



October 2022

**COLLEGE OF
LIBERAL ARTS & SCIENCES**
Department of Biology
143 Biology Building
Iowa City, IA 52242-1324
319.335.1050 Fax 319.335.1069
www.biology.uiowa.edu

Dear Editors,

We appreciate the positive responses to our revised MS and sole suggestion regarding unbinning Figure 2b, which we have followed. There is no need for point-by-point responses beyond appreciation for the careful review and our confirmation that we have followed the suggestion of reviewer 3 and Editor Brannelly regarding Figure 2.

Sincerely,
Maurine

Maurine Neiman, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Biology
Department of Gender, Women's and Sexuality Studies
Provost Faculty Fellow for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
University of Iowa
Senior Editor & Preprint Editor, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B
maurine-neiman@uiowa.edu
<http://bioweb.biology.uiowa.edu/neiman/>
Twitter @mneiman
she/her

Editor comments (Laura Brannelly)
[MINOR REVISIONS](#)

Thank you for submitting this final version to PeerJ. It is now in a form that is ready for publication, barring one final comment from Reviewer 2 about the choice of points within the violin plots. Before this is accepted, please consider the reviewer's comments/suggestions

Reviewer 2 (Alexandra A Barnard)



**COLLEGE OF
LIBERAL ARTS & SCIENCES**
Department of Biology
143 Biology Building
Iowa City, IA 52242-1324
319.335.1050 Fax 319.335.1069
www.biology.uiowa.edu

Basic reporting

This paper is clearly written and the authors made several changes suggested by reviewers to make the information even more clear.

Experimental design

The design of the experiment is sound, clearly described, and clearly displayed in Figure 1.

Validity of the findings

The authors revised graphs based on reviewer comments and reframed the experiment in a way that I believe better fits the experiment.

Additional comments

I appreciate the authors' thoughtful responses and revisions and I recommend that this paper be accepted for publication.

Reviewer 3 (Magdalena M Mair)

Basic reporting

no additional comment

Experimental design

no additional comment

Validity of the findings

no additional comment



**COLLEGE OF
LIBERAL ARTS & SCIENCES**
Department of Biology
143 Biology Building
Iowa City, IA 52242-1324
319.335.1050 Fax 319.335.1069
www.biology.uiowa.edu

Additional comments

I would like to thank the authors for considering my concerns and comments in their revised manuscript. The limitation of having tested only one asexual lineage is now stated clearly at several points in the manuscript, and non-significant results are now interpreted more cautiously. I appreciate the changes the authors made and also their explanations to points where the authors decided to stick to the original form.

I have only a last minor suggestion left which concerns the violin plot for mating durations: I would like to thank the authors for their explanations concerning the data points from females that consented to mating but are displayed as having a total mating duration of zero in the violin plot in Figure 2b. I now understand that the violin plot here assigns data points to a specified number of bins, resulting in data points with small mating duration being displayed as zeroes. This clarifies where these data points come from and why there are discrete steps in mating durations in the plot. It is still not clear to me however, which advantage this binning of data points has. Binning (or grouping) of data points always comes with a loss of information. I thus would appreciate if the authors would consider plotting the measured values directly (e.g. with `geom_jitter`) and thus keeping the whole information of the raw data visible. This could be done very quickly, does not change the results and would be an easy way for giving the reader a better perception of the underlying data. Thank you.