Klosterneuburg, 24th October, 2018

Dear Marianne Elias,

In the revised manuscript we made the minor revisions asked by Thomas Broquet, and we followed the additional modifications indicated by Thomas Guillemaud.

With best regards,

Christelle Fraïsse
Postdoctoral FWF Fellow,
+33 (0)6 69 55 20 85
christelle.fraisse@ist.ac.at

On behalf of all authors.
Decision
by Marianne Elias, 2018-10-15 08:12
Manuscript: https://doi.org/10.1101/239244 version 3
Fraisse et al.: recommendation pending minor changes

Dear Dr Fraisse,

I am pleased to announce that, after assessment of your revised version by the two referees, we will recommend your paper, pending minor revisions asked by Thomas Broquet. Both referees acknowledge major improvements in this version, so congratulations for the good job! Best regards,

Marianne Elias

Thanks for this decision.

Reviews

Reviewed by Tatiana Giraud, 2018-10-01 19:05

The authors have done a great job in addressing the previous comments, with extensive work on the text and new analyses, and I can only congratulate them for this nice piece of work.

We thank you for this positive statement.

Reviewed by Thomas Broquet, 2018-10-01 19:08

I have no further major criticisms or comments on this much clearer version of the manuscript. I list below a few minor points that caught my attention.

Thanks for these additional comments, we answered to all of them.

Most importantly, I struggled to understand the notions of ancient and recent incomplete lineage sorting (even with the explanations provided in the authors' responses to reviewers' comments). I think this point should be clarified.

We now clarified this point in the Introduction.

L. 21: replace "connectivity" with "genetic connectivity" (?)

This has been done.

L. 23: "introgression clines confounded with local adaptation": revise wording (a pattern cannot be confounded with a process).

This has been corrected.
L. 39: "admixture variation": this verbal shortcut is unclear
This has been changed.

L. 58-59: I'm not sure to completely follow the difference between points i) and ii)
Point (i) implies that there is an active effect of the environment on connectivity, while this is not the case in point (ii) where environmental variables happen to coincide with the barrier to gene flow.

L. 117-132: is this long résumé of the results really necessary in the introduction?
Given the various methods and types of data that we employed, we think it will be valuable for the reader to have a summary of the results at the end of the Introduction.

L. 141: comprises
This has been corrected.

L. 238: If this is not already in there (I did not check), I would add a figure presenting these different models in sup mat.
We now added additional panels on Figure S1 to present the different demographic models implemented in ∂a∂i.

L. 372: the least supported
This has been corrected.

L. 467: wrong italicization
This has been corrected.

L. 581: "another caveat". Where is the first caveat?
This has been corrected.