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**Summary**

This paper discusses the correlation between wing length and tail length in birds. The introduction starts generally with birds and their history, then the importance of the length of wings and birds. The author completed correlation tests and plots to show the relatedness of the two traits. The author concluded with a discussion of the results and reasons for any possible outliers, as well as more research to obtain more defined results.

**General Comments**

Starting with the introduction, it seemed a bit unorganized. The flow into what we are testing isn’t quite clear until the wings and tails are just stated. I would suggest looking into some previous studies that link these two traits and how the studies have proven it to be important to the fitness of birds. The sources used do give facts, but it would be a good idea to possibly have some further evidence to support why this study and correlation is important enough to write a paper about, and to clearly link how this is evolutionary. The methods section was straightforward. It was clear where the data was pulled from, but I was confused about how it went from 11,009 species to 449, maybe personally I just misunderstood but if it’s possible to clear that up I think it would be good for the paper. Also, there was a phylogeny mentioned but it wasn’t in the paper. I’m not sure if it would be beneficial to include it, but if so then you should include the figure, and if not, I would not mention it as it becomes random information that isn’t referred to later in the discussion. As for the results, they were very straightforward, and the graph was easy to read. For the Pearson’s correlation, you mention “to test the strength of the correlation” but I’m not sure if that phrase is necessary since it is already a “test”. As for the discussion, the results are discussed in a clear way. When discussing the graph, you say that it alone is enough to “confirm” (I would use “support” instead of “confirm”) the hypothesis, but looking at a chart alone can be very deceiving. You do mention the outliers, which is good for the study. I get a bit lost in the end of the discussion, when only mentioning one species of bird that is an outlier and how there are “costs” to flying. I would suggest looking into studies of other birds that don’t “fit the slope” of your graph to help explain to the reader why there are some outliers, and also look into previous studies into fitness relating to flight. Overall I think this paper has a good basis, I would mainly suggest looking for more scientific resources and previous studies to support your hypothesis and build up the introduction and discussion.

**Specific Comments**

Line 20: you may be able to find a better source than the one used, possibly using a database found on WVU libraries

Line 24: “entire body plan” sounds a bit off. Maybe try using “structure” or “anatomy”

Line 26: “most all stick” could be replaced with “have similar characteristics”

Line 39-41: this sentence doesn’t seem necessary. I would say that from this information, “these tests could be performed to test the correlation”

Line 48: “from” should be “for”

Line 50-51: “Wing Length” and “Tail Length” shouldn’t be capitalized

Line 99: saying “These two characteristics must have some form of genetic link or are due to pleiotropy” seems like a huge assumption without having reliable sources to back it up

Line 100-101: The last sentence is very random

To conclude your discussion, I would suggest tying the results back into what was discussed in the introduction, and then how further studies could provide more concrete evidence to support your hypothesis. Overall, this is a good paper with a few fixes to create a better understanding for the reader!