**Response To Reviewer Two Comments**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer 2 Comments** | **Author Comments** |
| Starting from title of the work: “urban isolation” this is not really studied. They do not have measured isolation in this study and n=1 for the urban areas; “produce instability” neither this is studied in the current manuscript. Title should be rewritten to more accurately reflect the true content of the work. The same applies to abstract, introduction and discussion. | We have changed our title to: Are urban populations of a gliding mammal vulnerable to decline?  The abstract does not refer to the terms listed by the reviewer. The introduction has a focus on small populations. The urban population is isolated but we use this term to describe the population not as a factor of investigation. We have added a sentence to highlight that our study is limited by the focus on 2 populations.  The discussion also highlights the limitation that we studied just 2 populations. Our discussion is focused largely on the observed population trends and possible causes of a decline. Reference to urban populations is that they tend to be small and isolated. We do not refer to instability in the discussion. |
| Do you have some evidence that this urban Minnippi population is somehow isolated or small? How much gliders occur in areas surrounding your trapping site? | The Minnippi population is situated within a highly urban matrix that has lost connectivity over a 50-year period. The patch is completely surrounded by roads.   * Extra detail has been added into 2.1 Study area. |
| Fig 1 is very unclear | Figure 1 has been revised. |
| At first reading, it was confusing that you use the names Minnippi and Mt Petrie in methods and results. Easier for reader for example, if you call them “urban site” and “forest site” or something like that | Rather than referencing the sites by their name we have changed wording to ‘urban’ and ‘peri-urban’. |
| It remained unclear whether your model could really separate mortality and immigration. For example, would lower survival in Minnippi be explained by higher immigration away from the site? | Survival in the model is ‘apparent’ survival because true mortality and permanent emigration cannot be separated. So lower survival could arise from higher emigration and/or higher mortality but cannot be known.  The model allows estimation of temporary emigration which accounts for periods when animals are captured in primary periods each side of one or more when they are not captured. Some text has been added to clarify. |
| Why you have this text in results lines 140-143 on sex ratios? You combined sexes for the analysis and do not present any test for this sex-ration data. | We include this as descriptive background so the reader can see the details. If we do not include a reader may think we have hidden some important information showing a highly skewed sex ratio that may have arisen over time. |
| 3.3. population sizes section could be shortened, because numbers in text partly repeat those in fig 2. No need to explain in text in detail what is presented in figure. | We have substantially reduced the amount of text here. |
| Discission line 216: “Minnippi showed substantial variation” There is variation (or decline) in Mt Petrie too during the first trapping period. | We have deleted ‘substantial’ and compared the variation directly to the trend at the peri-urban site. |
| Line 227. For this species, you can also found studies describing no decline | We have changed our wording that some populations have shown decline. |
| Line 243 No need to write about removal of horses from some local pasture | We have retained but have removed a few words to make more concise. |
| 4.3 Genetic implications. Too speculative, you can shortly mention this, but no need to highlight it with a separate section. You do not have any evidence that there is nay genetic implications or that those would be reason or result from the observed decline. In fact, many small populations in nature cope very well although genetic variation may be decreased locally | We have removed the section heading.  We have made more concise.  A genetic study that included samples from both our populations showed lower genetic diversity at the urban site and high relatedness. Therefore, it is valid that we briefly discuss our findings in relation to that. |
| 5 conclusions. This whole paragraph should be rewritten to reflect what you actually did here and observed. Everybody knows that long-term studies are needed to study yearly fluctuations. It is not less from this study. Multiple populations: you had n=2. Population dynamics in urban setting: you had n=1. “Loss of species” “healthy forests” not studied (what you did say on this was that your urban sites was better quality line 222!) | We have substantially revised our conclusion. |