

Montpellier, May 25st 2022

Dear Dr Paquet,

We thank you and Dr *Szykman Gunther* for your additional comments and your time. We have modified our manuscript to adopt all the suggestions and our responses are detailed in the text below (in red, following each comment).

Kind regards,
Nikolaos Smit



Line 87: perhaps use a more "geographical" terminology as the term "Old World" reflects a colonial perspective.

Thank you for this comment. We have replaced “Old World” by “from the *Cercopithecidae* family”. (L87)

Line 228: please state in the text (as you did in your response to one of my previous comments) that results remained similar when using slightly different thresholds and without using any threshold.

We have now added the sentence “However, we validated that our results remained similar when we used slightly different thresholds (25 or 35 minutes), or no threshold at all.” (L231)

Reviewed by Micaela Szykman Gunther, 21 May 2022 00:28

Lines 152-153: the citation “galbany2014age” is unclear. Is that how one of the variables in the model was named? It’s out of context.

We have now corrected this mistake. (L152)

Lines 153-155: awkward phrasing for describing error

We have rephrased the sentence for clarity (L153).

Line 192: to test if higher-ranking FE males? are preferentially targeted by males?

Indeed, this was a typo. We have now corrected it. (L192)

Line 228: I appreciate longer focal time period of this analysis (30 min, over the previous 5 min)

Our analysis was restricted to dyads observed for at least 30 minutes since the previous version, but we acknowledge that it was probably unclear. Each focal observation in our protocol lasts 5 minutes but for each dyad we pooled focal observations during the relevant period to reach at least 30 min of total

focal duration. This ensures that each dyad included in this analysis has been observed for a minimum amount of observation time.

Line 317: p-values are less intuitive when presented as negative exponents. Suggest $p < 0.001$

We have now rephrased as suggested. (L318)

Line 355: asymmetry is high, AS in mandrills (rather than LIKE in mandrills)

We have now rephrased as suggested. (L356)

References 46 and 59 seems to be missing Journal information.

We have now included Journal information in these two references and we have furthered checked again the reference list for similar omissions.