



Dear Dr. Whiteman,

21<sup>st</sup> May, 2018

Please find attached our revised manuscript, entitled “Haploid selection, sex ratio bias, and transitions between sex-determination systems”. We thank the reviewers and editors for their constructive evaluation on the previous version of this manuscript. In general, these reviews suggested that we have generated some pertinent and novel results regarding a topic that should be of interest to the readership of *PLoS Biology*.

Two major areas were highlighted for improvement: (1) increasing the accessibility of the results and (2) drawing more explicit comparisons with previous work. Accordingly, we have performed a major revision of the main text.

With regard to (1), we have revised according to the suggestions by reviewers 2 and 3. This includes a re-structuring of the Introduction (see Response 2.2 in our response to reviewers), a reduction of unnecessary technical language and a re-structuring of some sections in the Results (see Response 2.3), and highlighted take-home Conclusions (see Response 2.4). In particular, we believe that the style of highlighting our main conclusions will greatly help to communicate the novel and unexpected aspects of our results to a general readership.

These improvements in communication should also help the reader distinguish our results from previous studies, which brings us to improvement (2). In particular, reviewer 3 flagged two modelling studies of turnovers in sex-determination for discussion (Kozielska et al., 2010 and Ubeda et al., 2015), both of which include haploid selection. In this regard, the most important change is the addition of a paragraph in the Introduction that summarizes these results and highlights why our general model is necessary to determine the important forces driving transitions in sex determination. These two studies are then touched upon again in the Results and Discussion, clarifying the differences and increased generality of our conclusions.

We provide a file (diff.pdf) that tracks the changes made between manuscript versions. We also provide a detailed ‘response to reviewers’ file, which has a point-by-point discussion of reviewer comments and the corresponding changes to the manuscript.

Sincerely,

Michael Scott