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Revised manuscript

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   YES
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   YES
3. Are the data sound?
   YES, but some parts of the results are confusing.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   YES
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   YES
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   YES
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   YES
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   YES
9. Is the writing acceptable?
   NO, there are still obvious typographical and grammatical mistakes.

Some comments

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

-
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. The legend of figure 1 is missing in the revised manuscript.
2. The use of roman or arabic numerals in the identification of the tables must be standardized (Table II/2 p.9).
3. The four panels A, B, C and D of figure 2 must be mentioned in the text (p.9).
4. Some parts are missing in the text (p.9: ...(F statistics) values; p.12: but..... The protective advantage)

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

5. In the different panels of figure 2, the allele and genotype frequencies on the Y-axis (generations=0) still differ from the values mentioned in the text. I don't understand this point. Could I have an explanation on this point?

In conclusion, the quality of the manuscript has improved but the presentation of the results need to be revised again with more accuracy.
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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