

**Subject:** Decision on Conservation Biology 22-265.R1

**From:** Mark Burgman <onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com>

**Date:** 22-12-04, 18:27

**To:** richard.schuster@glcl.carleton.ca

**CC:** fjarrad@conbio.org, emain@conbio.org, jadrew@esf.edu, richard.schuster@glcl.carleton.ca, Rachel.Buxton@colostate.edu, jeffrey.hanson@uqconnect.edu.au, allisonbinley@cmail.carleton.ca, jpittman@uwaterloo.ca, v.tulloch@ubc.ca, fal42@cornell.edu, proehrdanz@conservation.org, p.h.verburg@vu.nl, arodewald@cornell.edu, ScottD.Wilson@ec.gc.ca, h.possingham@uq.edu.au, josephbennett@cunet.carleton.ca

04-Dec-2022

Dear Dr. Schuster,

Thank you for revising your manuscript "Protected area planning to conserve biodiversity in an uncertain future" (22-265.R1) for Conservation Biology. I sent the manuscript back to the handling editor, Prof. Josh Drew, who in turn consulted with the reviewers of the original submission. We are satisfied that the comments from the reviewers and editors have been addressed. Accordingly, I am pleased to accept your manuscript for publication. Congratulations.

Conservation Biology posts accepted articles online. Editing, typesetting, and proofing follow accepted article posting. Our senior editor, Ellen Main, will contact you about editing for style, format, and English grammar. Please deal with the remaining issues noted below at that time.

Your article may appear online as accepted in approximately one week if changes to meet journal style, format, and grammatical requirements are not extensive. At that time, this as-yet unedited version will be accessible to you, to colleagues, and to the media. Should you wish to wait until the manuscript has been edited or is in page proofs, please let us know immediately.

We cannot publish your article until you have signed the appropriate license agreement. You will receive an email from our publisher's (Wiley-Blackwell) Author Services system that will ask you to log in and will present you with the appropriate license for completion.

Later, electronic proofs will be sent by Wiley. Along with page proofs, you will receive information about page charges. Conservation Biology is published on behalf of the Society for Conservation Biology, a nonprofit organization. Payment of page charges not only supports the costs of editing and disseminating the journal, but also allows the society to support more effectively conservation science, management, policy, and education worldwide. Payment of page charges allows us to keep membership and subscription costs relatively low, particularly for colleagues in developing nations and for students. Payment of page charges from those with resources also allows us to publish the work of authors for whom paying page costs is impossible. If you have grant, institutional, or personal support for page charges, please contribute. Page charges will be waived for authors who affirm that they do not have institutional support or another means to pay page charges.

OnlineOpen is available to authors who wish to make their article available for free, or whose funding agency requires grantees to archive the final version of their article. With OnlineOpen the author, the author's funding agency, or the author's institution pays a fee of \$3000 to ensure that the article is made available to non-subscribers upon publication via Wiley InterScience, as well as deposited in the funding agency's preferred archive. The fee for OnlineOpen cannot be reduced or waived. In addition to publication online via Wiley InterScience, authors of OnlineOpen articles are permitted to post the final, published PDF of their article on a website, institutional repository, or other free public server immediately on publication. More information on OnlineOpen is available at <http://authorservices.wiley.com/bauthor/onlineopen.asp>.

If you are interested in reaching an audience beyond academia, consider contributing a summary of your article to Current Conservation Magazine ([www.currentconservation.org](http://www.currentconservation.org)). SCB has partnered with Current Conservation to more broadly communicate conservation science findings. Magazine staff work with authors to tell their stories in a manner that engages scientific and nonscientific audiences. Submit at [www.currentconservation.org/submissions/](http://www.currentconservation.org/submissions/). For more information, email Executive Editor, Devathi Parashuram ([devathi@dakshin.org](mailto:devathi@dakshin.org)).

Thank you for your contribution to Conservation Biology and to advancing the science and practice of conserving Earth's biological diversity.

Sincerely,

Mark Burgman  
Editor in Chief, Conservation Biology

P.S. – Wiley Editing Services offers professional video abstract and infographic creation to help you promote your research at [www.wileyauthors.com/eeo/promotion](http://www.wileyauthors.com/eeo/promotion). And, check out Wiley's free Promotion Guide for best-practice recommendations for promoting your work at [www.wileyauthors.com/eeo/guide](http://www.wileyauthors.com/eeo/guide).

#### REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer: 2  
Comments to the Author

I appreciate the work that the authors did in clarifying the manuscript, and I like the new title (less misleading). I also think that the results are explained in a more nuanced way, which will make sure people do not misunderstand the findings of the authors. I do not have additional comments beyond personal preferences that would not affect the core message of the manuscript. Let me just say that I am glad that someone decided to make this important point on uncertainty in conservation planning.

Reviewer: 1  
Comments to the Author

I appreciate the authors for having made substantial changes on the manuscript and addressed most of my concerns. I only have some minor comments which I think will not require too much time to address.

- I appreciate that the authors ran another prioritization with an alternative scenario on climate metrics. However, I have not seen why velocity of climate change is preferred as the main metric than exposure to extreme events. I think that some areas are more vulnerable to the latter. For example, the rainforest at my study site was heavily impacted by ENSO in 1997, 2015, and 2019, damaging much of wildlife habitat, causing wildlife mortality, increasing chance of disease outbreak, etc. Maybe in the other region, the former climate metric is more important. So I suggest the authors to add 1-2 sentences on why the former metric (velocity of climate change) is chosen for the main result (could add in line 126).

- Regarding unclear comment for Line 183-185 in the first manuscript, I was referring to how much area do we need to add to existing protected area network in order to cover all priority areas identified in this study, i.e. how much area in km<sup>2</sup> are purple vs. green in Figure 1?

- Figure 4: I agree that country names might make the figure busier. But not all

readers are familiar with the regions being shown. Perhaps add inset maps showing which part of the continent the pictures are from? (For me personally, I am not familiar with southern Europe).

- Supplementary materials Table S2: I still somehow see the notations A, S, L, and C in the first column of the csv spreadsheet. I am not sure if these are supposed to correspond with N, G, L, and C in the Table S2?
- Please change all “null” to “baseline” in the supplementary materials too.
- Line 84: Capital P for Python
- Line 180: superscript km<sup>2</sup>
- Line 184: add space between 2,160reptile