

Examiners' comments responses

Ting Kwan Lam

p. XXX - top one refers to the page of the thesis in the report

p. XXX – bottom one refers to the page of the updated thesis

Examiner Remarks	Thesis Author Comments	Page or other References
Responses to the first examiner (Dr. Andrew Baker)		
1. Grammatical errors	All grammatical mistakes have been reviewed and corrected.	p.1 - 188
2. Introduction - consistency presenting both common name and scientific name for all species at first mention.	All species common and scientific names inserted at first mention.	p. 1-11
3. Introduction - Numerous typos/applications of scientific name issues - please check <i>Tadarida</i> (spelling and application to Australian species), <i>Chalinolobus</i> , <i>Scotorepens</i> , <i>M. schreibersii</i> (subspecies spelling and application to Australian species), <i>Mormopterus</i> (application to Australian species), et al.	All species names have been reviewed and updated base on the AMTC Australian Mammal Species List (Version 1.0 Sep 2021) retrieved from The Australian Mammal Society Inc.	p. 1 - 184
4. Ch2 – How do you identify species during fly outs. How does this relate to the data from the recorders - how are they married up?	<p>It was stated in the second paragraph in section 2.2 Method and Analysis that the species and temporal pattern of activity of bats emerging and returning the tunnel was identified using the acoustic monitoring survey.</p> <p>In the third paragraph it was stated that the exit counts survey did not identify species during fly out. It was conducted to determine the timing of first emergence and first activity peak within the first hour after official sunset.</p>	p. 29 - 31

	<p>The following was added to the last paragraph of the section 2.2 that “The exit counts results also assisted to determine the first emergence and used to compare the time of first emergence peak with the acoustic data.” to explain how the exit counts and acoustic recorders data were used together for analysis.</p>	
<p>5. Ch2 - Sometimes on flyouts many individuals exit at once - how is this accounted for in the counts?</p>	<p>The following was added to the second paragraph in section 2.2 Method and Analysis: “If there were many bats exiting at once, the echolocation calls of that period were zoomed into at the millisecond time frame allowing the identification of calls according to Reinhold et al. (2001).”</p>	<p>p.30</p>
<p>6. Ch2 - How do you avoid missing or double counting bats that fly around in the tunnel as you disturb them on your walk-throughs?</p>	<p>It was stated at pg. 31 that a red light and slow walk were used during the walk through to minimize the disturbance to bats.</p> <p>During the walk – through bats were relatively calm and remained at their roosts. As there was no bat flying around in the tunnel during the walk through, I did not address this issue in the document.</p> <p>I agreed that it is difficult to avoid missing or double counting bats with observation. I acknowledged that the walk-through surveys might only provide a relatively accurate estimate on the number of bat population than other two surveys rather than showing the exact number of bats roosting in the tunnel.</p> <p>Hence, I added the following in pg. 32 “Results from exit counts and walk-through surveys did not undergo statistical tests but were used to compare the estimated bat population in the tunnel.” Also in pg. 60 “Although some bats may be hidden out of sight, this method provides a relatively accurate estimate of the total bat population in the tunnel than the other two surveys.”</p>	<p>p. 31, 32, 60</p>
<p>7. Ch3 - You identified twelve species - how accurate is</p>	<p>I agree with Dr Andrew Baker’s suggestion that it is important to state the accuracy of</p>	<p>p. 30-33</p>

the recorder ID work for achieving this - what scope is there for error?	my species identification work. However, it is difficult to provide a number or percentage. Hence, I inserted the following in section 2.2 Method and Analysis pg. 31 "Reinhold et al. (2001) was used to key out species based on their calls, with some call identifications were reviewed by a bat expert Dr. Roger Coles to improve the accuracy of the work. Calls whose ID remained uncertain were left as unidentified and not used in subsequent analyses."	
8. Ch4 - You identified 21 (of 34 SEQ) species, which is amazing in a 3km radius - how accurate is the recorder ID work for achieving this - what scope is there for error?	This was addressed in the previous response to Dr Andrew Baker's comment. (See response no. 7). The same approach was used to identify the species from the recordings.	p. 142-143
9. Ch4 - Results – 3rd para. X%?	It was changed to "90%"	p.144
10. Ch4 - Fig 4.2 and 4.3 - which species is which?	It was noted in the caption of both figures that the species list was sorted in descending order based on the proportion of their echolocation call passes.	p. 145-146
11. Ch5 - However, there was also some repetition in the discussion (of results) and then in the general discussion there was further repetition of discussion material (via a summary of each topic) without too much extension on the chapter material (or at least not referenced in light of literature).	The purpose of this chapter was mainly to summarise the results within a conservation framework for our partners, Moreton Bay Regional Council. Therefore, I summarised the major findings from each chapter and further expressed my suggestion for future research in this chapter.	p. 175 - 183
Responses to the second examiner (Dr. Leroy Gonsalves)		
12. It seems that <i>Nyctophilus geoffroy</i> to be present in many fragmented patches and will spend time foraging in adjacent cleared areas with scatter trees.	It was changed to "Bat species that have low tolerances for edge effects such as <i>Nyctophilus gouldii</i> and <i>Vespadelus vulturnus</i> are likely to experience a population decline in disturbed habitats (Threlfall et al. 2013; Meyer et al. 2008; Haddock et al. 2019)."	p. 4

13. This study didn't look at <i>C. gouldii</i> or <i>A. australis</i>	This reference was removed.	p. 7
14. Though <i>M. schreibersii</i> have been recorded making further movements between overwintering roost and maternity sites in NSW.	The following was added to pg. 11: “ <i>Miniopterus schreibersii</i> has been reported to undertake internal migrations from warmer to cooler areas when high temperature variability exists within caves (Kuipers & Dean 1970); this may also involve migration over relatively long distance or in a local scale (Brown & Bernard 1994). <i>Miniopterus orianae oceanensis</i> has been reported to undertake recorded long migrations between overwintering roost and maternity sites in NSW (Dwyer & Hamilton-Smith 1965; Mills 2021).”	p. 10-11
15. What about adding some details about other artificial structures used by bats- e.g. stormwater drains, mines, bridges etc?	This was mentioned in Chapter 1 General Introduction. As chapter 2 focuses on tunnel roosting bats, I think this is appropriate to keep it that way.	p. 27 p. 28
16. Why these two seasons? Can you please justify the selection of these seasons? For example, was summer selected as this is season when most female bats congregate to give birth. For winter, was this season selected as some species may use tunnels for overwintering given the stable microclimate tunnels can afford bats.	I agree with Dr. Leroy Gonsalves suggestion that I should justify the selection of the seasons for this study. Hence, I inserted the following in section 2.2 Method and Analysis pg. 29-30 “In the Köppen climate classification system, Brisbane is classified as a subtropical region characterised by humid and hot summers and mild winters (Peel et al. 2007). To align the findings from previous study by Hall (2015), two seasons (summer and winter) were justified as the sampling periods throughout the study.”	p. 29, p. 29 - 30
17. Did you do repeat counts on multiple nights in each season? This is suggested earlier in the methods when you say that counts were undertaken at the same time as acoustic surveys (which spanned 5 nights).	Yes, the exit count survey was conducted over 5 nights for comparison between summer and winter. I inserted the following text in pg. 31. “The final exit count of each night was calculated by averaging the count of bats leaving the tunnel determined by each observer. This result was then averaged over 5 nights and compared between summer and winter.”	p. 30 p. 31
18. How did you determine which species were	The sentence was changed in pg. 31 to “The transect line was followed at a slow walk	p. 30 p. 31-32

present? Please provide this detail.	and the species were observed and identified with the assist of prepared photos of several cave roosting bat species in Queensland, and number of bats counted; their distance from the entrance and height on the tunnel wall was recorded.”	
19. What about the acoustic and walk-through surveys? How did you analyse those datasets? Presumably you compared between seasons?	Yes, the results were compared between seasons for the datasets of the walk-through and acoustic surveys. However, results of the exit counts and walk-through did not undergo any statistical analysis; exit counts cannot determine activity pattern throughout the nights, and walk-through did not provide information for bats activity. Exit counts results were used to determine the first emergence from the acoustic survey, and to compare the time of the emergence peak during the first hour after official sunset. I inserted the following in pg. 32 “Multiple plots were created to examine the nightly activity pattern of bats, and a peak in activity was identified by observing these plots. Results from exit counts and walk-through surveys did not undergo statistical tests but were used to compare the estimated bat population in the tunnel. The exit counts results also assisted to determine the first emergence and used to compare the time of first emergence peak with the acoustic data.”	p. 31-32
20. Why was this period chosen for assessment? Why not the whole night?	I acknowledged that analysing the first 4.5 hours after sunset may not represent species activity throughout the nights. However, analysing all night for 5 whole nights could be too time consuming with great effort. Considering the time constraints of completing the study, I have chosen to analyse the first 4.5 hours after sunset which I believe shows the emergence time of the three bat species inhabiting the tunnel.	p. 34
21. Please consider whether it might be clearer to average activity levels by species over all nights of	I do not agree with Dr. Leroy Gonsalves’ comment, because the weather conditions were not uniform during the sampling periods (e.g. there were 3 days of rain	p. 34 p. 36-37

<p>sampling and then presenting two coloured lines (winter/ summer) in four plots – one for each species. Since each species will have echolocation calls that vary in amplitude it's difficult to make a fair comparison among species using acoustic activity data.</p>	<p>during summer). I think both Fig. 2-3 and Fig. 2-4 are clear enough to show the bat species activity pattern over the sampling nights. Meanwhile, Fig 2-5 compares the average of the first activity peak of each species between summer and winter, which does a similar job of what has been suggested.</p>	
<p>22. Which three species? Can you please specify?</p>	<p>The following was inserted on pg. 34 that “In summer, all four species (<i>M. macropus</i>, <i>M. australis</i>, <i>M. orianae oceanesis</i> and <i>R. megaphyllus</i>) were first detected within 0.5 hours before sunset, but each species exhibited peak activity at different times and at different levels (Figure 2-3).</p>	<p>p. 34</p>
<p>23. I think it is also important for you to describe how you identified peaks in activity. Was this done visually? Or did activity have to be above the nightly average for this to be considered a peak in activity?</p>	<p>I agreed with Dr. Leroy Gonsalves' comment that it is important to describe how I identified activity peaks. Hence, I inserted the following in pg. 32 “Multiple plots were created to examine the nightly activity patterns of bats, and a peak in activity was identified by observing these plots with each change in activity from increase to decrease classified as a peak.”</p>	<p>p. 34</p>
<p>24. This isn't clear to me – I'm not sure what you mean here. Are you saying that differences in activity between species varied with season?</p>	<p>I agreed to Dr. Leroy Gonsalves that the sentence was not very clear. It was meant to be comparing seasonal differences across different species. Hence, the sentence has been changed on pg. 38 to “Comparing seasonal difference across species, it was found that seasonal interactions on the time of first activity peak (emergence) across different species were also significant ($p < 0.05$ — Table 2-2) except for <i>R. megaphyllus</i> in summer and <i>M. australis</i> in winter, and <i>M. macropus</i> in summer and <i>M. australis</i> in winter ($p = 0.3169$ & $p = 0.2739$, respectively — Table 2-2).”</p>	<p>p. 36</p>
<p>25. It's not clear why this is a negative value. The plot seems to show a higher value for <i>Miniopterus australis</i> in summer</p>	<p>The table of the pos-hoc results were recalculated again and updated so that the number of the result tables were inputted correctly. Results were rewritten based on the updated table. Hence, the following was</p>	<p>p. 37 p. 38</p>

compared to winter. If that's the case, then summer minus winter should be positive.	inserted in pg. 38 "Within each species, <i>M. macropus</i> and <i>R. megaphyllus</i> emerged significantly earlier in winter than summer ($p < 0.0001$ — Table 2-2). While <i>M. australis</i> showed no significant difference between two seasons ($p = 0.2739$ — Table 2-2)."	
26. Shouldn't this be positive based on relative activity of <i>Myotis</i> in summer compared to <i>Miniopterus australis</i> in winter?	This was addressed in the response to Dr. Leroy Gonsalves' comments. (See response no. 25)	p. 37 p. 38
27. Seems odd that this isn't significant given the large differences in activity between both species in the respective seasons.	This was addressed in the response to Dr. Leroy Gonsalves' comments. (See response no. 26)	p. 37 p. 38
28. Again, this is not clear. Do you mean that differences between species were not influenced by season? Should this be $p > 0.05$?	I agree with Dr. Leroy Gonsalves that the sentence was not very clear. The following changes were made to pg. 40: "Comparing different species between the two seasons, it was found that seasonal interactions on the time of first activity peak (emergence) across different species were not significant ($p > 0.05$ — Table 2-3) except for the interaction between <i>M. australis</i> in summer and <i>R. megaphyllus</i> in winter ($p = 0.0313$, Table 2-3)."	p. 38 p. 40
29. You might consider reporting this to fewer decimal places – e.g. $p < 0.001$	It was changed to $p < 0.001$	p. 40 p. 42
30. Not according to fig 2-1.	"(Figure 2-9)" was inserted into the sentence in pg.44	p. 42 p. 44
31. What behaviour is this?	It was explained on pg. 59 that some bat species exhibit a light sampling behavior before emergence and on return. The behaviour is associated with predator avoidance (Fure 2006).	p. 46 p. 59
32. Why do you think this may be the case? If your surveys were carried out in summer (including late summer), could some activity be from juveniles that are starting to fly?	I agree with Dr. Leroy Gonsalves that some activity could be from young bats. Since it is not known if the Yugar tunnel is a maternity site for <i>M. australis</i> , there is potential that some activity could be from juvenile bats. Hence, I inserted the following on pg. 51 "However, some activity could potentially be produced by juvenile bats that were born in summer."	p. 49 p. 51

33. This study didn't assess emergence for tree-roosting <i>Myotis</i> .	This reference has been removed.	p.49, 51
34. This makes sense but contradicts your previous sentence.	The sentence has been changed to "However, Reichard et al. (2009) indicated that lactating females were likely to emerge earlier than pregnant females due to higher energy demands. Contrastingly, pregnant and juvenile bats have higher energetic costs of flight due to greater wing loading or inexperience, and so they may emerge later to reduce predation risk (Kunz & Anthony 1996; Jones & Rydell 1994)."	p. 50 p. 52
35. This is important and probably should be mentioned in the method.	I agree with Dr. Leroy Gonsalves that this should be mentioned in the methods section. Hence, I inserted the following on pg. 30. "In addition, there were heavy rains over the 3 sampling nights and no pattern of bat emergence under normal weather condition was recoded in summer."	p. 51 p. 53, 30
36. Insert references to support this statement	The following was inserted on pg. 57. "Studies indicated that insect abundance was positively correlated with warmer ambient temperature and dependent on immediate weather conditions (Meyer et al. 2016; Turbill 2008; Sherwin et al. 2013)"	p. 55 p. 57
37. Or there may be some relationship with breeding condition.	I agree with Dr. Leroy Gonsalves that breeding condition could potentially affect the return peak of <i>M. macropus</i> . Hence, I inserted the following in pg. 58. "Contrastingly, the earlier final return peak of <i>M. macropus</i> in summer may be caused by early satiation due to higher food abundance and possibly breeding condition."	p. 56 p. 58
38. Are walk-through surveys really favoured? They can cause a lot of disturbance to bats, especially in winter when bats can be in deep torpor. Disturbances can also have a long-lasting	I think walk-through surveys in this project are appropriate. Walk-throughs were conducted after the exit count and acoustic surveys. Thus, disturbance was minimized during the earlier two surveys.	p. 57 p. 59
39. Though sometimes bats may be hidden out of sight - e.g., in cracks/crevices. Walk	The following has been inserted on pg. 60 "Although some bats may be hidden out of sight, this method provides a relatively accurate estimate of the total bat	p. 58 p. 60

through surveys can also disturb bats, causing them to take flight which makes it difficult to count bats.	population in the tunnel when compared with the other two surveys.”	
40. This would be unlikely for a nursery site.	I agree with Dr. Leroy Gonsalves that <i>M. australis</i> with colonies mostly consisting of adult males and females are unlikely be a nursery site. Hence, this has been changed to the following on pg. 62 “ <i>Miniopterus australis</i> migrate to their nursery site in early spring from August to September (Dwyer 1968)”	p. 60 p. 62
41. Not sure this is accurate. Not all bats can roost in artificial structures.	The text was changed to the following on pg. 77 “Degradation of natural habitats due to human activities such as deforestation, urban development and agricultural expansion have decreased the availability of natural roosts for many bat species, consequently impacting populations and causing an increase of roosting in artificial structures (O’Malley et al. 2020; Sparks et al. 2004; Gehrt & Chelsvig 2003; Park 2015; Russo & Ancillotto 2015).”	p. 75 p. 77
42. It's not clear to me what you mean here.	The text was changed to the following on pg. 79 “Thermally stability in microclimate is thought to be suitable for maternity roosting as pregnant females generally preferred limiting excessive heat loss to promote growth of the young (Neubaum et al. 2017).”	p. 77 p. 79
43. This is important to know for chapter 2 and should be made clearer in methods for that chapter. The walk-through survey may have influenced activity patterns recorded on acoustic devices.	I think the walk-through surveys did not influence the emergence pattern recorded on acoustic device as the walk-through surveys were conducted after the exit counts and acoustic surveys. However, I agree with Dr. Leroy Gonsalves that this should be made clearer in the Methods. Hence, I inserted the following on pg. 30 (1 st paragraph in Section 2.2) “The exit counts and acoustic surveys were conducted simultaneously in summer (15th – 19th January 2020) and winter (17th – 21st July 2020). Walk-through surveys were conducted two days later to minimize potential effects on the emergence pattern of the bats.”	p. 78 p. 80, 30

	The following was also inserted on pg. 80 “After the three surveys described in Chapter 2, a further walk-through survey was conducted on the day of deployment (before bats emerged) to finalize the locations of each roost.”	
44. Include manufacturer details, make and model	Manufacturer details, make and model were inserted in the following at pg. 80 “HOBO loggers (manufacturer: Onset Computer Corporation; Model: HOBO U23 Pro v2 Temperature/Relative Humidity Data Logger - U23-001)”	p. 78 p. 80
45. Is this the east or west?	It is the east side of the wall. “(east side)” was inserted into the sentence.	p. 80 p. 82
46. Can you specify what the W and S represent in the diagram? I'm guessing it's the number of bats observed in each hole in summer/ winter.	I inserted a compass icon labeling the direction of the tunnel in Figs 3-1 & 3-2.	p. 83, p. 84, 85
47. Is this differences between seasons? If so, please describe which season had greater differences.	The following was inserted in pg. 90 “ T_{min} and T_{fluc} showed significantly greater differences in winter compared with summer (Independent T-test, $p < 0.05$ – Table 3-5).”	p. 88 p. 90
48. How is this different to what you have presented earlier? Is this looking at each individual roost vs ambient whereas the earlier results is comparing all roosts (i.e., pooled) vs ambient?	Yes, it is looking at each individual roost vs ambient. I agree that it could be clearer. Hence, I inserted the following in the first paragraph of pg. 92 “Comparing the mean daily diurnal temperature between each individual roost and each ambient, ...”	p. 90 p. 92
41. Can you describe which season had the greater difference?	It was changed to “However, maximum showed a significant difference, with winter greater than summer ($p < 0.05$).”	p. 102 p. 104
42. How are these results different to what has been presented above?	Again, this shows the difference between each individual roost and ambients.	p. 104 p. 106
43. It would be good to offer up suggestions for why this happens. Is it simply that the bats generate some heat and in winter this is greater than ambient heat elsewhere in the tunnel, whereas in	Suggestions were made in the next paragraphs in the Temperature – Bat roosts section. See page. 118 - 122	p. 116 p. 118

summer the heat generated by bats is small compared to ambient heat in the tunnel?		
44. It's not clear what you mean by this.	It was changed to "Meanwhile, minimum temperature increased when roost temperature was less varied between night and day"	p. 116 p. 118
45. So then is it clear that bats are selecting for temperature stability or high temperatures - or can this not be teased apart?	I agree with Dr. Leroy Gonsalves that the roosting selection of bats for better thermal stability and high temperatures can be teased apart. Hence, the sentence was changed to the following in pg. 119 "In general, bats preferred to select locations with either warmer or more thermally stable (or possibly both) conditions in the Yugar tunnel."	p. 117 p. 119
46. Not necessarily. Young regrowth can be very cluttered for bats.	True. I have changed the text to the following "Cluttered habitats contain vegetations with a relatively more closed canopy which provide potential roosting sites (Ciechanowski 2015; Callahan et al. 1997; Sedgeley 2003) and favorable foraging condition for clutter adapted species (Wegiel et al. 2019; Patriquin & Barclay 2003)."	p. 136 p. 138-139
47. But there is no way to know if the bats detected in the surrounding landscapes are the same bats that roost in the tunnel – you would need to do something like radio-tracking to achieve this. Or light tagging bats from the tunnel (a bit hit and miss).	I agree with Dr. Leroy Gonsalves that the acoustic surveys cannot determine where the bats from the Yugar tunnel go for foraging. I acknowledge that the acoustic surveys conducted in this study cannot identified where exactly the bats from the tunnel traveled for foraging at night. Hence, I inserted the following in the Discussion pg. 152 "I also acknowledged that the surveys conducted in this project cannot show where the bats in the Yugar tunnel were foraging in the surrounding landscapes."	p. 137 p. 152
48. Reference	A reference for vegetation classification document was inserted "(Queensland Government 2019)"	p. 137 p. 139
49. At what spacing	It was changed to "Each vegetation type was replicated 5 times, approximately 1.5 km apart."	p. 137 p. 139
50. Why not the whole night?	This was addressed in the response to Dr. Leroy Gonsalves comments. (See response no. 20)	p. 138 p. 140

51. Good to describe how you distinguished search phase calls in clutter from feeding buzzes.	The following was inserted in pg. 140. “Reinhold et al. (2001) was also used to identify search phase calls and feeding buzzes.”	p. 138 p. 140
52. It's not clear how species can be incorporated if the response variables are diversity and evenness indices.	No, species was not incorporated into the three-way non-parametric ANOVA. For clarification, the text has been changed to the following on pg. 141 “A three-ways non-parametric ANOVA using a 0.05 rejection level was conducted on the Shannon-Weaver indices and evenness among seasons, habitat and vegetation types.”	p. 139 p. 141
53. A clearer map will help to see where all the sites are.	I acknowledge that it is difficult to see where the sampling sites on this map. Unfortunately, this is the only vegetation map provided by Moreton Bay Regional Council. Hence, I can only extract this map by cropping the image with a relatively low resolution.	p. 140 p. 142
54. Did you log-transform data prior to analysis? I suspect the variability in sites might be behind the non-sig. result. Other analytical techniques such as mixed models might help to deal with this issue - i.e., including site as a random factor. Given edge and interior at each site are likely to be correlated, this needs to be accounted for in an analysis.	Yes, the data was not normally distributed, even after log-transformation. I inserted the following in section 4.2 Method and analysis pg. 145. “Shapiro-Wilk test and scatterplots were used to test the assumptions of linearity of the original data and the log transformed data; both indicated a non-normal distribution.” Hence, the Aligned Rank ANOVA, which is the non-parametric approach, was used.	p. 143 p. 145
55. Can you specify whether evenness was greater in summer?	The following was inserted to pg. 146 “The two-way interactions were also not significant, and only season showed a significant difference in evenness; winter showed greater evenness than summer (Table 4-2).”	p. 144 p. 146
56. It's not clear how this fits in.	It was changed to “eco-morphology”.	p. 150 p. 152
57. Can you please elaborate on this point? How does a change in season influence vegetation	The following paragraphs discussed this. See pg. 153-155	p. 151 p. 153-155

structure and the assemblage of bats?		
58. But you didn't measure insects to know if insect richness was higher in this habitat type. Can you provide references to support this idea?	The following sentences explained this with references. See pg. 154	p. 151 p. 154
59. This is a good point. But I think you should also discuss the implications of sampling for only part of the night and what this may mean in terms of potentially overlooking differences in diversity between seasons.	This was addressed in the response to Dr. Leroy Gonsalves's comments (see response no. 47).	p. 152 p. 154
60. Don't think this has been mentioned previously. Were there fewer watercourses sampled in summer/winter?	I think Dr. Leroy Gonsalves may have interpreted the meaning incorrectly. It was meant to be the number of available watercourses were fewer in winter than in summer. I sampled the same amount of the Riparian forest sites, and some parts of the river were dry in winter.	p. 152 p. 155
61. Can you offer up any reasons why activity may have been higher in particular habitat types?	Yes, the following paragraphs has explained this. See pg. 155-159 (Section: The three tunnel bat species activity in the surrounding environment).	p. 153 p. 155 - 159
62. Do you mean the number of search phase calls were not different to the number of feeding calls? or that the difference between seasons for both metrics was not significant? If the latter, than it's probably better not to say that there was a difference between seasons.	It means the location of the search and feed activity might be different between summer and winter (as winter activity was more concentrated in 2 RF sites, and summer were scattered across 5 sites). But the relative activity is similar.	p. 155 p. 157
63. But they weren't absent - you recorded them roosting in the tunnel.	Yes, it is true. However, the majority of them were absented in winter. Hence, it was changed to following in pg. 176 "The lower level of <i>M. australis</i> activity in winter was possibly due to the majority of bats being absent in the Samford region as they	p. 174 p. 176

	returned to their breeding sites, or because cold temperatures reduced insect activity.”	
64. But they give birth in summer.	It was changed to the following in pg. 182 “Therefore, the tunnel is likely to be more important during the breeding season in summer.”	p. 175 p. 177