

**Table 1.** The percentages of elements (carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, sulfur, phosphor, and silicon), calorific values of served foods ( $CV_{sf}$ ), energy values of served foods ( $E_{sf}$ ) and proportions of ash matter ( $FA_{sf}$ ) in served foods: detritus, moss *Brachythecium rutabulum* (Bra-rut), and moss *Calliergonella cuspidata* (Cal-cus) served to *Tetrix subulata* at laboratory conditions.<sup>†</sup>

|          | C          | H         | N         | S         | P         | Si         | $CV_{sf}$               | $E_{sf}$      | $FA_{sf}$  |
|----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------------------------|---------------|------------|
|          | %          | %         | %         | %         | %         | %          | (cal/g ash-free dry wt) | (kJ/g dry wt) | (%)        |
| Detritus | 10.05±0.03 | 1.61±0.02 | 0.78±0.03 | 0.19±0.03 | 0.40±0.03 | 56.75±0.25 | 3839.85±41.74           | 16.08±0.17    | 70.89±1.22 |
| Bra-rut  | 36.53±0.36 | 5.52±0.04 | 1.22±0.03 | 0.10±0.03 | 3.07±0.09 | 13.33±0.17 | 3852.46±55.44           | 16.13±0.23    | 2.76±0.83  |
| Cal-cus  | 43.69±0.38 | 5.86±0.05 | 1.21±0.02 | 0.10±0.03 | 1.97±0.07 | 14.49±0.18 | 3599.08±5.81            | 15.07±0.02    | 2.50±0.06  |

<sup>†</sup> Three samples evaluated for each type of food.

**Table 2.** Mean weights of males and females belonging to three different feeding groups (i.e., detritus, moss *Brachythecium rutabulum* (Bra-rut) and moss *Calliergonella cuspidata* (Cal-cus) in *Tetrix subulata*. The mean weights of defecated feces (in dry matter) were collected for 30 days in laboratory conditions.†

| Feeding group                     | moss Bra-rut |               | moss Cal-cus |              | Detritus     |              |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                                   | Male         | Female        | Male         | Female       | Male         | Female       |
| Weight of specimens (mg)          | 33.48 ± 7.15 | 71.58 ± 10.58 | 31.20 ± 2.45 | 71.18 ± 7.82 | 33.43 ± 2.05 | 71.70 ± 8.10 |
| Weight of feces (mg/spec./30days) | 11.81 ± 0.08 | 23.43 ± 1.63  | 10.40 ± 0.18 | 23.84 ± 0.53 | 18.36 ± 1.62 | 33.26 ± 0.43 |

† Each feeding group had 20 specimens with two replicates (for a total of 240 individuals).

**Table 3.** Tukey multiple comparisons of defecated feces weights (in dry matter) and energy food budgets in males and females of *Tetrix subulata* that consumed three different types of food: (moss Bra-rut) *Brachythecium rutabulum*; (moss Cal-cus) *Calliergonella cuspidata* and detritus. The values represent the honest significant difference ( $P$ -value).†

| Feeding group                     | Moss Bra-rut  |              | Detritus      |               |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
|                                   | Male          | Female       | Male          | Female        |
| <i>Weights of defecated feces</i> |               |              |               |               |
| Moss Bra-rut                      | —             | —            | 130.99 (0.03) | 196.70 (0.01) |
| Moss Cal-cus                      | -28.06 (0.59) | 8.33 (0.95)  | 159.04 (0.02) | 188.37 (0.01) |
| <i>Energy food budgets</i>        |               |              |               |               |
| Moss Bra-rut                      | —             | —            | 39.85 (0.00)  | 66.35 (0.00)  |
| Moss Cal-cus                      | -0.29 (0.95)  | -0.19 (0.99) | 40.15 (0.00)  | 66.54 (0.00)  |

† Each feeding group had 20 specimens with two replicates (for a total of 240 individuals).

This table is of very difficult interpretation, firstly because you mixed the information on the three levels of diet (detritus x bra-rut x cal-cus) among columns and lines, secondly because it is not clear where you found significant differences. I would suggest (1) to elaborate a table with different columns for each diet level; (2) avoid a posteriori comparisons (Tukey, Duncan etc.). Substitute this approach for a straight hypothetical-deductive approach, amalgamating factor levels and comparing models using anova (see Crawley 2013: chapter 11). You are already using R, therefore making this change will not exceed your software availabilities, and you will be able to state more precisely your hypotheses and the results.; (3) include figures with the significant results. I, myself, prefer figures to tables, as far as they show the

results more directly, and facilitate the readers' task to comprehend the results and evaluate your interpretations.

**Table 4.** Tukey multiple comparisons of calorific values (value before the slash) ( $CV_{sf}$ ) and ash matter (value after the slash) ( $FA_{sf}$ ) in served foods: (moss Bra-rut) *Brachythecium rutabulum*, (moss Cal-cus) *Calliergonella cuspidata* and detritus) and energy food budgets in feeding groups of groundhopper *Tetrix subulata*. The values represent the honest significant difference ( $P$ -value).<sup>†</sup>

| Type of food               | Moss Bra-rut                 | Detritus                      |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| $CV_{sf} / FA_{sf}$        |                              |                               |
| Moss Bra-rut               | —                            | -12.61 (0.95) / 68.13 (0.00)  |
| Moss Cal-cus               | -253.38 (>0.01)/ -0.26(0.96) | 240.77 (>0.01) / 68.39 (0.00) |
| <i>Energy food budgets</i> |                              |                               |
| Moss Bra-rut               | —                            | 53.10 (0.00)                  |
| Moss Cal-cus               | -0.24 (0.99)                 | 53.34 (0.00)                  |

<sup>†</sup> Each feeding group had 20 specimens with two replicates (for a total of 240 individuals).

**Table 5.** Calorific values of defecated feces ( $CV_{df}$ ) and proportions of ash matter in feces ( $FA_{df}$ ) per feeding group, calorific values of assimilated food ( $CV_{af}$ ), real calorific values of assimilated food ( $RCV_{af}$ ) per specimen collected for 30 days, and energy food budget ( $E_{fb}$ ) per specimen for males and females in feeding groups of *Tetrix subulata*. The feeding groups consumed three types of food: (Bra-rut) moss *Brachythecium rutabulum*, (Cal-cus) moss *Calliergonella cuspidata* and detritus. The values are mean  $\pm$  standard error. †

| Feeding group                       | <i>moss Bra-rut</i>  |                     | <i>moss Cal-cus</i>  |                     | <i>Detritus</i>    |                   |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|                                     | Male                 | Female              | Male                 | Female              | Male               | Female            |
| $CV_{df}$ (cal/g) per group/30 days | 3217.21 $\pm$ 344.38 | 3752.62 $\pm$ 32.48 | 3164.86 $\pm$ 426.33 | 3572.08 $\pm$ 32.75 | 280.67 $\pm$ 29.21 | 862.17 $\pm$ 3.66 |
| $FA_{df}$ (%) per group/30 days     | 4.71 $\pm$ 2.09      | 0.53 $\pm$ 0.09     | 6.30 $\pm$ 1.95      | 2.10 $\pm$ 0.47     | 85.86 $\pm$ 1.45   | 55.50 $\pm$ 0.12  |
| $CV_{af}$ (cal/g/spec./30 days)     | 31.76 $\pm$ 14.45    | 4.99 $\pm$ 1.15     | 21.71 $\pm$ 21.03    | 1.35 $\pm$ 1.35     | 177.96 $\pm$ 0.63  | 148.88 $\pm$ 1.90 |
| $RCV_{af}$ (cal/spec./30 days)      | 5.27 $\pm$ 2.40      | 1.84 $\pm$ 0.42     | 3.17 $\pm$ 3.07      | 0.51 $\pm$ 0.51     | 290.82 $\pm$ 1.02  | 477.28 $\pm$ 6.10 |
| $E_{fb}$ (J/spec./day)              | 0.73 $\pm$ 0.33      | 0.26 $\pm$ 0.06     | 0.44 $\pm$ 0.43      | 0.07 $\pm$ 0.07     | 40.59 $\pm$ 0.14   | 66.61 $\pm$ 0.85  |

† There were three replicates for each type of food. There were 20 males and females in each group with two replicates (for a total of 240 individuals).