

- The abstract is informative but overly long and includes background details that belong in the Introduction.
Condense the abstract to focus only on the objective, methods, principal findings, and conclusion (limit to 300 words).
- The introduction provides good taxonomic and geographic context, but need to be more clearly defined.
Expand lines 68–79 to explicitly state: what is currently unknown, why the Cordillera Yanachaga is important, and how this study addresses that gap.
- Sentence structure in lines 44–50 is convoluted (e.g., “high Andean strabomantid frogs share...”).
Simplify complex phrases. Example: “High Andean strabomantid frogs have similar external morphology, which previously led to their classification within a single genus: *Phrynopus*.”
- Table 1 is informative but some variables are unexplained (e.g., SVL, TL, FL).
Include a brief note or table caption explaining all abbreviations.
- The Discussion effectively summarizes species rarity and field observations, but it reads more like an extended Results section.
Focus more on comparative context and implications for conservation or biogeography of the genus *Phrynopus* in the central Andes.
- The phrase “this supports the idea...” (line 499) is vague.
Replace with “These findings support previous hypotheses about high levels of microendemism and beta-diversity in Andean amphibians (Rodriguez & Catenazzi 2017).”
- The manuscript uses professional English, but there are sections where syntax or phrasing reduce clarity.
 - Line 23: “heel bearing one or two subconical tubercles...”
 - Consider: “the heel bears one or two subconical tubercles...”
 - Line 77: “the two species we name herein”
 - Consider: “the two new species described in this study”
 - Line 128: “support the recognition...”
 - Consider: “support the taxonomic recognition...”

A thorough review by a fluent English-speaking colleague or a professional editing service is advised.