Reader Comment on "Economic Impacts of Climate Change on Two Mexican Coastal Fisheries: Implications to Food Security" by Alonso Aguilar Ibarra, Armando Sanchez Vargas, and Benjamin Martinez Lopez

It is a good paper on the whole, and a useful addition to the more local examination of the effects of CC on fisheries - where there are relatively few other papers at present.

There are, perhaps inevitably given English is not the authors' first language, a number of grammatical errors, and while these do not inhibit the reader from understanding the content, it would be nice to see them remedied (i.e.: 'dependent - as opposed to 'latent' variables/ the sentence beginning "Indeed factors" on page 3 etc.). Probably the weakest part of the part are the two concluding paragraphs where we suddenly see a proposal to eliminate fuel subsidies - a topic not covered at all in the paper, and also a comment upon poor management - is this the case for Mexican fisheries? Equally, the last paragraph just lists various researches on adaptation/mitigation - and lists solutions/measures, while a more Mexican-centric discussion of these would be more beneficial.

This aside, it would be useful to be told more of the paper by Cheung [2010] given it is probably the closest to the theme of the draft. It is in fact discussed in more detail later in the paper (P. 10), but this discussion - and choice of fishery, would be better moved forward to this section of the paper.

P.5. Why the number of people hired in fishing activities - and not in the sectors concerned. Equally, is number of vessels - as opposed to their GRT - the best indicator of effort? i am not convinced financial capital is likely to reduce as a consequence of CC - in the sardine fishery for example we might expect an influx of capital?

P9. It is not immediately obvious to the reader why shrimp storage/distribution facilities will be affected by CC - presumably to do with sea-level rise? - This will affect all species, not just shrimp?

P14. The discussion on aquaculture is too generalised and either needs to be elaborated - or struck from the paper.