

The paper is extremely well-written and conveys complex evolutionary ecological ideas in an easy-to-follow manner. Some of the treatment combinations have low replication that limits the interpretation of some of the results. Nevertheless, I found the thought processes explaining the findings and their placement within the various ecological theories valuable and exceptional. I only have minor comments.

## Comments

### Abstract

Line 30: I would spell out which species (*A. marmorata*) evolved a colonizer lifestyle. At first read I was a bit confused. It has become clear on 2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> read but better to include the species name here.

### Introduction

Line 81: then be envisaged “on the resident species”. Similarly as in the abstract I had to reread a few sentences to clarify whether these predictions refer to the invader or the native species.

Line 103: between

Line 120: delete (iii) “is”

Line 121: These 3 main hypotheses (two typos)

Line 141: at ‘the’ invasion front

Line 142: confronted “by”

Line 145: the same set of populations as used by Chapuis et al. 2017? Please specify.

Table 1. (iii). The predictions here are a bit confusing. Maybe saying (or less) and (or lower) in the parentheses would help to clarify that the predictions can be in opposite directions.

Line 215: individuals

Line 395: addressed.

Line 397: over the resident

Line 405: “in the latter” what? Trait or species? Please clarify

420: adults of *P. acuta*

428: environment