**Eye-pinning**

I haven’t run any models, but in our data set all species that do eye-pinning are mimics. It also seems that it’s the larger species that are more likely to be observed for eye-pinning (smaller are NA), but this is likely because the eye is larger? Anyway, before I put this in a model, I would need to have some idea of what is theorized to predict what in this context.

**Sociality – no afr**

Here I’m struggling a bit. Sociality has very high uncertainty, also after removing AFR from the model. It could have a very strong effect, or non at all. Or maybe something is wrong in the model (but I haven’t figured out what, and it does converge nicely). See below.



**Ground**

There is no effect of whether or not a species forages on the ground.

**Second data set – repertoire size (total number of mimics)**

There is no clear effect of body, relative brain or longevity in the first model. There is a strong random effect of species, which means that species are relatively stable in how many mimics they can do.



**Second data set – mimic quality**

A bit trickier, but I figured out how to run it as ordered categorical variable: low – moderate – high.

The results for longevity, body size and brain size are a bit surprising. There might be some serious confounding going on (and the model is very complex, so maybe I made a mistake), but it looks as if brain size has a strong negative effect. Longevity and body size both have a positive effect.



As expected, having a template present increased the quality.



Also having a human present improves quality. However, this is probability because the human provides a template, since this effect is not present when both are included.

