

Peer Review

Review of: "Feeding Ecology and Activity Rhythms of the Critically Endangered Hawksbill Turtle"

Ninive Espinoza¹

1. Departamento de Ecología, Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of

This manuscript addresses an important topic in marine conservation by examining the feeding ecology and activity patterns of *Eretmochelys imbricata*, a critically endangered species. The study contributes valuable insights into the behavioral ecology of hawksbill turtles, which are essential for informing effective conservation strategies. The research appears to be well-structured and supported by relevant data. However, I have several comments and suggestions that could strengthen the manuscript's clarity, methodological rigor, and overall impact.

Regarding the title, even though it is informative, I would suggest adding something like "in the Caribbean" at the end. The abstract provides a good summary of the study. The introduction effectively establishes the importance of studying hawksbill turtle ecology. I suggest elaborating further on the knowledge gaps this study addresses, especially in relation to previous work in the region, such as the ones mentioned in the methodology section when addressing the studies with green turtles. The methodology is generally sound, but some important clarifications are needed. For example, when explaining the methods used to determine dietary composition, the authors include preliminary result values (e.g., "20% of bites could be confidently assigned to a prey category"). I suggest relocating such quantitative statements to the **Results** section, as they do not strictly belong to the methodological description. In addition, several methodological statements are presented without proper citations to support their use or relevance. It would strengthen the manuscript to include appropriate references, particularly when describing observational protocols or classification criteria for prey categories and turtle behaviors. The results are clearly presented and supported by appropriate figures and tables. My suggestion is to change one figure (Figure 3) to maybe a bar graph, as the pie chart is not used that often. Also, I recommend checking the fonts in all the figures and graphs, as some of them (maybe it was

something when I downloaded the manuscript to read) seem different from one another; make sure they are all the same. The discussion provides useful interpretations; consider highlighting any conservation implications more explicitly.

As a non-native English speaker and not a specialist in the English language, I encourage the editors to consider a second review by someone with greater fluency in academic English. While I have aimed to provide constructive and objective feedback, further expert evaluation could help ensure the accuracy and depth of the scientific and linguistic assessment.

Minor revisions: The manuscript presents relevant findings and is suitable for publication after the authors address the comments mentioned above.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.