Response to Reviewer 2, third round:

*Thank you for your comments and continuing to devote time to reviewing this manuscript.*

Comments to the Author(s)  
The authors have improved their manuscript. I still feel that results are over interpreted. I still feel that the part related to wild boar in fig.4 should be removed and only mentionned in the results as non significant, because in its present form, I feel the figure 4 is misleading by trying to compare pig and deer.

*Thank you, we appreciate your feedback on this. We included these plots in the main manuscript to make the point that we were unable to detect correlations with pig scats, whereas there were strong correlations with deer scat abundance and seedling metrics. We conducted surveys at sites that cover the range of variability in pig and deer abundance present in the limestone forests of Guam, therefore we believe the comparison is relevant and not misleading, and important to include in the main manuscript. In our results, we also added the following language to help justify our decision:*

*“Although we found no correlations with pig scat counts, we include these numbers in the left-hand panel of Figure 4 to allow for comparison with deer scat count correlations.” (L. 251-253)*

In Table 1.b the treatment effect for Ochrosia seems to be significant and in contradiction to what is stated in the text (L200).

\*\*\*

*Thank you for pointing this out. In this version of our table, we accidentally switched the “no treatment” and “treatment” AICc values. “No treatment” was the better fit model, and our table has been corrected. We have carefully scanned the entire document and scripts before this final submission for minor errors such as this.*

Moreover I proposed to add the differences among species in fig. 2 but is has not been done. [Previous comment was “If there is a species effect, please show it in the figure with letters (a, b, c…) species sharing the same letter are not different…”]

\*\*\*

*We apologize, but we are unsure exactly what the reviewer means by this comment (we have copy and pasted the comment from the previous round of review). Species and species interaction with treatment were factors that contributed to the best fit model, as shown in Table 1a. However, we believe adding letters to the figure would add unnecessary confusion, as it is visible which species had lower overall survival by the bars in the figure. In addition, we are unsure what the reviewer means by species being the same or different. Species played a role in accounting for differences in survival based on the best fit model.*

In Table 2, I still feel that authors should calculate average seedlings par scat only considering the scats where the species germinated but not in all as they did.

\*\*\*

*Thank you for this comment, we amended the numbers in the table to reflect averages only for scats that contained that particular species. We also added this sentence to clarify that quantity in Table 2’s caption: “Average seedlings per scat are calculated only from scats that had seedlings of that species germinate from them.”*

L252 wrong : pigs do not disperse more native species than non-native ones (2 natives versus 6 non-natives)

\*\*\*

*We have read through the results and discussion to ensure we do not say that more native species germinated from pig scats. While more individual native seedlings germinated from scats than non-native seedlings, We made the following change, removing the word “predominantly” from before “…large numbers of native seeds.”:*

*“When assessing seed dispersal, we found that deer dispersed very few seeds, while pigs dispersed large numbers of native seeds.” L262-263.*

L269 M. citrifolia has an average of 170 (not 120).

\*\*\*

*This has been corrected in the text. Thank you.*