NOTES

Line 4 – Mori (M not H)

Line 47 para – if words need to be chopped, this paragraph, especially the first two sentences, feel like they can be combined and shortened.

Intro stuff – the “scale” element (the (or at least a) reason why these feedbacks aren’t broadly known or included) isn’t brought up in the intro bit at all. Do we need to or want to outline the reasons why we expect these feedbacks to be more important or extensive than are included?

Figure 2 – negative feedbacks, if we’re discussing stabilizing feedbacks, should be one positive and one negative arrow – which I think is what you’re discussing (here is pred-prey, so prey has a positive arrow to pred and pred has negative arrow to prey. (Sasha made this point too before I sent these comments in but keeping here for completeness)

Lines 170 ish – negative and positive feedbacks need to be clarified in line with the arrow comment for fig 2. Soil drying -> diversity is a negative feedback, but soil moisture retention -> diversity is a positive feedback. It’s just shifted to the other side of an unstable equilibrium point or like an allee or threshold effect of water (that’s the wrong terminology, but just to (possibly!!) make clear what I’m trying to say)

Line 199 – I don’t know how I feel about this – they are *exactly* the sum of their parts, right? It’s just they are interactive? So they feed on each other and get bigger or smaller because of the dynamical nature? I know you know this, but do we want the implication to be “we can’t understand these even by knowing the elements”? Maybe what we have here is the only way that the point can be made, but I like the idea that if we understand the system as a whole we can understand it as a whole, we just can’t look at one link. My brain is a little fried so I’m not sure I’m explaining my point well at all… I can clarify, or based on this info you can decide that this is trivial and we don’t need to change.

Line 212 – would we want to cite biotime and predicts as examples here? Maybe not.

Fig 2b (the flowchart starting with eDNA) here we have humans separate when we don’t want them to be? I think this looks good but for consistency may be good to point out.

Line 274 – can we add in mention of causal interpretation here? In that we need to be able to detect and isolate the relationships and feedbacks at all scales and across scales, i.e. it’s hard to assign causality in observational data.

Line 288 – hmm .. maybe this is a sufficient reply to my last comment? I can’t decide. I do think that the difficulty in not being able to leverage observational data is a major thing to point out.

Point #6 (line 331+) just a point of consideration, not just how resilient to keeping the biodiversity feedbacks themselves, but also how biodiversity promotes resilience of a variety of other things, response to global changes, resilience of particular species of interest and value (microclimate amelioration type stuff)… not a major point, again, just a thought.

Line 368 – we don’t use pbeff otherwise in the paper – write out the words here

Line 371 – in here can we add an important point about interpreting these observations in any sort of causal way, as in, developing our statistical techniques? Bringing in ideas from/collaborations with other more necessarily observational-based fields (public health, etc)