

Montpellier, May 31<sup>st</sup> 2022

Dear Dr Paquet,

Thank you for your last comment and for already preparing the recommendation. We have modified our manuscript and figure 1c according to your suggestions. Please find our answer below in red.

Kind regards,  
Nikolaos Smit



In Figure 1c the occurrence of copulations is shown on the x axis and the aggression rate on the y axis. Similarly in the text lines 303-305, you present the mean aggression rate of dyads that copulated vs dyads that did not. Yet, what was tested (and is indeed correct) is whether aggression rate statistically explained the probability to copulate later on, not the other way round. Therefore I feel that a figure showing copulation rate on the y axis as a function of aggression rate on the x axis would better illustrate the analysis (even if it may not look as "nice" as copulation is a binary variable. Similarly, it would be more relevant and adequate given the test performed to provide in the text was the expected copulation probability was for dyads with no aggression vs dyads with an aggression rate of e.g 1 per hour (or another more biologically relevant rate).

Indeed, figure 1c included the relevant response variable (copulation probability) on the x-axis. We realize it was probably confusing for readers. We have now replaced the violin plot with a scatter plot including a regression line. Y-axis represents the predicted probability of copulation within a heterosexual dyad and x-axis represents the corresponding male aggression rate towards the female.

In addition, we now present in the main text the average number of copulation per observation time of dyads with no male aggression vs. dyads with male aggression rate higher than 0.1 (i.e. dyads where the male assaulted the females at least 0.1 times per hour). L 303-305