The last sentence has been changed to the sentence suggested by the reviewer in comment 26.	
26	The paper has been reviewed by all of the authors and we feel that background as covered in the Introduction should be covered. The authors have been brief in covering the incident, other studies, and the species investigated.	
27	Comment incorporated	
28	Comment incorporated	
29	Comment incorporated	
30	Comment incorporated	
31	Comment incorporated	
32	Accepted suggestion to move the fiddler crab description to later in the macroinvertebrate scetion description, as it is not quntitative data	
33	Comment incorporated	
34	The authors did the statistical examination at the length divisions as stated by the commenter and in other studies. We did add the large adult catgory at >20mm because that became a significant division to the conclusions. The text and all references, including Figure 8, to the size categories have been changed to reflect this category scheme.	
35	Comments addressed and citation added; also, term "large adults" description added in lines 187-189	
36	Comment incorporated	
37	Section of Methods that discussed results was omitted	
38	The SAS calculation of Trend become a daily increment calculation over the year between the sampling periods which was divided by 365 to calculate the yearly trend. Rather than confuse the reader, the authors have explained this calculation as a pooling of the sampling periods within a year to develop the yearly trend.	
39	Comment incorporated	
40	Comment incorporated	
41	Comment incorporated	

42	The authors are involved in a long-term study of the recovery of the marsh ecosystem from the oiling event. This paper represents one portion of that research; however, we want to present the interrelationships of our data when it is important. We have discussed how we should approach that and have decided to minimally present information and graphics where it informs the reader and supports our conclusions. This represents that minimal presentation that includes both TPH and vegetation data. The discussion includes a section on the significance of the recovery of Spartina to the recovery of the periwinkle. The comment about the lack of recovery of total aboveground biomass at the HV sites through 66 months has been included in the text.	
43	Uca dates changed, paragraph reordered to lead with our quantitative data first	
44	Comment incorporated, reworded in the text	
45	The lack of data at sampling periods affected the influence by sampling period. There was no significant difference between sampling events when data was collected.	
46	Comment incorporated	
47	Comment incorporated	
48	This comment was incorporated and the potential difference was represented by a difference in the total density at sampling periods. The comment about splitting out the larger adults was a very good observation by the commenter. This is an ongoing study and we will include that in our future analysis of data and report on the results in the future.	
49	Comment incorporated	
50	Comment incorporated	
51	Comment incorporated, wording altered to better convey point	
52	Comment incorporated	
53	The authors have attempted to clarify the point that the RF and MD sites are not attaining the population distribution of the RF sites.	
54	Size classes in Methods edited to reflect those in results; also added sentence in Methods to recognize our breakdown of adults into smaller (14-20mm) and larger (21-26)	
55	All figures and text have been changed to months after the spill.	
56	Comment Incorporated	
57	Content deleted as advised	
58	Comment incorporated	
59	Comment incorporated	
60	Some text has been eliminated based on comments	
61	Comment incorporated	
62	Comment incorporated	
63	Comment incorporated	
64	Comment incorporated	
65	Comment incorporated, paragraph deleted	

66	Comment incorporated	
67	Comment incorporated	
68	Comment incorporated	
69	Really want to illustrate that the other studies showed the same depression and recovery of the reference sites starting in 2012 and recovering by 2015. The text has been modified to reflect this.	
70	Changes suggested have been incorporated	
71	Comment incorporated	
72	Comment not needed	
73	Comment incorporated	
74	Comment incorporated and paper checked for all scientific names in italics	
75	Comment incorporated	
76	Comment incorporated	
77	Comment incorporated	
78	Comment incorporated	
79	Comment incorporated	
80	small change to include reference sites (which were implicit in "all oiling levels."	
81	Comment incorporated	
82	Comment incorporated	
83	agree and clarified in the text.	
84	Comment incorporated	
85	Comment incorporated	
86	Referred to Figure 6B in Lin et al. 2016, i.e. stem density figure	
87	reworded to indicate that we did not find correlation, but the patterns of recovery exist.	
88	references to Lin et al. 2016 included for vegetation recovery	
89	Comment incorporated	
90	line omitted.	
91	Comment rejected, think wording is fine as is. This is really the purpose of the joint effort of our research group.	
92	I believe that the reviewers wording for the conclusion sounds good, but believe that Don needs to make the final call on that here	
93	Attempted to best standardize references, needs a final review and determination whether some of the papers "in press" have since reached their publication	
94	Figures edited as suggested	

1) Formatted issues of multiple citations to be ordered by last name throughout document