Bogotá, D.C. April 29, 2016

**Dr. Juan Carlos Salcedo Reyes, Ph.D.**

Editor in Chief

Universitas Scientiarum

Faculty of Sciences

Pontificia Universidad Javeriana

Dear Dr. Salcedo and Anonimous Reviewers

Answering to observations you made, we thank a lot because of them were an opportunity to discuss our findings and correct mistakes, in order to increase performance in our paper. Based on them we made the following changes:

1. The title was adjusted as required and keywords were totally changed.
2. The abstract was reduced to less than 180 words and main paragraphs were changed to give more strength to its sense.
3. Spanish words for protected areas were conserved totally.
4. Text citation was reduced in many paragraphs of introduction text taking into account that bibliography cited here were the most appropriated.
5. Some figures and tables were corrected with new and detailed information. When they weren’t clear, new figures or tables replaced the old ones. New figures were made in Oriana and Stat graphics software. Order in figures and tables were changed to give more clarity to text.
6. About confusion with term monitoring, its mean was best oriented with the idea that monitoring could be made with activities like species inventories, activity patterns and use of vegetation covers if they are made during considerable periods of time. Literature was reviewed carefully to support our ideas; see examples:

**Gessner J, Buchwald R, Wittemyer G (2013) Assessing species occurrence and species-specific use patterns of bais (forest clearings) in Central Africa with camera traps. Afr. J. Ecol., 52: 59–68**

**Sathyakumar S, Bashir T, Bhattacharya T, Poudyal K (2011) Assessing mammal distribution and abundance in intricate eastern Himalayan habitats of Khangchendzonga, Sikkim, India. Mammalia 75: 257–268 doi: 10.1515/mamm.2011.023**

1. In Material and methods, we made a description of the well and less conserved habitats, based on vegetation covers associated, to give information about the degree of human impact.it. Based on this it was given a definition of well and less-conserved habitats, related with human intervention. Those habitats are consistent with descriptions made in other documents os the SFFOQ.
2. Sample effort was recalculated following Sberk-Araújo & Chiarello (2005) and was described in the Material and Methods.
3. Data analysis was made considering the together years (pooled), based on that our design made surveys in similar epochs, each year. We take into account literature about this subject; see examples:

**Monroy-Vilchis O, Zarco-González MM, Rodríguez-Soto C, Soria-Díaz L, Urios V (2010) Fototrampeo de mamíferos en la Sierra Nanchititla, México: abundancia relativa y patrón de actividad. J. Trop. Biol Vol. 59 (1): 373-383 doi: 10.15517/rbt.v59i1.3206**

**Tobler MW, Carrillo-Percastegui SE, Pitman RL, Mares R, Powell G (2008) An evaluation of camera traps for inventorying large- and medium sized terrestrial rainforest mammals. Animal Conservation 11: 169-178 doi: 10.1111/j.1469-1795.2008.00169.x**

1. The criterion for selection of species was reviewed and corrected. It was taken into account that species were chosen additionally, with 5 or more independent events, based on categories of risk proposed by UICN (from LC to EN), in order to include species of poor detection. Here we consider species with high conservation risk, but with low probabilities of been detected by cameras.
2. Oriana software (circular statistics) was employed to make graphs for dogs and other species. It helps us to reinforce statistically Kruskal-Wallis analysis about:
   1. Species activity patterns in 24 hours cycles, as well as their average hour of peak activity patterns.
   2. To compare activity patterns between dogs and foxes.
   3. To show changes in activity patterns first of all for *T.pinchaque*, and then for other species with high records.
3. Species were located in their phylogenetic order following:

**Solari S , Muñoz-Saba Y, Rodríguez-Mahecha JV, Defler TR, Ramírez-Chaves HE, Trujillo F (2013) Riqueza, endemismo y conservación de los mamíferos de Colombia. Mastozoología Neotropical, 20(2):301-365**

1. Discussion about cameras effort was changed, showing that the asymptote wasn´t reached. Percentage of a number of species inventoried in this study was compared with and percentage (%) in relation to other studies cited (Alberico et al. 2000, Guerrero et al. 2004), showing differences respect the curve calculated and a necessity of more effort in order to increase the species inventory. Tobler et al. (2008), used the same formula to calculate sample effort.
2. Discussion about domestic dogs and *C.thous*, as well as *T.pinchaque* in SFFOQ, was reoriented to analyse results based, for the first case on the use of covers in habitats and activity patterns, clearly stating that when domestic dogs were present, use of covers inside habitats, and activity patterns of *C.thous* change. In the case of *T.pinchaque* analysis was made putting emphasis on the implications for Tapir movements towards SFFOQ, and changes in its activity patterns. Discussion helps us to decide what conservation actions were necessary and mandatory.
3. Conclusions were reduced to ten lines and were rewritten to give them best sense.

As we showed here we have tried to follow, at detail, recommendations of the reviewers, which we know that helped, substantially, to give more understanding about our research. We hope these fulfill your expectations.

Sincerely

**Germán Jiménez, Natalia López-Cepeda, Andrea P Delgado, Ana M Guevara, Laura Lozano**

Ecology and Systematics Unit (UNESIS), Department of Biology. Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Bogotá Colombia. Center for Research and Studies on Biodiversity and Genetic Resources (CIEBREG), Pereira, Colombia. Group for Conservation and Management of Wildlife. Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Bogotá, Colombia.