**Discussion**

Lack of difference between the sexes might indicate several things:

1. Personality traits might not be important for sexual selection in the species represented in our meta-A (i.e. one sex doesn’t benefit from a particularly different optimal personality so both sexes have the same amount of variation)
2. Personality traits, in animals, are often scored around the lowest and highest expression of those traits (i.e. antisocial vs extraverted, docile vs aggressive, shy vs bold, inactive vs active, safe vs explorative). It’s possible that the means for males and females are some average of the two extremes that doesn’t represent the true mean and variation of the population
3. Assortative mating? Maybe males and females prefer to mate with a similar personality so the variation between the sexes remains the same? Not good wording but something to that effect
4. Antipredator or behaviours related to survival (like exploration) experience much stronger selection than other personality traits (where there is no optima), which would explain the strong interaction with sexual size dimorphism

We might see greater male variability in morphological traits, like body size, brain structure and in traits directly related to morphology, like intelligence or cognition (see that chimp paper), but we don’t see such sex differences in behavioural traits ??? This could be explained by behaviours having a complex genetic underpinning (controlled by multiple genes that aren’t sex-linked?) or that personality-like behaviours are important for survival in both sexes so there is no sexual conflict ??? Something like this I guess

Can also mention greater female variability in some traits, like vision (both mice and humans) which might indicate some traits are more beneficial for females to express variation (finding food, seeing predators?) (see Shaqiri *et al*. 2018, and also Suzie’s paper)

BASICALLY:

* We don’t see differences in means or variability in personalities between the sexes, which means that personalities are unlikely to be under sexual selection (in our sample of species), or that personalities are equally variable in the sexes because they are heritable, and trade-off with life-history traits important for survival
* Sexual size dimorphism alone doesn’t moderate sex differences in personalities, which suggests that the greater male variability hypothesis, nor the sex chromosome hypothesis don't apply to animal personalities
  + More relevant for morphological traits than behavioural according to the literature
* Finally, we see strong interactions between SSD and personalities for mammals only, where males are strongly dimorphic, which could relate to Rensch’s rule - in species where males are bigger than females, the size differences between the sexes increases with body size. Indeed, we have several large mammalian species in our dataset with big differences in body sizes. Additionally, as male size increases, female size increases as a result of fecundity and viability selection, so it’s possible that, for mammals at least, using SSD as a proxy for sexual selection actually encompasses 3 different types of selection that might also operate on personality traits… like females and activity (big females need to be more active to get enough food to fuel their big bodies and subsequent offspring), males and aggression (bigger males are often the dominant individual so bigger means more testosterone
* For our significant measures of phylogeny on heterogeneity (I2) for lnCVR in birds and mammals, we can say that this suggests heritability of personality in these groups – heritability measures the degree of phenotypic variation due to genetic (not environmental) variation. This would suggest that variability in personality traits, for birds and mammals, are not driven by environmental conditions but are instead heritable. As such, any sex differences in variability in personalities would be due to heritable variation
* Archer and Mehdikhani (2003) talk about and compare means and variances between males and females for personality-like traits related to sexual selection and unrelated to sexual selection. They found that traits related to sexual selection (directly like physical aggression, or indirectly through a change in reproductive strategy) consistently had significant greater male variability, while traits unrelated to sexual selection had no difference in variability, but often greater female means. *Good paper to relate my main finding that, depending on the context under which a personality trait is measured, there’s likely to be no sex differences in variability! Especially where a trait is related to survival…*
* Potential source of bias in our meta-analysis – most species where sex differences in personality have been recorded are quite sexually dimorphic. Would be interesting to see more species where males and females are monomorphic to see how general our findings are.