

Answers to Reviewer 1

1) *Are the results, discussion and conclusion clearly presented and do they correctly address the objectives of the study? * Reviewer 1: No. There are divergences between values presented on species richness that should be reviewed by the authors.*

A. Values were revised and table and text were adjusted. There are five Vespertilionidae species, instead of four, as previously presented.

2) *Are all the figures and tables essential and self-explanatory? * Reviewer 1: Yes, ... but I took the liberty of suggesting complementary information that is relevant and much appreciated in this type of manuscript.*

A. Done. However, in Figure 1 the sample points were not presented, because a plenty of sample units were established e the map would be visually “polluted”. The new map shows the phytophysiognomies.

3) *Are the references pertinent and up-to-date? * Reviewer 1: No. There are quotes from articles that are not listed in the bibliography.*

A. Done. Absent references were included: Carmignotto *et al.* (2014), de la Sancha & Teta (2015) e Shapiro & Bordignon (2014).

4) *Final Considerations:*

Reviewer 1: This article provides data relevant to the distribution of mammal species in western MS. However, it should be reviewed again by the authors, based on the suggestions provided by the reviewers.

A. All suggestions were done.