


Peer Review: What is the future for The *Martes* Complex (*Guloninae*) in the face of climate change and ecological breakdown?

Johnny Birks¹, Stephanie Johnstone², Ed Snell³, Jenny MacPherson² 

Collaborators: Wayne Spencer & 1 other reviewer

Accepted by 2 of 2 reviewers

Funding Information

No funding was received for this study.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Publishing History

Submitted 12 April 2024
Accepted 17 April 2025
Published 13 June 2025

Corresponding Author

Johnny Birks
mustelap@icloud.com



Open Access



Peer-Reviewed



Creative Commons

¹ Swift Ecology Ltd., Blockley, Moreton in Marsh, GL56 9EF, UK

² Vincent Wildlife Trust, Ledbury, HR8 1EP, UK

³ NatureSpy, Mildenhall, IP28 7DE, UK

Transparent Peer Review

- [View reviewer summaries](#)
- [View second resubmission with reviewer comments](#)
- [View resubmission with reviewer comments and author responses](#)
- [View initial submission with reviewer comments and author responses](#)

Recommended Citation

Birks, J., Johnstone, S., Snell, E., & MacPherson, J. (2025). What is the future for The *Martes* Complex (*Guloninae*) in the face of climate change and ecological breakdown? *Stacks Journal*: 25006.

<https://doi.org/10.60102/stacks-25006>



Reviewer Summaries

Marie Martin

Initial Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

What did the authors do a good job with?

I appreciate the conceptual framework for the manuscript, and think it focuses on an important and time-sensitive conservation situation. The manuscript was generally well written

How do you think this research will contribute to the field?

This manuscript highlights the current, and potential future, effects of climate and ecological changes on Guloninae, which are often under-studied compared to other Carnivorans.

Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

A few things would be helpful:

- more clarity about the audience, intended goals, and takehome points. As written, the authors outlined some conservation actions/goals, but seemed to focus/flesh out some points more than others.
- more clarity on the ranking/aggregation of information on Guloninae, and how the authors arrived at "vulnerability" statuses.
- more citations from a broader range of authors' studying Guloninae, including those describing status, distribution, ecology, etc. of equatorial and Asiatic Guloninae
- incorporation of current/contemporary knowledge on Guloninae into putative effects of climate and ecological change on the distribution, resilience, and persistence of Guloninae
- highlighting gaps in knowledge that should be addressed to strategically guide Guloninae conservation in light of climate and ecological change

Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

Little analysis was presented -- their interpretation/conclusions would be strengthened by the suggested changes to Methods/Data Accumulation/Analysis suggested above

Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?

I would suggest minimizing colloquial/unscientific phrases, and revising longer/multi-clause sentences to be more direct

Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?

No

Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?

Revise & Resubmit

Revised Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?



No

How well did the authors respond to your comments?

4/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?

None

Based on your review, what should happen next?

This article should be sent back to the authors for *more revisions*

Why is this article not ready to be published?

The authors added new concerns in their edits that need to be addressed

What do the authors need to change for you to accept this article for publication?

I agree with many of the comments the other reviewer provided regarding organization, tone, and interpretation throughout. I appreciate all of the hard work the authors did to address our original comments. I also understand this is a unique manuscript, and supposed to be more conceptual/provide a framework for discussion and future actions to support Guloninae.

However, I still feel the organization of the manuscript is hard to follow sometimes, and the revision contains some errors. For example, there are several passages in the Methods and Results that reference non-Guloninae taxa and/or provide descriptive discussion of results that should be moved to the Introduction or Discussion, respectively. Further, some of the revisions and references incorporated are now incorrectly cited (e.g., the authors here say something the cited manuscript did not or the authors here conflated results from one paper with another). While I understand this is not supposed to be a meta-analysis or comprehensive review, I am still underwhelmed by the lack of depth in discussing threats/existing information for Guloninae globally. There are virtually no examples provided for species occurring outside of North America and Europe, and much of the information provided is dated, personal communications, and/or from a limited set of authors. This is probably not a huge deal, but again I think the breadth of subjects the authors cover makes me wish for better, and more comprehensive, inclusion of Guloninae results and research.

2nd Revised Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

no

How well did the authors respond to your comments?

5/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?

none

Based on your review, what should happen next?

This paper is ready for publication

Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?

No, I do not want to be listed as a Collaborator

Wayne Spencer

Initial Submission



Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

What did the authors do a good job with?

A quick overview of likely climate-change effects across Guloninae.

How do you think this research will contribute to the field?

It might influence future studies, such as more modeling of likely habitat and population shifts for gulonids, or focused field surveys to investigate habitat changes, population shifts, thermal influences on gulonids, etc.

Regarding the study design and methods, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

The methods need to be more thoroughly and clearly explained, along with uncertainties. As noted in my comments, I do not recognize the Köppen-Geiger classes used in the analysis, and all of the criteria used in Table 1 need to be fully and clearly articulated. For example, thresholds for small, medium, and large geographic ranges; sources for range delineations; terms for describing habitat types, how were the Köppen-Geiger classes determined for each species (majority overlap? at least xx% overlap of species range with the mapped Köppen-Geiger classes?); who classified the CEE relative vulnerabilities, using what criteria? Etc.

Regarding the analysis and interpretation of their findings, what do the authors need to fix or improve upon to be fit for publication?

See previous comments on Methods. Much of the interpretation seems to be expert opinion by the authors without much methodological support. If expert opinion is all that is available, this is a fine first step, but how the opinions were justified needs more description. Comparisons across species by one or a few authors can be highly variable, depending on experience of each expert. More detailed information on some species can lead to more discriminating determinations (e.g., an expert with knowledge about threats to different subspecies or populations of a given species may tend to weight their opinions for the entire species more heavily based on the most at-risk populations than another expert). Also, the analysis of forest loss is heavily focused on tropical forests, although this affects few gulonids. A broader, more consistent analysis across all biomes or habitat types seems in order, if possible.

Is there anything else you think the authors need to fix in their article to be fit for publication?

Much of the writing is in the passive voice, often with overly complicated sentence structures and colloquial terms. More direct, concise language would improve clarity.

Do you have any concerns about the ethics of this research?

None

Do you believe the article, in its current form, is fit for publication?

Revise & Resubmit

Revised Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

no

How well did the authors respond to your comments?

3/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?



The methodological approach has been improved (e.g., categorization of climate zones and quantification of range sizes), but I think the methods could be more clearly and directly presented.

Based on your review, what should happen next?

This article should be sent back to the authors for *more revisions*

Why is this article not ready to be published?

The authors added new concerns in their edits that need to be addressed

What do the authors need to change for you to accept this article for publication?

I think the paper should be re-organized in a more traditional Introduction/Methods/Results/Discussion format. The text throughout mixes introductory information, discussion, methods, and results, breaking up logical flow and making it somewhat confusing. Many of the subheaders seem unnecessary, overly wordy, out of place, or redundant). The Methods should be concise, direct, and clear, setting up the Results (as summarized in Tables 1 and 2) and Discussion/Conclusions, rather than mixing Methods, Results, and Discussion items along the way. I think a simpler, more direct organization could also shorten the paper significantly, by reducing redundancies that pop up in different sections (e.g., often repeating information about CEE, forest loss, etc.). Note also that the current range map(s) for the 11 species does not reflect changes being made by the Martes Working Group (for this or another submission?).

2nd Revised Submission

Do you have any conflicts of interest that could bias your ability to provide an independent review?

No

How well did the authors respond to your comments?

4/5

What - if any - feedback do you feel the authors did not adequately respond to?

Based on your review, what should happen next?

This paper requires minor revisions but does not need further peer review

Would you like to be listed as a Collaborator on the final publication?

Yes, please list me as a Collaborator