

Dear Author,

Congratulations on your research, but there are some important points of improvements, as it follows:

1. Your most important issues:

- Material and Methods: the presence of just one non-normal variable is enough to use only non-parametric tests. You cannot mix parametric and non-parametric tests in the same research. With that said, it will be necessary to redo all statistical analyses, using just non-parametric tests. I cannot review the results and discussion related to the statistical analysis until the correction of this issue.
- Results:
 - o There is one missing table (I think it's table 2), affecting the understanding of the entire section.
 - o Line 119: you cannot talk about significant difference using just a table. Statistical analyses are required to affirm that.
 - o Lines 124 to 138 need to be rewritten after the statistical analysis correction. As well as lines 163 – 166 in the Discussion section.

2. Other important issues:

- Abstract: you should add the results, at least the most important ones.
- Material and methods:
 - o Do you have the permission number of the Universidad San Francisco de Quito ethics and animal handling? You should write it on the text, like the permission of the Galapagos National Park Service that is on line 71.
 - o Line 82: you should describe the instruments used to weight and to record the body temperature of the birds.
 - o Line 100: you should first describe the normality test used and after that, you write about other tests. Summary statistics also should come before the tests in the text.
 - o Line 101: the variable is non-normal; the test is non-parametric. With that said, you should replace “non-parametric” with “non-normal variables”.
- Results: lines 120 to 122 are difficult to understand. Which blood chemistry parameters are different between populations? And which one had high eosinophil counts? They seem so similar to me, as well as leucity profiles. Can you rewrite it?

- Lines 150 – 152: Do you have any supposition about the reason why the eosinophil counts are higher than other studies? If so, can you add it on the discussion?
 - Line 154: you should write “BUN” unabbreviated at this first time.
 - Figure 1: In subtitles, you say that the “boxplots demonstrate statistically significant differences between...” You cannot demonstrate statistically significant differences using a graphic. Statistical analyses are required. Also, you have to add the acronym meanings in subtitles.
 - Figure 4: “comparison of red-billed tropicbirds between two breeding colonies” – it is not what the graphic is demonstrating. It is demonstrating comparison between the two methods.
 - Table 1: there is no need to explain what is sample time in the subtitle. Keep it short. You can explain it on the text.
3. The least important points:
- Introduction: line 62 – isn’t it “published work” instead of “work published”?
 - Material and methods: lines 86 and 87 – if possible, you should write down the needles and the syringes brands.
4. Strong points:
- Very important research. It is valuable to have available data from the species, especially in free-living birds.
 - I admire your care in keeping short the handling and sampling time.
 - You have excellent recommendations on future studies along the text. Maybe you could reunite all this recommendations at the end of the text.
 - Valuable micrographs illustration.
 - Excellent use of English language.

Congratulations!