

Peer Review

Review of: "Association of Franciscana (Pontoporia blainvillei) Occurrence with the Doce River Plume"

Yvonnick Le Pendu¹¹. Universidade Estadual de Santa Cruz, Brazil

Any study of this highly endangered franciscana population is relevant to its conservation. Nevertheless, the description of collection and analysis methods needs to be completed and enriched. The discussion seems relevant and up-to-date.

First paragraph: The coordinates (18° 25') and (42° 10%27) are incomplete (inform the hemisphere) and erroneous (replace “%” by “o ”).

Second paragraph: The name of the ministry that published the “Portaria MMA 14,8” was the “Ministry of Environment” (delete “and Climate Change’s Red List”). The document is currently referred to as the “National list of Endangered species”.

The references of the following citations are lacking: (Gomes et al., 2017; Do Carmo et al., 2017)

Third paragraph: The references of the following citations are lacking: Yaney-Keller et al., 2021; San Martin et al., 2021).

(...) the occurrence of the franciscana dolphin (instead of “this species”) in the region.

Fourth paragraph:

The geographical coordinates of the launch points provided are insufficiently precise: for each coordinate, inform degrees, minutes, and seconds. The coordinates of the point Piraqué Açu River are not correct: 20°0'S 40°0'W is located in the ocean, 13 km from the coast.

It is necessary to provide a detailed map showing the launch points, the areas sampled, and the concentration area of the species.

Use “above” instead of “over” in “(...) over the mouth (...) point flies over”

Fifth paragraph:

The data collection and selection protocol is insufficiently described: For example, you need to clearly define what a “sighting” is: is it a dolphin seen on a frame at the surface, all the dolphins seen on a frame at the surface, or all the frames with visible dolphins on a video? Depending on the definition, you may need to explain how you have dealt with data independence.

How did you ensure that the sampling effort inside and outside the plume was similar? Did the flight plan follow the dividing line between the two zones?

Was the probability of detecting a dolphin (i.e., the contrast between the color of the water and that of the franciscana) the same inside and outside the plume?

The sentence “A total of (...) in the study region” must be inserted before the statistical results.

What does “all analyses” mean in “Results were compared using the non-parametric Mann-Whitney test, where all analyses yielded significant results ($p < 0.05$)”? It seems that you conducted only one Mann-Whitney U-test. You could probably analyze your data more deeply to enrich the results section.

Figure 1: The term “record” has not been defined in the method section: is “record” a synonym for “sighting”?

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.