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**View Letter**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date:** | Feb 16, 2017 |
| **To:** | "Steven Latta" steven.latta@aviary.org |
| **cc:** | pstouffer@lsu.edu |
| **From:** | "The Condor: Ornithological Applications" AmericanOrnithologyPubs@gmail.com |
| **Subject:** | Editor Decision |

Ref.: Ms. No. CONDOR-16-161  
AVIAN COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS AND DEMOGRAPHICS REVEAL HOW CONSERVATION VALUE OF REGENERATING TROPICAL DRY FORESTS CHANGES WITH FOREST AGE  
The Condor: Ornithological Applications  
  
Dear Steve,  
  
Thank you for your submission.  I must begin by apologizing for the long delay in getting to a decision your paper.  We had a series of unresponsive reviewers who held up the process.  It is really unacceptable for the paper to take so long.  After getting the reviews and AE recommendation, it took me a little while to give the paper a careful read, hoping for a path forward at Condor.  Unfortunately, in the end I must respect the AE and reviewers' consensus that the paper has significant weaknesses.  I think it will be more suited for a regional journal or a journal that publishes basic descriptive ornithology.  
  
Below my letter you'll find comments from the reviewers.  Reviewer 2 best summarizes the main problem- it is hard to know what part of your results are year effects, what are site effects, and what are due to successional stages.  I don't see how to manage this weakness to strengthen the inference, despite the great sample size.  
  
Thank you for giving us the opportunity to consider your work.  Good luck on a path to publication.  
  
Yours sincerely,  
Phil  
  
Philip C Stouffer  
Editor-in-Chief  
The Condor: Ornithological Applications  
  
Reviewers' comments:  
  
Reviewer #2: This manuscript provides rare information on resident and migrant species' use of regenerating agricultural fields relative to mature dry forest in the Caribbean. Although the data may provide information important to management and conservation decision-making processes, different statistical analyses may be needed to appropriately address the questions being asked. Minor and major comments are provided below.  
  
Minor Comments:  
  
p. 4 lines 7-9: Introduction states that "few researchers have evaluated the conservation value of regenerating pastures, and the employment of avian survival or other demographic variables in these studies is seldom realized...". Site persistence is used in this study as the measure of survival; however, no references are provided indicating the validity of this assumption. Either references should be cited and described, or the use of "survival" throughout should be replaced with "site persistence."  
  
p. 6 lines 4-53: In descriptions of vegetation at each site, indication of which shrub and tree species are non-native and which are native would be useful.  
  
p. 13 lines 14-24: The meaning of "individual" in this paragraph is not clear: "Preferred habitats of mist-netted species was not significantly different among sites..., but the preferred habitats of individuals did vary significantly among sites. Early-successional sites were dominated by a greater proportion of individuals favoring pastures, scrub, and secondary forest, while the mature forest was dominated by individuals favoring evergreen forest habitats (Fig. 2b)." Does number of "individuals" refer to the total numbers (or proportions) of birds across all species? Terminology here and in Fig. 2b caption should be clarified.  
  
Tables 3 and 4: Could be deleted, to decrease overall numbers of tables and figures, with information summarized in Results text.  
  
Table 5: I recommend using the same species name format as provided in Table 1. Also, clarification of "%SP" should be provided in table notes.  
  
  
Major Comments:  
  
p. 5 lines 31-34: Text states that sites "contained two replicate mist netting arrays...". However, the full description of the study sites indicates that both mist net arrays occurred within a single site, rather than within replicate sites for each successional stage. The term "replicate" should be deleted here, and acknowledgement made that the study design did not contain replicates of the 5 successional-stage treatments (i.e., there was one site per treatment).  
  
Methods overall: Text indicates that data were collected during different time periods for successional agricultural fields (data collected 2003-2008) and mature dry forest (data collected 1996-2001). Neither the statistical analyses nor text in the Results and Discussion take into account differences between successional and mature habitats that may be due to the years sampled rather than successional stage. Regarding statistical analyses, the text states that "Data within a site were not analyzed to determine variability among years but were pooled across years to increase sample sizes." Given that data were collected within sites over a 5-year period, it seems that significant differences between years within sites may have existed, as vegetation in early-successional sites matured over that time period. The Methods description seems to indicate, for example, that the 2-year-old site would have been 7 years old by the end of the study. Data from all years for this site were pooled and compared to a site that was 5 years old at the beginning of the study (and 10 years old at the end, which in turn was compared to a third site that was 10 years old at the beginning of the study). After all years were pooled within a site, the successional stages were compared by grouping bird species by migratory status, then diet category, then preferred habitat type, etc. in separate analyses, with the use of separate chi-square tests for each variable. Given the multiple independent variables being analyzed, it seems that statistical methods that allow for inclusion of multiple variables within a test (e.g., ANOVA) may be more appropriate to the data set. Finally, some of the statistical analyses are seemingly not fully described in the Methods section, with the Results section containing test statistics, in some cases, that aren't described in the Methods section, and with some P-values (e.g., in Table 6) for which test statistics aren't provided in the table or text. Overall, more appropriate statistical analyses may be available, and the statistics methods used should be described more clearly in the text. However, the lack of true replicates for each successional stage, and the fact that successional habitats were sampled in completely different years that was mature dry forest, may limit the analyses and conclusions that are possible.  
  
  
  
Reviewer #3: Overall, I liked the paper and the general idea that framed this study, which I consider very relevant for both ornithological science and conservation biology. I did not find major flaws though I have some general comments, which should be addressed.  
  
Length of the paper  
  
I have the feeling that sometimes the paper needs to be shortened in some sections or in specific paragraphs. I understand that the data has a lot of potential, though is limited too, which requires a balance between the necessary wording for arguing, while avoiding unused speculation. In other words try to 'polish' the text, which may require some text reduction.  
  
Statistics  
  
Though I am not very used to analyse this kind of data in my ecological studies, I have the feeling that some extra analyses may be conducted, without necessarily increase the text (I hope!). For example do you think will be worth to calculate 'Average Dissimilarity' (e.g., Bray Curtis Similarity index) on Birds species within and between the different sites? And Non-Metric Multidimensional Scaling (MDS) biplots of bird assemblage variation among different (Forest) sites?  
  
See for example this study in Brazil:  
  
http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10531-009-9711-6  
  
Discussion (and potentially in Introduction)  
  
Though an extremely well written paper, which is not a surprise considering previous studies, I think this paper needs a 'somewhat broader context'. This is even more important because Condor is an 'Applied Journal', contrasting with other journals. I think is nearly there, but may be in the final 'Conservation Implications' subsection still needs some improvements. I think you need to stress even more the results of this study widen the scope of the potential impacts of land use change for Neotropical birds, which included several latitudinal migrants. It will be useful to inform the reader if these land use change happening in Dominican Republic are also happening in other neotropical islands and how they may impact bird communities.  
  
  
Minor issues:  
  
  
Introduction, line 58: I think you should add 'native' before 'mature' because it's important to specify the importance of native stands, which is now clear in this version (goals).  
  
  
Page 7, line 12: May be '16h00' instead of '1600'.  
  
Page 9, line 48: Any reference for the method (Dunn-Sidak)?  
  
Pages 18-19: I think there is a lot of text about the potential importance of remnant trees, which I think is not necessary. I do think you may reduce considerably this part of the text.  
  
Table 1: Please include and explanation for acronyms mainly the ones related to habitat and diet. By the way a very organized table - well done!  
  
Table 6, lines 6 and 7: Replace Table 2 by 1 (I guess).  
  
  
  
  
Reviewer #4: The authors address a question that is poorly understood but because of fundamental problems with the design of the study, it is impossible to conclude that the differences they observed are due to forest age. Each forest age class must have at least two replicates for statistical comparisons of bird density, diversity, and persistence among the sites.  
  
Below are my specific points.  
1. Pg. 2, Ln. 25- Spell out 25.  
2. Pg. 5, Ln. 21- The study suffers from pseudoreplication. One study site for each forest stand severely limits the inferences that can be drawn from the study. In addition, the close proximity of the 5 study sites limits the ability to make inferences to the entire island of Hispanola.  
3. Pg. 5, Ln. 31- It is not clear if the two mist-netting arrays at each site were treated as independent samples or were combined. There are problems with treating them as independent samples because of their close proximity. If you don't treat them as independent samples, however, you have no replication and therefore cannot conduct statistical analyses of the data.  
4. Pg. 6, Ln. 4-53- Limit descriptions of sites to general characteristics. Canopy height should be provided in the results, after methods of measuring canopy height have been provided in the methods.  
5. Pg. 8, Ln. 17- The measure of persistence does not account for potential differences in recapture or resighting rates between the different habitats. It is likely that recapture/resighting rates differ between habitat types. Because there were 3 capture occasions each year, it would be possible to compute CJS estimates of survival at each location.  
6. Pg. 8, Ln. 56- It is not clear if the two mist-netting locations at each site were examined separately or were combined. If they were combined, this means there was one sample per site and comparing differences among sites is invalid. (see comment 3).  
7. Pg. 7, Ln. 38- The assumption of equal capture probabilities of birds at different sites is very unlikely to be met given the distinct vegetation differences. It would be relatively easy to estimate capture probabilities at each site with the data. A simple Comack Jolly-Seber model would suffice.  
8. Pg. 8, Ln. 24- The resighting effort suffers from the same issue as the capture rates, it is unlikely that resighting probability is the same in the different locations given the differences in vegetation. Resighting probability can and should be estimated for each site.  
9. Pg. 9, Ln. 41- A Chi-Square test is not appropriate because the observations are not independent. As stated above because there is one site for each forest age class, there is no replication and therefore only descriptive differences can be used.  
10. Pg. 7, Ln. 38-  
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8. Pg. 8, Ln. 24- The resighting effort suffers from the same issue as the capture rates, it is unlikely that resighting probability is the same in the different locations given the differences in vegetation. Resighting probability can and should be estimated for each site.  
9. Pg. 9, Ln. 41- A Chi-Square test is not appropriate because the observations are not independent. As stated above because there is one site for each forest age class, there is no replication and therefore only descriptive differences can be used.  
10. Pg. 7, Ln. 38-  
  
  
  
\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*Ref.: Ms. No. CONDOR-16-161  
AVIAN COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS AND DEMOGRAPHICS REVEAL HOW CONSERVATION VALUE OF REGENERATING TROPICAL DRY FORESTS CHANGES WITH FOREST AGE  
The Condor: Ornithological Applications  
  
Dear Steve,  
  
Thank you for your submission.  I must begin by apologizing for the long delay in getting to a decision your paper.  We had a series of unresponsive reviewers who held up the process.  It is really unacceptable for the paper to take so long.  After getting the reviews and AE recommendation, it took me a little while to give the paper a careful read, hoping for a path forward at Condor.  Unfortunately, in the end I must respect the AE and reviewers' consensus that the paper has significant weaknesses.  I think it will be more suited for a regional journal or a journal that publishes basic descriptive ornithology.  
  
Below my letter you'll find comments from the reviewers.  Reviewer 2 best summarizes the main problem- it is hard to know what part of your results are year effects, what are site effects, and what are due to successional stages.  I don't see how to manage this weakness to strengthen the inference, despite the great sample size.  
  
Thank you for giving us the opportunity to consider your work.  Good luck on a path to publication.  
  
Yours sincerely,  
Phil  
  
Philip C Stouffer  
Editor-in-Chief  
The Condor: Ornithological Applications  
  
Reviewers' comments:  
  
Reviewer #2: This manuscript provides rare information on resident and migrant species' use of regenerating agricultural fields relative to mature dry forest in the Caribbean. Although the data may provide information important to management and conservation decision-making processes, different statistical analyses may be needed to appropriately address the questions being asked. Minor and major comments are provided below.  
  
Minor Comments:  
  
p. 4 lines 7-9: Introduction states that "few researchers have evaluated the conservation value of regenerating pastures, and the employment of avian survival or other demographic variables in these studies is seldom realized...". Site persistence is used in this study as the measure of survival; however, no references are provided indicating the validity of this assumption. Either references should be cited and described, or the use of "survival" throughout should be replaced with "site persistence."  
  
p. 6 lines 4-53: In descriptions of vegetation at each site, indication of which shrub and tree species are non-native and which are native would be useful.  
  
p. 13 lines 14-24: The meaning of "individual" in this paragraph is not clear: "Preferred habitats of mist-netted species was not significantly different among sites..., but the preferred habitats of individuals did vary significantly among sites. Early-successional sites were dominated by a greater proportion of individuals favoring pastures, scrub, and secondary forest, while the mature forest was dominated by individuals favoring evergreen forest habitats (Fig. 2b)." Does number of "individuals" refer to the total numbers (or proportions) of birds across all species? Terminology here and in Fig. 2b caption should be clarified.  
  
Tables 3 and 4: Could be deleted, to decrease overall numbers of tables and figures, with information summarized in Results text.  
  
Table 5: I recommend using the same species name format as provided in Table 1. Also, clarification of "%SP" should be provided in table notes.  
  
  
Major Comments:  
  
p. 5 lines 31-34: Text states that sites "contained two replicate mist netting arrays...". However, the full description of the study sites indicates that both mist net arrays occurred within a single site, rather than within replicate sites for each successional stage. The term "replicate" should be deleted here, and acknowledgement made that the study design did not contain replicates of the 5 successional-stage treatments (i.e., there was one site per treatment).  
  
Methods overall: Text indicates that data were collected during different time periods for successional agricultural fields (data collected 2003-2008) and mature dry forest (data collected 1996-2001). Neither the statistical analyses nor text in the Results and Discussion take into account differences between successional and mature habitats that may be due to the years sampled rather than successional stage. Regarding statistical analyses, the text states that "Data within a site were not analyzed to determine variability among years but were pooled across years to increase sample sizes." Given that data were collected within sites over a 5-year period, it seems that significant differences between years within sites may have existed, as vegetation in early-successional sites matured over that time period. The Methods description seems to indicate, for example, that the 2-year-old site would have been 7 years old by the end of the study. Data from all years for this site were pooled and compared to a site that was 5 years old at the beginning of the study (and 10 years old at the end, which in turn was compared to a third site that was 10 years old at the beginning of the study). After all years were pooled within a site, the successional stages were compared by grouping bird species by migratory status, then diet category, then preferred habitat type, etc. in separate analyses, with the use of separate chi-square tests for each variable. Given the multiple independent variables being analyzed, it seems that statistical methods that allow for inclusion of multiple variables within a test (e.g., ANOVA) may be more appropriate to the data set. Finally, some of the statistical analyses are seemingly not fully described in the Methods section, with the Results section containing test statistics, in some cases, that aren't described in the Methods section, and with some P-values (e.g., in Table 6) for which test statistics aren't provided in the table or text. Overall, more appropriate statistical analyses may be available, and the statistics methods used should be described more clearly in the text. However, the lack of true replicates for each successional stage, and the fact that successional habitats were sampled in completely different years that was mature dry forest, may limit the analyses and conclusions that are possible.  
  
  
  
Reviewer #3: Overall, I liked the paper and the general idea that framed this study, which I consider very relevant for both ornithological science and conservation biology. I did not find major flaws though I have some general comments, which should be addressed.  
  
Length of the paper  
  
I have the feeling that sometimes the paper needs to be shortened in some sections or in specific paragraphs. I understand that the data has a lot of potential, though is limited too, which requires a balance between the necessary wording for arguing, while avoiding unused speculation. In other words try to 'polish' the text, which may require some text reduction.  
  
Statistics  
  
Though I am not very used to analyse this kind of data in my ecological studies, I have the feeling that some extra analyses may be conducted, without necessarily increase the text (I hope!). For example do you think will be worth to calculate 'Average Dissimilarity' (e.g., Bray Curtis Similarity index) on Birds species within and between the different sites? And Non-Metric Multidimensional Scaling (MDS) biplots of bird assemblage variation among different (Forest) sites?  
  
See for example this study in Brazil:  
  
http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10531-009-9711-6  
  
Discussion (and potentially in Introduction)  
  
Though an extremely well written paper, which is not a surprise considering previous studies, I think this paper needs a 'somewhat broader context'. This is even more important because Condor is an 'Applied Journal', contrasting with other journals. I think is nearly there, but may be in the final 'Conservation Implications' subsection still needs some improvements. I think you need to stress even more the results of this study widen the scope of the potential impacts of land use change for Neotropical birds, which included several latitudinal migrants. It will be useful to inform the reader if these land use change happening in Dominican Republic are also happening in other neotropical islands and how they may impact bird communities.  
  
  
Minor issues:  
  
  
Introduction, line 58: I think you should add 'native' before 'mature' because it's important to specify the importance of native stands, which is now clear in this version (goals).  
  
  
Page 7, line 12: May be '16h00' instead of '1600'.  
  
Page 9, line 48: Any reference for the method (Dunn-Sidak)?  
  
Pages 18-19: I think there is a lot of text about the potential importance of remnant trees, which I think is not necessary. I do think you may reduce considerably this part of the text.  
  
Table 1: Please include and explanation for acronyms mainly the ones related to habitat and diet. By the way a very organized table - well done!  
  
Table 6, lines 6 and 7: Replace Table 2 by 1 (I guess).  
  
  
  
  
Reviewer #4: The authors address a question that is poorly understood but because of fundamental problems with the design of the study, it is impossible to conclude that the differences they observed are due to forest age. Each forest age class must have at least two replicates for statistical comparisons of bird density, diversity, and persistence among the sites.  
  
Below are my specific points.  
1. Pg. 2, Ln. 25- Spell out 25.  
2. Pg. 5, Ln. 21- The study suffers from pseudoreplication. One study site for each forest stand severely limits the inferences that can be drawn from the study. In addition, the close proximity of the 5 study sites limits the ability to make inferences to the entire island of Hispanola.  
3. Pg. 5, Ln. 31- It is not clear if the two mist-netting arrays at each site were treated as independent samples or were combined. There are problems with treating them as independent samples because of their close proximity. If you don't treat them as independent samples, however, you have no replication and therefore cannot conduct statistical analyses of the data.  
4. Pg. 6, Ln. 4-53- Limit descriptions of sites to general characteristics. Canopy height should be provided in the results, after methods of measuring canopy height have been provided in the methods.  
5. Pg. 8, Ln. 17- The measure of persistence does not account for potential differences in recapture or resighting rates between the different habitats. It is likely that recapture/resighting rates differ between habitat types. Because there were 3 capture occasions each year, it would be possible to compute CJS estimates of survival at each location.  
6. Pg. 8, Ln. 56- It is not clear if the two mist-netting locations at each site were examined separately or were combined. If they were combined, this means there was one sample per site and comparing differences among sites is invalid. (see comment 3).  
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