

Line 122 – units missing 10 mm/cm?

Line 150 – What are "follow-ups"? Not clear what this actually means.

Line 153 – "...could record..." perhaps should be "...recorded..."

Line 228 – "In this habitat" could be replaced by "In continuous habitat" to clarify.

* HOWLER MONKEY DIETARY COMPOSITION

A clear difference between the consumption of mature fruit in continuous forest to immature fruit in fragments appears to exist. However, it would be useful to hear whether this was due to active 'choice' by the monkeys or whether it was because only immature fruits were to be found in the fragments. The data doesn't suggest this is the case but were there fewer mature fruits? If so, was that due to some phenological differences of the habitat, such as delayed maturation of fruits due to poor or slow pollination? Then if this were the case is it valid to conclude that there was a difference in feeding habit/ If the authors had conducted their surveys a month later in the fragments, would they have observed feeding on mature fruit/ It would be nice if this were clarified. Something like this is suggested in line 282-284. The authors have taken due care not to attribute "choice" or "selection" of fruit by the monkeys and the paragraph at 287-292 is suitably worded and valid. However the final sentence of the ms (line 317-319) is not so careful. To say that "howler monkeys inhabiting fragments have become less selective" is perhaps worded poorly. Yes, monkeys in fragments displayed less selective foraging in terms of the metrics measure but this is probably due to the limited 'preferred' food species rather than an active 'choice' on behalf of the monkey. To clarify, a monkey taken from a fragmented forest to a continuous one may well begin to display greater selectivity. If this is the case, then their low selection is being driven by the habitat rather than their foraging behaviour per se. It is likely that this is what the authors are implying, but perhaps tightening the final sentence in a way similar to the following suggestion would be nearer being strictly correct "...displayed less dietary selection due to the limited numbers and/or absence of preferred food plants present in the continuous habitat... *

* Line 240-241 – This is an important point and one that should be supported by further analysis. It is fundamental to one of the main claims of this paper - that monkeys in fragments display less dietary selection (bearing in mind the comments above). However there is no analysis to support the fact that a H_2' value of 0.22 is "significantly lower" than a value of 0.28. Those numbers appear very similar and it is asking a lot of the reader to believe they are different! In addition it would be useful to know what the potential range of the H_2' value is, does it range between 0-1 for instance? *

Line 244/5 & 250 – Should not the genus name be given in full the first time a species is named?

Line 259 – suggest deleting "concurrently"

Line 274/5 – Surely this is something the authors are well-placed to show with their dataset rather than claim that it is "likely". Doing so would greatly strengthen this argument.

Line 285 – typo "consume" should be "consuming"