

Round #2

by Cedric Pennetier, 18 Nov 2022 09:49

Manuscript: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.14.476310> version v2

Dear Louise van Oudenhove and authors,

The revised preprint was reviewed by 2 reviewers who agree that the revised draft is very good. One of them suggested a minor revision.

So I invite you to address this last minor concern before recommending your paper.

Thanks you again for your support to PCI.

Cédric Pennetier

AUT > Thank you for this positive feedback. We addressed the reviewer's last concern (see answer below) and modified the manuscript.

Sincerely yours,

Louise van Oudenhove,

in behalf of the authors.

Reviews

Reviewed by Olivier Roux, 14 Sep 2022 14:03

All concerns and suggestions I have made were satisfactorily answered by the authors.

Nevertheless, I still have a minor concern with one point in the "statistical analysis" – "olfactometry bioassays".

To a previous comment, the authors answered: "We do not know individual location, we only have access to the number of individuals in a given zone". In that case, the use of some wording is confusing, such as: "determination of the individuals that stay in their current zone" line 265. This suggests that some identified individuals did not move while it is the number (or proportion) of individuals that has not changed.

The authors should consider slightly rewording this section as well as the corresponding results section.

AUT > We understand the concern. In order to avoid suggesting that we observed the location of the wasps individually, we changed "the individuals that stay" by "the portion of individuals that stay" (L. 265, L. 280 and L. 354) or by "the probability to stay" (L. 277, L. 281) when the current formulation could be misleading.

Reviewed by Angélique Porciani, 15 Sep 2022 09:17

The authors have addressed all my comments and improved the manuscript with a better description of the methods and results and a more complete discussion. I have no supplementary comments.