Other comments:

Thanks for including me on this. Please find my thoughts and suggestions on the manuscript. I did some editing, which (as always) you can ignore or alter as you wish... Solid effort in explaining all of this freaking hard lab work you had to do! Also, the figures are great! One thing I think could use a bit more detail is in the introduction. Specifically I feel the significance of why a reader should care about GCs (and really CORT) was glossed over and didn’t really link to your predictions/hypothesis. I think there is room to do this. I also think the discussion should start with your ‘key findings’: i.e. counter to your predictions, learning for both species was robust to developmental environments! This is pretty cool, and the ecological outcomes of this are a fascinating topic to discuss further!

Here are my major suggestions:

1. Break the paragraph on CORT and temp effects on learning in the intro into two paragraphs. Currently the intro only has three paragraphs and it seems reasonable to have a paragraph on how developmental cort can affect learning and a second paragraph about how temp can affect learning (include interactive effects in that paragraph). CORT and temp seem like very different things unless they are explicitly linked. There is a place later in the discussion where you could clarify this link
2. In the discussion: We know that the high dose of CORT does NOT result in lifelong changes to baseline CORT. We actually don't know if that's true for juveniles, but, assuming it is true, we could discuss the results in terms of programmatic versus activational effects. Essentially, we know that the effects Pablo describes are NOT due to elevated levels of baseline CORT in juveniles (activational effects). Therefore, if there had been effects, they would have been due to programmatic effects of CORT treatment (permanent neuro effects that happen during development). This is a potentially exciting way to talk about the results because it could explain discrepancies across studies due to hormone doses. I've flagged the paragraph in the discussion where this could be added.
3. Consistency in word choice is helpful for readers. You often use multiple terms for things. For example "blue condition", "blue ramps", "blue feeders." We all do this, but it's much easier for your reader to follow if you use consistent terms throughout.
4. Simplify language when possible. Some of the word choice is a bit fancy when simple words would do. This is also something we all do and something that I imagine is more tricky when writing in your non-native language! For example, at the end of the intro you have a prediction "We predicted that individuals exposed to high levels of CORT or low temperatures will perform less proficiently..." I've suggested in the text that you change the underlined words to "learn slower." It can feel awkward to use simple terms like that, but it makes it easier for your reader!