

We agree with Larkin *et al.* 2019: restoration is context specific

Holly P. Jones, Peter C. Jones, Edward B. Barbier, Ryan C. Blackburn, Jose M. Rey Benayas, Karen D. Holl, Michelle McCrackin, Paula Meli, Daniel Montoya and David Moreno Mateos

Article citation details

Proc. R. Soc. B **286**: 20191179.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.1179>

Review timeline

Original submission: 21 May 2019
Revised submission: 20 June 2019
Final acceptance: 21 June 2019

Note: Reports are unedited and appear as submitted by the referee. The review history appears in chronological order.

Review History

RSPB-2019-1179.R0 (Original submission)

Review form: Reviewer 1

Recommendation

Accept with minor revision (please list in comments)

Scientific importance: Is the manuscript an original and important contribution to its field?

Good

General interest: Is the paper of sufficient general interest?

Good

Quality of the paper: Is the overall quality of the paper suitable?

Good

Is the length of the paper justified?

Yes

Should the paper be seen by a specialist statistical reviewer?

No

Do you have any concerns about statistical analyses in this paper? If so, please specify them explicitly in your report.

No

It is a condition of publication that authors make their supporting data, code and materials available - either as supplementary material or hosted in an external repository. Please rate, if applicable, the supporting data on the following criteria.

Is it accessible?

N/A

Is it clear?

N/A

Is it adequate?

N/A

Do you have any ethical concerns with this paper?

No

Comments to the Author

This is a rejoinder to a response to the authors' original paper, a meta-analysis of passive and active restoration approaches and their ecological outcomes. The response was critical of several elements of the original paper, including the response ratio used, the classification of passive vs active restoration, the treatment of data and the conclusions drawn. I agree that a rejoinder is warranted and this contribution is a fair and reasonable response to the key points raised about the original paper. The debate sparked by the original paper and subsequent responses was been valuable; it has drawn attention to the response ratio and its appropriate use and interpretation, and to the different ways that restoration approaches, and success, are conceptualised. I recognise the authors are constrained by a word limit in these types of contributions, but I do suggest a careful edit to see if there are places where statements could be made slightly more specific to improve the extent to which this can be read and understood without cross-referencing to the original paper and the rejoinder. I also suggest a few sentences below that could be clarified: "Defining passive versus active restoration is particularly difficult and confounding, which we talked about extensively in our original paper, LEA highlight, and has been discussed heavily in the literature" - perhaps break this into two sentences as the sentence is hard to follow as is. I also had to read "Whereas it would be useful if restoration ecologists could come to a consensus on a specific way to categorize the difference, the reason for the debate is because it is so difficult to do so as these actions exist along a continuum" a few times - perhaps reword to improve clarity. "When we changed various categories of restoration types to passive or active, we still found no differences between the two categories." - I think this is a really key point, but if made, more detail needs to be given - what changes did you make to the classification which still yielded no differences between passive and active restoration? Did all the classifications you compared lead to the same conclusion? "short-term restoration approaches are not a panacea for a lack of conservation or long-term investment in ecosystem restoration." - also suggest rewording, and slightly elaborating upon, this point. Perhaps it is the reference to conservation that throws me in reading this - is there really serious argument that short-term restoration is a 'panacea for a lack of conservation'? "Our analysis was a first global inquiry into these questions, but we agree with LEA that looking deeper is required." - could this be expanded upon slightly - what would 'looking deeper'

entail?

Decision letter (RSPB-2019-1179.R0)

12-Jun-2019

Dear Dr Jones

I am pleased to inform you that your Review manuscript RSPB-2019-1179 entitled "We agree with Larkin et al. 2019: restoration is context specific" has been accepted for publication in Proceedings B.

The referee(s) do not recommend any further changes. Therefore, please proof-read your manuscript carefully and upload your final files for publication. Because the schedule for publication is very tight, it is a condition of publication that you submit the revised version of your manuscript within 7 days. If you do not think you will be able to meet this date please let me know immediately.

To upload your manuscript, log into <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/prsb> and enter your Author Centre, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, upload a new version through your Author Centre.

Before uploading your revised files please make sure that you have:

- 1) A text file of the manuscript (doc, txt, rtf or tex), including the references, tables (including captions) and figure captions. Please remove any tracked changes from the text before submission. PDF files are not an accepted format for the "Main Document".
- 2) A separate electronic file of each figure (tiff, EPS or print-quality PDF preferred). The format should be produced directly from original creation package, or original software format. Please note that PowerPoint files are not accepted.
- 3) Electronic supplementary material: this should be contained in a separate file from the main text and the file name should contain the author's name and journal name, e.g `authorname_procb_ESM_figures.pdf`

All supplementary materials accompanying an accepted article will be treated as in their final form. They will be published alongside the paper on the journal website and posted on the online figshare repository. Files on figshare will be made available approximately one week before the accompanying article so that the supplementary material can be attributed a unique DOI. Please see: <https://royalsociety.org/journals/authors/author-guidelines/>

4) Data-Sharing and data citation

It is a condition of publication that data supporting your paper are made available. Data should be made available either in the electronic supplementary material or through an appropriate repository. Details of how to access data should be included in your paper. Please see <https://royalsociety.org/journals/ethics-policies/data-sharing-mining/> for more details.

If you wish to submit your data to Dryad (<http://datadryad.org/>) and have not already done so you can submit your data via this link <http://datadryad.org/submit?journalID=RSPB&manu=RSPB-2019-1179> which will take you to your unique entry in the Dryad repository.

If you have already submitted your data to dryad you can make any necessary revisions to your dataset by following the above link.

5) For more information on our Licence to Publish, Open Access, Cover images and Media summaries, please visit <https://royalsociety.org/journals/authors/author-guidelines/>.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to Proceedings B and I look forward to receiving your final version. If you have any questions at all, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Sincerely,

Dr Daniel Costa
<mailto:proceedingsb@royalsociety.org>

Associate Editor Board Member: 1

Comments to Author:

This is a rejoinder to a response to the authors' original paper, a meta-analysis of passive and active restoration approaches and their ecological outcomes. In my view this is a constructive debate that involves both concepts and some statistical issues. The reviewer has some minor suggestions. I hope that this sparks further research and thinking into this important topic.

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Referee: 1

Comments to the Author(s)

This is a rejoinder to a response to the authors' original paper, a meta-analysis of passive and active restoration approaches and their ecological outcomes. The response was critical of several elements of the original paper, including the response ratio used, the classification of passive vs active restoration, the treatment of data and the conclusions drawn. I agree that a rejoinder is warranted and this contribution is a fair and reasonable response to the key points raised about the original paper. The debate sparked by the original paper and subsequent responses was been valuable; it has drawn attention to the response ratio and its appropriate use and interpretation, and to the different ways that restoration approaches, and success, are conceptualised. I recognise the authors are constrained by a word limit in these types of contributions, but I do suggest a careful edit to see if there are places where statements could be made slightly more specific to improve the extent to which this can be read and understood without cross-referencing to the original paper and the rejoinder. I also suggest a few sentences below that could be clarified: "Defining passive versus active restoration is particularly difficult and confounding, which we talked about extensively in our original paper, LEA highlight, and has been discussed heavily in the literature" – perhaps break this into two sentences as the sentence is hard to follow as is. I also had to read "Whereas it would be useful if restoration ecologists could come to a consensus on a specific way to categorize the difference, the reason for the debate is because it is so difficult to do so as these actions exist along a continuum" a few times – perhaps reword to improve clarity.

“When we changed various categories of restoration types to passive or active, we still found no differences between the two categories.” – I think this is a really key point, but if made, more detail needs to be given – what changes did you make to the classification which still yielded no differences between passive and active restoration? Did all the classifications you compared lead to the same conclusion?

“short-term restoration approaches are not a panacea for a lack of conservation or long-term investment in ecosystem restoration.” – also suggest rewording, and slightly elaborating upon, this point. Perhaps it is the reference to conservation that throws me in reading this – is there really serious argument that short-term restoration is a ‘panacea for a lack of conservation’?

“Our analysis was a first global inquiry into these questions, but we agree with LEA that looking deeper is required.” – could this be expanded upon slightly – what would ‘looking deeper’ entail?

Decision letter (RSPB-2019-1179.R1)

21-Jun-2019

Dear Dr Jones

I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript entitled "We agree with Larkin et al. 2019: restoration is context specific" has been accepted for publication in Proceedings B.

You can expect to receive a proof of your article from our Production office in due course, please check your spam filter if you do not receive it. PLEASE NOTE: you will be given the exact page length of your paper which may be different from the estimation from Editorial and you may be asked to reduce your paper if it goes over the 10 page limit.

If you are likely to be away from e-mail contact please let us know. Due to rapid publication and an extremely tight schedule, if comments are not received, we may publish the paper as it stands.

If you have any queries regarding the production of your final article or the publication date please contact procb_proofs@royalsociety.org

Your article has been estimated as being 2 pages long. Our Production Office will be able to confirm the exact length at proof stage.

Open Access

You are invited to opt for Open Access, making your freely available to all as soon as it is ready for publication under a CCBY licence. Our article processing charge for Open Access is £1700.

Corresponding authors from member institutions

(<http://royalsocietypublishing.org/site/librarians/allmembers.xhtml>) receive a 25% discount to these charges. For more information please visit <http://royalsocietypublishing.org/open-access>.

Paper charges

An e-mail request for payment of any related charges will be sent out shortly. The preferred payment method is by credit card; however, other payment options are available.

Electronic supplementary material:

All supplementary materials accompanying an accepted article will be treated as in their final form. They will be published alongside the paper on the journal website and posted on the online

figshare repository. Files on figshare will be made available approximately one week before the accompanying article so that the supplementary material can be attributed a unique DOI.

Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of the Proceedings B, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Sincerely,

Editor, Proceedings B
mailto: proceedingsb@royalsociety.org