Reviewer **A**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer’s comment/question (on the review form OR throughout the main text of the manuscript)** | **Author’s answer** |
| **[A1] Comment:**  | Done/Not done. If not done, why |
| This running head is confusing. | Done. The running title was rephrased in order to improve clarity. |
| I suggest use more attractive key words. | Done. We tried to use keywords that would attract a wider audience. |
| Describe better your study area.... “Our study was conducted in the Park...” I missed link the description of habitat heterogeneity in the Cerrado with the description of abiotic conditions that are different among the two areas. This topic may probably fit one paragraph. | Done. We made a better description of our study areas. However, direct measures of abiotic conditions were not inserted since the difference between areas was only visually determined by observing canopy openness and presence or absence of limestone rocky outcrops. |
| Better define each kind of habitat as you use Cerrado | Done. The word cerrado is used replacing the term “Cerradão” in our text. The description is given above the reviewer comment. |
| State if this species is native or exotic. | Done. The invasive status in Brazil was clearly stated in the text according to the official Species List from the Brazilian National Museum |
| How were plots established and how were plants selected? What was the size of the plot? | Done. We explained plots size and distribution in study areas. |
| I did not understand what you did here. I am not convinced with the approach of using plant height as the measure for habitat. But I am not sure if I understand what do you mean. It is not clear what factors did you include in the GLMs in this sentence and in the others. I only understood when I checked table 1. Please review the text. I would like to see in a simple graph like Figure 1 the mean herbivory between the two areas and a statistical comparison of herbivory between the two habitas. | Done. We reformulated the paragraph in order to clarify our experimental procedures and clearly stated what factors are included in the GLMs. A graph comparing the herbivory rates was produced and a comparison of the mean herbivory between the two areas was performed using GLM. |
| Shrub? | Done. The word was changed. |
| It was not measured before that the species is exotic. In the Brazilian Flora it is stated as native. Review the text to be more specific. | Done. The phrase was inserted as a possible consequence of herbivory resistance in the plants invasion ability and we rephrased it for better comprehension. |
| Is there any expectation about differences in the densities of herbivores between habitats? | Not done. We expect differences between herbivores densities between habitats, but we did not made any measurements in this sense, so we prefer not to speculate. |
| Check upper case letters. | Done. Checked and corrected. |
| Table 1: Factor | Done. We changed the name of the column to clarify our results. |

Reviewer B

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer’s comment/question (on the review form OR throughout the main text of the manuscript)** | **Author’s answer** |
| **[A1] Comment:**  | Done/Not done. If not done, why |
| Title | Done. We changed the title in order to clarify the meaning of our study. |
| Abstract | Done. We rebuilt abstract in order to clarify the reviewer’s doubts. We understand that different habitats are prone to present different environmental conditions but is not always clear if these alterations in abiotic characteristics are enough to cause changes in plants morphology or in ecological processes that rely upon these differences. Our hypothesis is that the changes in habitat conditions would cause differences in plant morphology and that these differences would be able to change the herbivores accumulated consumption rates. In general, individual plant species located in different habitats would present different herbivory rates that may be relate to different leaf sizes (Gonçalves-Alvim et al., 2010), chemical composition (Gonçalves-Alvim, 2011) and specific leaf mass (Neves et al., 2010). |
| Introduction | Done. We added references about changes in Cerrado Habitats influencing herbivory rates due to plant morphological differences in page 3, lines 1-5. We also explained why we used *Ruellia brevifolia* as a model in the section Study Species, in Materials and Method. The use of Cerrado and Mata Seca areas was explained in the study area section of Matherial and Methods. We also clearly stated the hypotheses of our study in the final paragraph of Introduction section. |
| Methos | We added information in order to clarify the methods used in plant sampling and referenced the circular plot sampling. We also referred to the sampling method used for herbivory survey in order to clarify how leaves were collected. |
| Statistics | We added an explanation of how plants height was obtained in the sampling section |
| To whom work in the Brazilian tropical savanna the results are obvious anddo not represent any novelty. | We understand the reviewer’s concern. However, the authors agree that this is an important study case that may help Brazilian researchers on understanding the behaviour of single plant species that occur in different habitats, sheding light on important issues as ecotypic variation, phenotypic plasticity and also indirect effects of habitat on biological interactions. This kind of information are useful to reinforce the body of ecological information that has been published about the Cerrado Domain and to improve our ability to predict results of habitat changes and land use conversion in plant species autoecology.  |