

This manuscript "Conservation networks do not match ecological requirements of amphibians" is relevant in the domain of the conservation biology. The writing and logic in the manuscript were easy to follow and the results are interesting. However, I think the manuscript lacks details about the methodology to determine their real ecologic significance. I have several major comments.

Firstly, what sort of detection and survey method was used in this study? The authors worked on 9 amphibian species that have very different ecological preferences and constraints. Therefore, it is important to specify in the materials and methods how the data concerning the presence of the species in the different sites were acquired. I understand that the data are issued from participatory sciences and expert knowledge. But, even if the authors refer to already published articles, it is necessary to specify if the survey was done randomly or only on sites favourable to amphibians. Was it a daytime survey, a nighttime survey, a net survey? What is the probability of detection of each species with this method? have you adapted the survey effort to the probability of detection for each of the 9 species studied?

Secondly, how is the coefficient of friction calculated for the different species? Is the friction coefficient per habitat depending on the species considered? Indeed, for example, the friction coefficient of an habitat for animals that move on the ground (*bufo spinosus*) is very different from that, for the same habitat, for animals that move in trees (*Hyla arborea*)?

Finally, I do not know the IUCN classification of protection areas. Nevertheless, I am really surprised by the authors' choice to include ENS and PNR in the protection area. What are the specific regulatory protection measures for amphibians in these areas? To my knowledge, none. Do the ENS of this study have specific regulations?

Why are the Natura 2000 areas that have a regulatory status in group 3? (lines 152-162 ; Table 2).

Minor comments:

Line 72: In this study, the authors consider only the green infrastructures. Nowhere is mentioned the blue infrastructures which are particularly important for amphibians (tadpoles but also adults). In conservation policies, green and blue infrastructures are often associated. (Line 83) Does the term "wetlands" refer to the blue part of green infrastructures? Did the authors take ditches into account in their study? Ditches are very important for the movement of amphibians.

Line 86: I disagree that charismatic species are poorly representative of species-habitat relationships. In many case, charismatic species are considered as umbrella species that are important in terms of protection.

Line 98-102: I am not sure that in Western Europe, traditional hedgerows landscapes have a high density of ponds. This is true in the western of France but it is probably not the general case in Europe.

Line 110: Amphibian skin is permeable and not impermeable

Line 156: I do not understand what the authors mean line156-157 (For two types of Pas, site boundaries were not available.)

Line 248-256: Does this mean that 1% of the amphibian habitat in the study area is in Group 1, or does it mean that only 1% of the amphibian habitat is in Group 1?

The article would be improved if species-specific data were included in the results so that interspecific variability in results could be assessed.

Although the study focuses on the importance of PAs and GI to amphibians, biodiversity is not just about these species. The authors could comment this point in the discussion.