

In their study, authors investigated conflict management behaviors in a group of zoo-housed orangutans ($N = 6$), and document for the first time the occurrence of reconciliation (post-conflict affiliation between former opponents). While I think this manuscript is appropriate for PeerJ, in its current form I have some concerns, mainly falling under basic reporting criteria and aspects of the experimental rationale/design. These concerns are outlined below.

- First, I think the general wording/framing of the paper could be greatly improved. The language is awkward in many areas (22, 34, 64-65, 157-159, etc.) including typos (e.g., 96). Unfortunately, this takes away from the soundness of the study. Further, the figures are not particularly high quality, and are often descriptive in nature (I'm referring mainly to Figures 1-4). Some of this information could be better explained in the text (Figure 1), included as supplementary materials or by referring the reader to the dissertation if publically available (Figures 2 & 3) or omitted altogether (Figure 4).
- Second, while the research question clearly fills a gap in knowledge, it could be better developed and framed. I think the manuscript would improve markedly by honing in on several aspects of the broader research objective (post-conflict behavior in orangutans), avoiding too many descriptive findings (though I do appreciate the authors' point that such qualitative descriptions are valuable), and tightening certain aspects of the logic throughout. I provide specific suggestions that touch on each of these main points below.

12-13: Age- or sex-specific needs reads a bit vague, perhaps elaborate or omit and just focus on competition for limited resources.

24: Conflicts might include aggression, so better to replace "conflicts and conflict management" with "how aggression is managed." In the following sentence, to what does "both" refer? This sentence (24-27) is also a bit redundant (the first paragraph already introduces conflict and post-conflict behavior as integral aspects of social life).

38-40: It seems strange to emphasize the great apes and then omit the literature on conflict resolution/management behaviors in gorillas. Especially given the stated study objective (79-81), I think better to include this work, which will only further emphasize the point that orangutans are the only great ape species that remain to be investigated. This may also allow you to briefly discuss other social systems (e.g., fission-fusion vs. harems) and associated conflict resolution patterns.

47-48: I think the logic could be a bit tidier/clearer here. If social contact is rare, but the relationships that do form are valuable; and conflicts have the potential to disturb those relationships, then we would expect conflict resolution mechanisms to evolve.

49-50: Given that this is the only other work on conflict management in orangutans to date, it may be worth elaborating in 1-2 more sentences on this study's findings/implications.

50-54: What about the orangutans already in zoos? I think it's a benefit of your study to highlight the very present/proximate need for such studies given the unique social environments for orangutans who are currently (already) in captivity.

77: Doesn't this also include Marzec et al.'s (2016) study mentioned above (50)?

100: Please clarify whether this is 30 days total or 30 days during each observation period.

143-151: Were MCs uniquely paired with a particular PC? Please specify.

179-182; 183-189; and others: I do not think speculations about the behaviors' functions are appropriate for the methods; clear operational definitions would suffice and be more appropriate here.

207-208: While I certainly applaud your use of multiple approaches, the reasoning behind why these two particular methods were selected (what are their unique advantages?) remains a bit unclear.

230: Perhaps obvious to most, but I'd be clear here that the second rater was a (trained) behavioral observer!

245-247: How might conflicts that occur within the context of male sexual coercion differ from other conflicts? In my opinion you could consider excluding these conflicts (in effect better focusing on/showcasing the other findings you have), or otherwise should bolster the rationale for including them.

248-250: If they are causally connected, why are the remaining 29 cases being treated as separate interactions? Most reconciliation studies focus on the final interaction in the sequence of aggressive events.

264-271; 313-317; and others: Such qualitative descriptions in the methods are interesting, but may be better suited to a dissertation format, or perhaps as supplementary materials?

272-276: Could the increase in conflicts under less spacious conditions (indoors) be due to particular protocols – such as feeding times?

387-393/Table 2: Provides interesting information given the relative lack of knowledge about orangutan post-conflict behavior. However, I'm left with several questions. How was sit in close proximity defined? Perhaps a less conservative measure of proximity would yield different patterns—especially given that contact-sitting was by far the most common behavior. Also, why was play so much more common in MC than PC periods? I'm guessing these frequencies are very age-dependent, and thus wonder whether PC/MC phases should be matched according to the general behavioral repertoires of the individuals involved (immature vs. adult subjects)?

Discussion/Conclusion: Please be clear which of these conclusions are speculative/descriptive in nature (e.g., 409-419). I find it interesting that here you do not return to the points made in the introduction re: captive settings. A statement or two about this at the end would bring more cohesion to the manuscript.