

Line-Notes

Similar seed dispersal systems by local frugivorous birds in native and alien plant species in a coastal seawall forest (#55858).

Reviewer 2 (Jorge Isla)

Lines 31 -34: The wording of this sentence makes it difficult for me to understand, even though the result is simple and robust. It could perhaps be said: "Similar results were shown across alien and native species in bird foraging behavior (feeding frequency, feeding duration and first stop distance) indicating that a similar seed dispersal relationship had been established between local frugivorous birds and both plant species."

Lines 83-87: At the end of the introduction, perhaps before this paragraph of objectives, it might be good to briefly develop the hypothesis or starting point, what facilitation or competition processes can be found and what consequences they could have. I consider that an explanation of this would improve the quality of the manuscript as it would help the reader to understand why it may be necessary to compare these seed dispersal systems.

Line 109: Confusing. Perhaps "small number of other fleshy fruited plant species such as *Lycium*."

Line 114: Change "...we randomly inspected..." for "we randomly chose 20 focal trees from each target species along the coastal..."

Line 118: Fruit's height is confusing for me, in Table 1 for *Cayratia japonica* the average Fruit height is 0.2 (m). How have you measured this trait? Did you measure the distance of the tallest fruits to the ground?

Lines 119-121: Despite the McDonnell reference, it is not clear to me how these ratios are calculated. If values of 100% are reached, I suppose that everything refers to an initial available crop size. Is that correct? How are the missing fruits calculated? Is it a subtraction or have you based on signals in the infructescence? These results are key to affirming that there is no limitation in the dispersal of any of the target species, so it is necessary to define well how they have been calculated.

Line 130: "20 focal stands". In each focal stand could inhabit more than one individual plant. There are stands with both species co-occurring or are species-specific stands? It is confusing because the incongruence between "focal individual sampling" and "20 focal stands". Be more specific please.

Lines 179-180: Perhaps an example of how these values have been measured in the field, which was measured, and how these ratios have been calculated, can be useful to understand and suggest clarifications to improve the explanation of these results.

Line 212: The selection of the bar.plot of fig. 3 leads to a misunderstanding. What is being compared in the t-tests are the microhabitat preferences within each species. I think the best thing to do would be to represent the seedlings found in each microhabitat of one species next to each other, and in the other part of the graph the other species. Substitute the order of place (Forest gap and understory) for the species, and use the colors for the Microhabitats. It is only a suggestion and there are many possibilities, but what is being compared in the statistical test does not agree with the supporting figure.

Line 213: "We randomly.." In M&M section you explain: Seedlings were found within plots ($r=25\text{m}$, $n=30$) around the individual selected plants. Maybe just write: "We found 300 *P. americana* seedlings.."