

KORESPONDENSI PAPER

Judul : Assessing mangrove restoration practices using species-interaction networks

Jurnal : Restoration Ecology

No.	Aktivitas/Status	Tanggal	Keterangan
1.	Submission	5 Mei 2021	Acceptance letter of the manuscript submission
2.	First Decision	6 Juli 2021	Decision on manuscript and Reviewers' Comments
3.	Revised	1 September 2021	Covering Letter & Authors' Comments
4.	Accepted	2 September 2021	Acceptance letter
5.	Published online	7 September 2021	Available online (open access)

<https://authorservices.wiley.com/index.html#article/17200987>

Publication History



Acceptance Letter of The Manuscript Submission

Restoration Ecology - Manuscript ID REC-21-206
Valter Amaral <onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com>

Kam, 6 Mei
2021, 07.34

kepada darren.oconnell, M.Fusi, saya, bulfrit_rajagukguk, fihribach
mid75, James.Kitson, zoedunnett25, agustrianto.undip, aiyen, K.Die
le, Darren.Evans

05-May-2021

Dear Dr. O'Connell:

Your manuscript entitled "Assessing mangrove restoration practices using species-interaction networks" has been successfully submitted online and is presently being given full consideration for publication in Restoration Ecology.

Your manuscript ID is REC-21-206.

We are pleased to report that submissions to Restoration Ecology have increased exponentially in the last few years. While this also means that the rejection rate has climbed, the quality of papers published in Restoration Ecology has never been higher.

Please mention the above manuscript ID in all future correspondence or when calling the office for questions. If there are any changes in your street address or e-mail address, please log in to Manuscript Central at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/rec> and edit your user information as appropriate.

You can also view the status of your manuscript at any time by checking your Author Center after logging in to <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/rec>.

This journal offers a number of license options, information about this is available here: <https://authorservices.wiley.com/author-resources/Journal-Authors/licensing/index.html>. All co-authors are required to confirm that they have the necessary rights to grant in the submission, including in light of each co-author's funder policies. For example, if you or one of your co-authors received funding from a member of Coalition S, you may need to check which licenses you are able to sign.

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Restoration Ecology.

Sincerely,
Valter Amaral

Valter Amaral, PhD
Managing Editor, Restoration Ecology

Decision on Manuscript and Reviewers' Comments

Restoration Ecology - Decision on Manuscript ID REC-21-206

Valter Amaral <onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com> 6 July 2021 at 15:02

Reply-To: vlamaral@fc.ul.pt

To: darren.oconnell@ucd.ie

Cc: stephen.murphy@uwaterloo.ca

06-Jul-2021

Dear Dr. O'Connell

Manuscript ID REC-21-206 entitled "Assessing mangrove restoration practices using species-interaction networks" which you submitted to Restoration Ecology, has been reviewed. The comments of the Reviewers and Editor-in-Chief, Prof. Stephen Murphy, are included at the bottom of this letter.

Your manuscript was generally well received but there are some issues that deserve your attention so that the manuscript could become publishable in RE. Prof. Murphy has recommended minor revisions to your manuscript to allow you to deal with the criticisms. Also, please note that Tables and figures within Supplements in Supporting Information should be labelled as Figure i, ii... Table i, ii... and must not be cited directly in the main text.

I invite you to respond to all of the review comments and revise your manuscript accordingly. Please be very explicit in describing your response to the comments and address each concern point by point; this will speed up the processing of your revision.

To revise your manuscript, log into <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/rec> and enter your Author Center, 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, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Please also indicate the changes to your manuscript within the document by using highlighted text in MS Word. It is essential that you also document all changes made or justify why you have not made a change suggested by a reviewer (see below).

Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center. When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewers and editors in the space provided. You can use this space or a covering letter to document any changes you made to the original manuscript or explain why you disagree with the review comments. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, be as specific as possible in your responses (please address review comments point by point).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Because we are trying to facilitate timely publication of manuscripts submitted to Restoration Ecology, your revised manuscript should be uploaded as soon as possible. If it is not possible for you to submit your revision in a reasonable amount of time, we may have to consider your paper as a new submission.

This journal offers a number of license options, information about this is available here: <https://authorservices.wiley.com/author-resources/Journal-Authors/licensing/index.html>. All co-authors are required to confirm that they have the necessary rights to grant in the submission, including in light of each co-author's funder policies. For example, if you or one of your co-authors received funding from a member of Coalition S, you may need to check which licenses you are able to sign.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to Restoration Ecology and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,

Valter Amaral

--

Valter Amaral, PhD

Managing Editor, Restoration Ecology

Reviewers' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author

Overall this is a novel study and approach to restoration. The study was designed well and this body of work

contributes to pushing the field of restoration science forward. I recommend the authors consider the comments

below before recommending this for publishing.

Line: 106 - I recommend mentioning selection of appropriate life history stage of transplant / accounting for high

mortality of planted propagules.

Paragraph at 114: Consider incorporating some of the literature criticizing the use of areal extent as a proxy of

ecosystem health. Functionality is more complex than area, as you allude to. See publications by Joe Shing Yip Lee

Line 173: Add comma after "Tiwoho, six...." Some grammatical errors throughout the paper. Please read again with attention to these details.

Consider mentioning light as a limiting factor earlier in the introduction for justification of GLAMA methods. Light is

also an important factor that shifts with age following restoration.

A conceptual model / figure or image that demonstrates the concept tested in this paper would be helpful.

Boxplot Figures: please add significance indicators.

Fig 5 - needs color legend- some words appear cut off, and titles too small. I recommend revising to make more

aesthetically pleasing and readable. Please format figures consistently.

Results section was a bit disorganized- with very short sentence long paragraphs. I recommend re-writing this section

with attention toward a clear, organized flow to improve readability.

Discussion: the use of 'shy' (line 454) may be anthropomorphizing fauna. Please rephrase.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author

I want to thank the authors for the opportunity to review their manuscript. The manuscript is very interesting and demonstrates new ways to evaluate mangrove restoration. I appreciate the authors making the R scripts and some data available on Github (please add more data!). There are some amendments and additions that need to be done. However, to fully explain the environment of both Tiwoho and Likupang, and the limitations of the current study.

Overall, I would recommend the article for publication with major revision. Interesting article! I hope you continue to improve on this for future studies. I invite the authors to consider the following points:

1. Forest Structure: As DBH and species have been surveyed in every study, it would be good to have at least a summary data table available (means, SD, range, n) for all treatments and plot level forest structure. You could also calculate tree densities and basal areas which can be proxies for biomass (like in lines 197-199 where you state being a biomass index). This would be useful information in addition to the canopy cover that you already include in the analysis. The age of the forest stands (monoculture/mixed) would be good to emphasize as well. All this information would further highlight differences and similarities in forest structure between monoculture/mixed stands.

2. Geomorphology and Tidal Regimes: In the discussion and supplementary materials, the authors mention that the two sites are in two different geomorphologies and tidal regimes

(estuarine and coastal fringe). This is an important factor and should be further mentioned in the abstract, introduction, and methodology. Then authors could further point out trends that happen despite the two forests being very different locations in terms of tidal regimes. Are reference forests (structure or fauna wise) in the two locations be comparable to each other? Could the tidal regimes also affect the species interaction? Another interesting aspect you could look at in the "future research" section is whether interactions increase or decrease in intensity/frequency during tides.

3. Species interaction: If I understood correctly, surveys were only done during low tide. This therefore excludes any possible species interaction that occur during high tides. For example, there could be interaction of archer fish and ants during tidal flooding. You should mention this in the limitations section (see point 5).

4. Fauna: While a detailed fauna survey was done, avifauna, which play an important role in mangroves, were not surveyed (or observed?). While it might have not been possible to conduct such surveys during the study, this could be included in a limitations/further research subsection. For future research, authors may use field techniques such as using acoustic surveys to account for avifauna. Mammalia/Reptilia was not included/observed either, but it could be also that there was no record of them during the camera captures (and in that case, should be mentioned in the discussion).

Please see:

Acevedo, M. A., & VILLANUEVA-RIVERA, L. J. (2006). From the field: Using automated digital recording systems as effective tools for the monitoring of birds and amphibians. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 34(1), 211-214.

Buelow, C., & Sheaves, M. (2015). A birds-eye view of biological connectivity in mangrove systems. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 152, 33-43.

5. Limitations/Assumptions and Future Research section: It would be good to have a section in the main text summarizing certain assumptions and limitations you make in this study (can be included either in methodology/discussion, and that consider what was mentioned in points 1-4). Also, it would be important for you to mention what further research should be done based on your findings.

Overall, I would recommend the authors to add the following to the manuscript, considering the points stated above:

- 1) Assumptions/Limitations section in the methodology
- 2) Forest Structure Summary Table in Results
- 3) Any tide data or further description of tidal regimes in both sites
- 4) Future Research section in the Discussion

Editor-in-Chief Comments to Author:

Editor-in-Chief : Murphy, Stephen

Comments to the Author:

Although one reviewer recommended major revisions, I think the substance of both reviews are really minor revisions.

You can address both reviewers' comments and then send back the MS; we should be on a clear path to getting this published after that.

Prof. Stephen Murphy

2 Sep 2021, 10.23

Valter Amaral <onbehalfof@manuscriptcentral.com>

kepada darren.oconnell, M.Fusi, saya, bulfrit_rajagukguk, fihribachmid75, James.Kitson, zo edunnett25, agustrianto.undip, aiyeen, K.Diele, Darren.Evans

01-Sep-2021

Dear Dr. O'Connell:

Your manuscript entitled "Assessing mangrove restoration practices using species-interaction networks" has been successfully submitted online and is presently being given full consideration for publication in Restoration Ecology.

Your manuscript ID is REC-21-206.R2.

Please mention the above manuscript ID in all future correspondence or when calling the office for questions. If there are any changes in your street address or e-mail address, please log in to Manuscript Central at <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/rec> and edit your user information as appropriate.

You can also view the status of your manuscript at any time by checking your Author Center after logging in to <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/rec>.

This journal offers a number of license options, information about this is available here: <https://authorservices.wiley.com/author-resources/Journal-Authors/licensing/index.html>. All co-authors are required to confirm that they have the necessary rights to grant in the submission, including in light of each co-author's funder policies. For example, if you or one of your co-authors received funding from a member of Coalition S, you may need to check which licenses you are able to sign.

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Restoration Ecology.

Sincerely,
Valter Amaral

--

Valter Amaral, PhD
Managing Editor, Restoration Ecology

Covering Letter and Authors' Comments

Author's covering letter

Firstly we would like to thank the editors and reviewers for their invaluable help with this manuscript. They have both helped us make major improvements in this manuscript and informed our thinking about our study system going forward.

Here we directly address each of the comments provided in the review. All comments are numbered for ease of reference. If a comment has been entirely dealt with in the revised manuscript then we have just directed reviewers to there. If we have felt that further explanation is needed, we have provided it in this document.

If any further clarifications or revisions are required we are more than happy to supply them. High quality publication ready figures available upon request.

Reviewers' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author

General summary: Overall this is a novel study and approach to restoration. The study was designed well and this body of work contributes to pushing the field of restoration science forward. I recommend the authors consider the comments below before recommending this for publishing.

Comment 1.1:

Line: 106 - I recommend mentioning selection of appropriate life history stage of transplant / accounting for high mortality of planted propagules.

RESPONSE 1.1: added

Comment 1.2:

Paragraph at 114: Consider incorporating some of the literature criticizing the use of areal extent as a proxy of ecosystem health. Functionality is more complex than area, as you allude to. See publications by Joe Shing Yip Lee

RESPONSE 1.2: a sentence referencing these points has been added

Comment 1.3:

Line 173: Add comma after "Tiwoho, six...." Some grammatical errors throughout the paper. Please read again with attention to these details.

RESPONSE 1.3: added

Comment 1.4: Consider mentioning light as a limiting factor earlier in the introduction for justification of GLAMA methods. Light is also an important factor that shifts with age following restoration.

RESPONSE 1.4: a sentence has been added mentioning the issues around light intensity and how that can bias the GLAMA measures. Please be assured that periods of intense direct sunlight were avoided when taking these measurements at our study sites.

Comment 1.5: A conceptual model / figure or image that demonstrates the concept tested in this paper would be helpful.

RESPONSE 1.5: Conceptual figure (Figure 1) added, outlining our hypothesis that, for a given recovery time post restoration, Monoculture Reforestation will show greater differences from the Reference Forest baseline than Mixed Species Regeneration in terms of species interaction network attributes.

Comment 1.6: Boxplot Figures: please add significance indicators.

RESPONSE 1.6: significance indicators added to all boxplots.

Comment 1.7: Fig 5 - needs color legend- some words appear cut off, and titles too small. I recommend revising to make more aesthetically pleasing and readable. Please format figures consistently.

RESPONSE 1.7: colour legend added, and title size increased.

Comment 1.8: Results section was a bit disorganized- with very short sentence long paragraphs. I recommend re-writing this section with attention toward a clear, organized flow to improve readability.

RESPONSE 1.8: We have made several edits to the sentences in the Results section to improve readability. If further changes are required, please let us know which lines require greater clarity.

Comment 1.9: Discussion: the use of 'shy' (line 454) may be anthropomorphizing fauna. Please rephrase.

RESPONSE 1.9: replaced with “behaviourally cryptic”

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author

General summary: I want to thank the authors for the opportunity to review their manuscript. The manuscript is very interesting and demonstrates new ways to evaluate mangrove restoration. I appreciate the authors making the R scripts and some data available on Github (please add more data!). There are some amendments and additions that need to be done however, to fully explain the environment of both Tiwoho and Likupang, and the limitations of the current study.

Commented [kdiel1]: You did for some, but not all..., not better to do for all?

Overall, I would recommend the article for publication with major revision. Interesting article! I hope you continue to improve on this for future studies. I invite the authors to consider the following points:

Comment 2.1: Forest Structure: As DBH and species have been surveyed in every study, it would be good to have at least a summary data table available (means, SD, range, n) for all treatments and plot level forest structure. You could also calculate tree densities and basal areas which can be proxies for biomass (like in lines 197-199 where you state being a - biomass index). This would be useful information in addition to the canopy cover that you already include in the analysis. The age of the forest stands (monoculture/mixed) would be good to emphasize as well. All this information would further highlight differences and similarities in forest structure between monoculture/mixed stands.

RESPONSE 2.1: in response to this comment, and the reviewer's general suggestion that we provide further data, we have added our data for all vegetation surveys to the paper's github folder (https://github.com/oconned5/Mangrove_restoration_networks/blob/main/Full_vegetation_survey.csv). In this we have provided taxonomic ID, DBH (cm) and Basal area (m²) for each individual tree surveyed, and CaCo index, Foliage projective cover and Canopy height for each quadrat. We hope this addresses the reviewer's concerns about providing sufficient access to the data utilised to calculate our vegetation indices. We believe that we these data provide good insight for the reader to the forest structure at both site, while providing the raw data required to calculate further indices of interest to the reader.

In terms of the forest structure indices we have used, we have chosen to largely utilise canopy cover as this provides a good and rapid assessment of overall forest structure that isn't species specific. What this allows us to build into our model is any broad differences in forest structure which would bias results if not accounted for. This type of overall forest structure measure is most useful for our analyses of full network indices. For species level network indices, we have included the Biomass index derived from mean DBH multiplied by number of individuals for the target species per quadrat. This was used in addition to a canopy cover measure for modelling species level network indices, as the biomass of a plant species in a network will of course influence the level to which it is interacted with. As the reviewer has stated, we could have also utilised total basal area in a similar way. Basal area is derived from DBH so would produce a strongly correlated index to the one we used.

The age of the forest stands is now stated in the methods (14-16 years at the time of sampling). The Site descriptions section of Supplement i provides further details, outlining that restoration work for both monoculture and mixed forests was largely completed in 2004 and 2005 in Tiwoho, and in 2003 in Likupang. There have been some small scale follow up plantings, but the main work was completed in this period. This information was put in the Supplementary Information to save on word count while writing the paper, but if the reviewer and editor feel it is worth including in the main text we are happy to do so if that improves clarity.

Comment 2.2: Geomorphology and Tidal Regimes: In the discussion and supplementary materials, the authors mention that the two sites are in two different geomorphologies and tidal regimes (estuarine and coastal fringe). This is an important factor and should be further mentioned in the abstract, introduction, and methodology. Then authors could further point out trends that happen despite the two forests being very different locations in terms of tidal regimes. Are reference forests (structure or fauna wise) in the two locations be comparable to each other? Could the tidal regimes also affect the species interaction? Another interesting aspect you could look at in the "future research" section is whether interactions increase or decrease in intensity/frequency during tides.

RESPONSE 2.2: The reviewer is correct; tidal regime and range is very important in shaping the life of the mangrove forest. In this study we therefore assessed the tidal regime/range at Tiwoho and Likupang by placing Water Level Data Loggers for 15 days at both sites, with continuous recording throughout. The following information was added to the study site description in the method section: " Both sites experienced semidiurnal tides during the study period. Tidal inundation was monitored between dd/mm/yy and dd/mm/yy at Tiwoho and dd/mm/yy and dd/mm/yy at Likupang (Hobo Onset Water Level Loggers 0-4m). At Tiwoho, maximum tidal range was xx and xx m at the spring and neap tide days, respectively. At Likupang maximum tidal range was xx m and xx m at the spring and neap tide days, respectively. At Tiwoho, the forest floor was inundated at xx out of xx days monitored, whereas at Likupang tidal inundation was more frequent, with xx days out of xx days".

Comment 2.3: Species interaction: If I understood correctly, surveys were only done during low tide. This therefore excludes any possible species interaction that occur during high tides. For example, there could be interaction of archer fish and ants during tidal flooding. You should mention this in the limitations section (see point 5).

RESPONSE 2.3: Yes the reviewer is correct, and we agree this is an important limitation to note. This has been added to the limitations section.

Comment 2.4: Fauna: While a detailed fauna survey was done, avifauna, which play an important role in mangroves, were not surveyed (or observed?). While it might have not been possible to conduct such surveys during the study, this could be included in a limitations/further research subsection. For future research, authors may use field techniques such as using acoustic surveys to account for avifauna. Mammalia/Reptilia was not included/observed either, but it could be also that there was no record of them during the camera captures (and in that case, should be mentioned in the discussion).

Please see:

Acevedo, M. A., & VILLANUEVA-RIVERA, L. J. (2006). From the field: Using automated digital recording systems as effective tools for the monitoring of birds and amphibians. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, 34(1), 211-214.

Buelow, C., & Sheaves, M. (2015). A birds-eye view of biological connectivity in mangrove systems. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 152, 33-43.

RESPONSE 2.4: The faunal survey on in this paper was focused on surveying plant-animal interactions. Therefore our cameras were placed facing down towards the tree base/leaf

litter/sediment and our direct searches focused on collecting animals from the vegetation. Targeting our methods to capture these interactions meant that invertebrates and fish were the main faunal groups we recorded, as they were the major herbivores/detrivores in this system.

The avifauna of our study sites were not specifically surveyed, as although they play an important role, it is largely as predators/insectivores and our focus was on plant-animal interactions in this study. *Todiramphus chloris*, *Gerygone sulphurea* and *Cinnyris jugularis* were extremely commonly heard in the mangroves, though seldom seen due to the density of the habitat. *Cinnyris jugularis* is a noted pollinator, though we only observed it nectar feeding on coconuts in neighbouring villages during this field season. As the reviewer suggests birds play a key role as top predators, and our plan for future research was to create multi-layer interaction networks including the mangrove top predators. This was to include acoustic surveys (we had already secured a set of AudioMoths), but the extreme disruption the global pandemic has caused has forced us to delay follow up fieldwork indefinitely.

One Reptilia species *Emoia atrocostata* (shorthand in network diagrams - Squ_01) was recorded on the cameras and is part of our analyses (see Interaction_data.csv). This was the only Reptilia species observed in the mangroves. No mammals were observed in any of our time in the mangroves. Our local guides could only confirm the presence of bats, and the occasional presence of cuscus in the area (they also noted cuscus experienced strong hunting pressure). MacKinnon (1979), O'Brien and Kinnaird (1996), Riley (2002) and Lee et al. (2005) all report that both *Ailurops ursinus* and *Strigocuscus celebensis* are heavily hunted for food in northern Sulawesi, supporting this anecdotal evidence. Therefore we do not believe that there are likely to be common diurnal mammal species missed by our recording methods. While cuscus are important herbivores, anthropogenic pressures have led them to be locally scarce. Bats are certainly important mangrove pollinators, but our study was not designed to survey nocturnal mangrove species. Detecting the relevant bat species will require future acoustic surveys.

We have summarised these caveats and limitations of our survey methods in the Limitations section (2nd last paragraph of the Discussion) in line with the points made in the reviewer's comments.

Comment 2.5: Limitations/Assumptions and Future Research section: It would be good to have a section in the main text summarizing certain assumptions and limitations you make in this study (can be included either in methodology/discussion, and that consider what was mentioned in points 1-4). Also, it would be important for you to mention what further research should be done based on your findings.

RESPONSE 2.5: A paragraph has been added to the discussion (2nd last paragraph), outlining the limitations highlight and suggesting future research possibilities.

Comment 2.6: Overall, I would recommend the authors to add the following to the manuscript, considering the points stated above:

- 1) Assumptions/Limitations section in the methodology
- 2) Forest Structure Summary Table in Results
- 3) Any tide data or further description of tidal regimes in both sites

4) Future Research section in the Discussion

RESPONSE 2.6: A paragraph has been added to the discussion (2nd last paragraph), outlining the limitations highlighted and also suggesting future research possibilities (points 1 and 4).

To address point 2, we have provided forest structure data to add to the supplementary material in the paper gitub folder in the Full_vegetation_survey.csv document (https://github.com/oconned5/Mangrove_restoration_networks/blob/main/Full_vegetation_survey.csv). This provides further requested measures such as basal area, and provides the raw data. We have opted to provide the forest structure data in the supplementary material, as there are already eight figures and one table in the main text, therefore adding further tables may make the main text of the manuscript overly crowded. However if reviewer and editor believe that a summary table in the main text is more appropriate we are happy to produce one.

Acceptance Letter

From: **Valter Amaral** <onbehalf@manuscriptcentral.com>
Date: Thu, 2 Sept 2021 at 07:39
Subject: Restoration Ecology - Decision on Manuscript ID REC-21-206.R2
To: <darren.oconnell@ucd.ie>
Cc: <stephen.murphy@uwaterloo.ca>

02-Sep-2021

Dear Dr. O'Connell:

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript entitled "Assessing mangrove restoration practices using species-interaction networks" in its current form for publication in Restoration Ecology. All appears to be in order for Production; Wiley-Blackwell Publishing will contact you direct if they have any queries. You will be informed of the issue number that your manuscript will appear in at a later date.

What are the best ways to increase the impact of your published work? Explore the author toolkit from @wileyinresearch to ensure your paper gets seen, cited and read <https://authorservices.wiley.com/asset/Wiley-Promotional-Toolkit.pdf>

This journal offers a number of license options, information about this is available here: <https://authorservices.wiley.com/author-resources/Journal-Authors/licensing/index.html>. All co-authors are required to confirm that they have the necessary rights to grant in the submission, including in light of each co-author's funder policies. For example, if you or one of your co-authors received funding from a member of Coalition S, you may need to check which licenses you are able to sign.

Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editorial Board of Restoration Ecology, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Sincerely,
Valter Amaral

P.S. – You can help your research get the attention it deserves! Wiley Editing Services offers professional video abstract and infographic creation to help you promote your research at www.wileyauthors.com/eo/promotion. And, check out Wiley's free Promotion Guide for best-practice recommendations for promoting your work at www.wileyauthors.com/eo/guide.

--

Valter Amaral, PhD
Managing Editor, Restoration Ecology