**RESPOSTA AOS QUESTIONAMENTOS DOS REVISORES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Questionamentos do Revisor 1** | **Resposta dos Autores** | **Status** |
| **[A1] Comentário:** What are the objectives of this study? When it was conducted? What methods have been used? | We did not include the material and methods because we followed Papavero (1994), which say that the abstract should contain just objectives and conclusions. | **Parcialmente atendida**  |
| **[A2] Comentário:** Why you are using two different notations (PARNASO and ParNaSO) to the same thing? Please avoid this behavior all over the text. | We are keeping PARNASO | **Atendida** |
| **[A3,4] Comentário:** Please make this information clearer and precise. If these species were already known to occur in the PARNASO or in its high-elevation areas, what is the real relevance of this result? If this is not the case, please be clearer. | Occurs in Serra dos Órgãos | **Atendida** |
| **[A5] Comentário:** A poor introduction has been presented, mostly focused in to describe the study area. Please use this introductory section to present arguments that justify your objectives and support your hypothesis. | Two paragraphs were inserted into the introduction in order to improve the paper. See A11. | **Atendida** |
| **[A6] Comentário:** The presently known species richness of anurans in Brazil can be quantified using the Frost's (2015) work and it is very close to this mentioned 1,020 (I did not count it myself). An estimated richness of anurans will be much more higher.Frost, Darrel R. 2015. Amphibian Species of the World: an Online Reference. Version 6.0 (Date of access). Electronic Database accessible at http://research.amnh.org/herpetology/amphibi | The brazilian anurofauna is currently representes by 1,021 species, corresponding to 16% of anuran. | **Atendida** |
| **[A7] Comentário:** Methods: study site | The paragraph were moved from introduction to the study area | **Atendida** |
| **[A8] Comentário:** What are the main conclusions of these two studies? What about other studies in Atlantic Forest high-elevation areas other than in Rio de Janeiro? What do you say about studies with other vertebrates living in high-elevation areas in the Atlantic Forest? | We redescribed this paragraph, so they are no longer as a list of species. Do not make sense include studies from other vertebrates groups, then we just mentioned in the introduction. | **Parcialmente Atendida** |
| **[A9] Comentário:** These studies are more than just a list of species. | Redescribed | **Atendida** |
| **[A10] Comentário:** I do not see in your introduction where is the “clear necessity”. Please work on justifications to support your study. | The sentence was removed from the text and the paragraph redescribed in another way. | **Atendida** |
| **[A11] Comentário:** Please be explicit on your ecological question of interest, your objectives, and hypotheses. | This is a descritive work to report the local fauna and serve as a primary documentation helping futures Works, so we do not have a hypothesis. | **Parcialmente Atendida.** |
| **[A12] Comentário:** The study area has been poorly described here. | Were included one more paragraph in the study area | **Atendida** |
| **[A13] Comentário:** How did you define this altitudinal range? Is it just an arbitrary choice? | From the altitude that the Pedra do Sino trail starts | **Atendida** |
| **[A14] Comentário:** Please be consistent always adopting the same notations to the coordinates. Check the right symbol for minutes. | Checked | **Atendida** |
| **[A15] Comentário:** How can “Pedra do Sino” be the main sample spot if it was not even mentioned in the Study Area section? You only mentioned “Pedra da Baleia” and “Vale das Orquideas” | We specify in the study area | **Atendida** |
| **[A16] Comentário:** How much of the PARNASO is higher than 1,200 m.a.s.l. ? From that, how much was effectively sampled? Where did you invest your time in active searches? etc. | That is in study area in Mat & Met | **Atendida** |
| **[A18] Comentário:** Move this paragraph to “Sampling” section. | The pitfall paragraph were moved from study area to sampling | **Atendida** |
| **[A19] Comentário:** The use of dots in English refers to decimal cases. | OK | **Atendida** |
| **[A20] Comentário:** Please be consistent always adopting the same notations to the coordinates. | Checked | **Atendida** |
| **[A21] Comentário:** Please be precise explaining your sampling effort. For instance, how many buckets form one pit fall trap? How the buckets were arranged? What is one survey? When exactly did you get your samples? | It is in sampling of Mat & Met | **Atendida** |
| **[A22] Comentário**: Which data? | Specimens | **Atendida** |
| **[A23] Comentário**: You could make your discussion more informative. For instance, how many anuran species occur in the PARNASO? What is the proportion of species in the high-elevation areas compared to the total anuran fauna in the PARNASO? | Were included in the introduction and results | **Atendida** |
| **[A24,25] Comentário:** These names may be deleted from here if you just mark the collected species in the table 1. You save space and avoid redundant information. | Collected species are in table 1 with asteriscs and the paragraph from the text was removed. | **Atendida** |
| **[A26] Comentário:** This paragraph is completely redundant with Table 1, adding no relevant | The paragraph were removed from the text | **Atendida** |
| **[A27] Comentário:** It seems to be Method but not a result | Now it is in material and methods | **Atendida** |
| **[A28] Comentário:** It makes clearer your ideas if you follow the same pattern to present correlated information  | We redescribed matching with Mat & Met | **Atendida** |
| **[A29] Comentário:** Do you mean that altitudinal differences found in your study may not be discussed because they are sample biased? | Redescribed | **Atendida** |
| **[A30] Comentário:** It require better contrast between adopted colors. | The Figure was removed as the other reviewer suggested | **Atendida** |
| **[A31] Comentário:** Better to present your results first and afterward discuss them contrasting with other results available in the scientific literature. Avoid to start an issue with results from someone else. | We presented the data that already exist first. After that, we told how many species we included in the list, specifying our contribution to this previous work. | **Não atendida** |
| **[A32] Comentário:** I must to disagree with such statements. The study conducted by Rocha et al do not compare their sample with other stony or open habitats. Check the pitfall efficiencies in classical open habitats such as deserts and savannas all over the world. In deed “only a small fraction of anurans in open restinga habitats seems to move on the ground” (Rocha et al 2004). Pitfalls are efficient traps to sample particular stratums of the biological assemblage, i.e., terrestrial, cryptozoic, and/or fossorial species. The low rate of captures using pitfall traps reveals the dominance of species presenting any level of arboreality rather than the method inefficiency. | Redescribed. | **Atendida** |
| **[A33] Comentário:** What methods? | Active and acoustic survey. Reescribed | **Atendida** |
| **[A34] Comentário:** This kind of conclusion must be | Reescribed | **Atendida** |
| **[A35] Comentário:** It was assessed more than one year ago. Please recheck and update. | Rechecked and updated | **Atendida** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Questionamentos do Revisor 2** | **Resposta dos Autores** | **Status** |
| **[A1] Comentário:** Or is it anuran diversity | It is anuran | **Atendida** |
| **[A2] Comentário:**  I think the authors mean “of its original **area**” here. Or not? | Yes | **Atendida** |
| **[A3] Comentário:**  These coordinates are wrong! Longitude 45º W is outside the western limits of the state of Rio de Janeiro, and 42º 09’ W is east of the city of Nova Friburgo (well outside the PARNASO’s limits). Please check the right coordinates. | The coordinates were checked and are just as they appear on park management plan (ICMBIO 2008)  | **Não atendida** |
| **[A4] Comentário:**  This paragraph should be transferred to the “SAMPLING” sub-section. | The paragraph was moved from study area to sampling | **Atendida** |
| **[A5] Comentário:**  This paragraph should be transferred to the beginning of the section, just after the “STUDY AREA” heading. | The paragraph was moved to the beggining of study area | **Atendida** |
| **[A6] Comentário:**  Since the text is in English, I think it would be more appropriate to give the English name first and the Portuguese name in parentheses. | The names are in english now | **Atendida** |
| **[A7] Comentário:**  How many excursions per year? Give more details. | First paragraph of Sampling (Mat & Met) | **Atendida** |
| **[A8] Comentário:**  In the the “STUDY AREA” sub-section the authors say that the area has “no dry season”. So, this is contradictory. It would be better to say in which months the samplings were made, instead of “rainy and dry seasons”. | Redescribed | **Atendida** |
| **[A9] Comentário:**  How many days in each month? | Second paragraph of Sampling (Mat & Met) | **Atendida** |
| **[A10] Comentário:**  And what about your own field data? | Redescribed.  | **Atendida** |
| **[A11] Comentário:**  And who took the other photos? Give the credits to all photos. | Done | **Atendida** |
| **[A12] Comentário:**  Manuscripts “in prep.” should not be cited in the References, so I excluded it from the References section. | OK | **Atendida** |
| **[A13] Comentário:**  What is the basis for this statement? And what do the authors consider as mid- and low elevations? Also, why do the authors mention only this species here, when there are others that also certainly occur at lower altitudes in the area (e.g. *Rhinella icterica*, *B. circumdata*)? I suggest that this sentence should be deleted. | Suggestion accepted | **Atendida** |
| **[A14] Comentário:**  These altitudinal ranges were established a priori or only after all the data was analysed? If they were chosen a priori, then this sentence should be transferred to Materials and Methods section.  | Specified in Mat & Met | **Atendida** |
| **[A15] Comentário:**  This figure is unnecessary, since this information is already given in the text. I suggest excluding it. | Done | **Atendida** |
| **[A16] Comentário:**  Species of what? Amphibians? Birds? Vertebrates? Animals? | Amphibians | **Atendida** |
| **[A17] Comentário:**  Is this area the PARNASO? If so, say it in the text. | Mountainous region | **Atendida** |
| **[A18] Comentário:**  Which are these species? There are no other mention in the text of 15 species being endemic of high altitudes in PARNASO. Where did the authors take this information from? | Information removed from the text | **Atendida** |
| **[A19] Comentário:**  Is there a reference for this statement? Or is this just an assumption? | We didn’t understand this comment | **Não Atendida** |
| **[A20] Comentário**: Is the holotype included? If so, discriminate the holotype from the paratypes. If not, just substitute “type series” by “paratypes”.  | Reviewed | **Atendida** |