

Title	Exploring the hidden landscape of female preferences for complex signals
Authors	Reichert, Michael S.;Finck, Jonas;Ronacher, Bernhard
Publication date	2017-03-01
Original Citation	Reichert, M. S., Finck, J. and Ronacher, B. (2017) 'Exploring the hidden landscape of female preferences for complex signals', <i>Evolution</i> , 71(4), pp. 1009–1024. doi:10.1111/evo.13202
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.51g4t/1 - 10.1111/evo.13202
Rights	© 2017 The Authors. <i>Evolution</i> © 2017 The Society for the Study of Evolution. - https://authorservices.wiley.com/author-resources/Journal-Authors/licensing-and-open-access/licensing/onlineopen-without-a-creative-commons-license.html
Download date	2023-09-29 00:14:41
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/3973



UCC

University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

1 Table S1: Description of all of the experimental stimuli. For definitions of variables, see Methods and Fig. 1 in main text. *n* is the
2 sample size of females tested with the set of stimuli referred to on each row. For each row, all factorial combinations of stimuli were
3 tested. Additional controls that were tested for all trials within an experiment are listed at the bottom row of each experiment. In
4 Experiments 1 and 3, in a given experimental session, females were only tested with 2 of the appendage durations, the durations that
5 were paired together are therefore listed on separate rows. Females may have been tested with other sets of stimuli in subsequent
6 testing sessions. ‘Base song’ refers to the simple calling song stimulus without an appendage.

7

8

	Base song	Appendage type	Appendage durations (ms)	Appendage delays (ms)	Appendage positions	Base song SPL (dB)	<i>n</i>
Exp.				8, 32, 64, 100, 200,			
1	Standard	Noise	10, 20	300, 400	leading, lagging	70	20
				8, 32, 64, 100, 200,			
	Standard	Noise	40, 80	300, 400	leading, lagging	70	20
				8, 32, 64, 100, 200,			
	Standard	Noise	120, 200	300, 400	leading, lagging	70	20

				8, 32, 64, 100, 200,			
Standard	Noise	300, 400		300, 400	leading, lagging	70	20
				8, 32, 64, 100, 200,			
Standard	Noise	500, 600		300, 400	leading, lagging	70	16
				8, 32, 64, 100, 200,			
Standard	Noise	700, 800		300, 400	leading, lagging	70	17

*Additional controls for all trials of Experiment 1: 3240 ms noise, silence, standard song with no appendage, the two appendages with no base song

Exp.

2	Shortened	Noise	10, 80, 200, 400, 800		200	leading, lagging	64	29
----------	-----------	-------	-----------------------	--	-----	------------------	----	----

*Additional controls for all trials of Experiment 2: 3240 ms noise, standard song with no appendage, shortened song with no appendage, 4 attractive synthetic calling songs

Exp.

				8, 32, 64, 100, 200,				
3	Gappy	Noise	10, 20		300, 400	leading, lagging	70	17

				8, 32, 64, 100, 200,			
Gappy	Noise	40, 80		300, 400	leading, lagging	70	16
				8, 32, 64, 100, 200,			
Gappy	Noise	120, 200		300, 400	leading, lagging	70	17
				8, 32, 64, 100, 200,			
Gappy	Noise	300, 400		300, 400	leading, lagging	70	17

*Additional controls for all trials of Experiment 3: 3240 ms noise, silence, standard song with no appendage, the two appendages with no base song, 4 attractive synthetic calling songs

Exp.	Synthetic <i>C. b.</i>						
4	Standard	<i>hedickei</i>	810	200	leading, lagging	64	34
	Standard	Synthetic <i>C. brunneus</i>	690	200	leading, lagging	64	34
	Standard	Synthetic <i>C. mollis</i>	600	200	leading, lagging	64	34
		Natural <i>C. b. hedickei</i>					
	Standard	exemplar 1	1936	200	leading, lagging	64	34
	Standard	Natural <i>C. b. hedickei</i>	450	200	leading, lagging	64	34

	exemplar 2						
	Natural <i>C. b. hedickei</i>						
Standard	exemplar 3	1957	200		leading, lagging	64	34
	Synthetic <i>C. b.</i>						
Shortened	<i>hedickei</i>	810	200		leading, lagging	64	29
Shortened	Synthetic <i>C. brunneus</i>	690	200		leading, lagging	64	29
Shortened	Synthetic <i>C. mollis</i>	600	200		leading, lagging	64	29
	Natural <i>C. b. hedickei</i>						
Shortened	exemplar 1	1936	200		leading, lagging	64	34
	Natural <i>C. b. hedickei</i>						
Shortened	exemplar 2	450	200		leading, lagging	64	34
	Natural <i>C. b. hedickei</i>						
Shortened	exemplar 3	1957	200		leading, lagging	64	34

*Additional controls for Experiment 4: 3240 ms noise, standard song with no appendage, shortened song with no appendage, heterospecific appendages without base song, 4 attractive synthetic calling songs

10 Table S2: Details of the natural *C. b. hedickei* appendage stimuli used in Experiment 4. The
 11 natural *C. b. hedickei* appendage stimuli were obtained from recordings kindly provided by
 12 Frieder Meyer, Museum für Naturkunde, Berlin. To generate the stimuli used for playbacks,
 13 these recordings were digitized, and the amplitude envelope of the digitized natural appendage
 14 was then extracted and filled with filtered white noise (4.0-40 kHz) using custom software
 15 provided by R. Matthias Hennig.

16

Stimulus	Recording Location	Recording		
		Temperature (°C)	Date	Recorded by:
Natural exemplar 1	Hungary, Budapest, Szechenyi-mountain	unknown	unknown	unknown
Natural exemplar 2	Kosovo, Sar planina	23-24	28-31 July 1979	K.-G. Heller & M. Volleth
Natural exemplar 3	Slovakia	32	07 August 2004	F. Mayer

17

18 Table S3: Results of generalized linear mixed models testing effects of appendage and song characteristics on the absolute proportion
19 of response to each stimulus. In the main text, our graphical presentations and statistical analyses were based on measures of the
20 differences between the female's response to each complex appendage stimulus and its response to the corresponding simple stimulus
21 (either the standard or shortened song, depending on the experiment). Here, we present the results of analyses of the absolute response
22 data, not taken in reference to any particular stimulus. We measured a female's response as the proportion of presentations of a given
23 stimulus to which she gave a response song out of the total number of presentations of that stimulus. We analyzed these data
24 statistically using generalized linear mixed models. The response variable was a list containing the number of stimulus presentations
25 in which the female responded and a term for the total number of times a female was exposed to that stimulus. This was modeled as a
26 binomial variable (logit link function) using the glmer function in the lme4 package (version 1.1-10; Bates et al. 2015) in R 3.2.2
27 software (R development Core Team, 2015). Otherwise, models were constructed and assessed using the same procedures described
28 for the analyses in the main text. Only the final models after the removal of non-significant higher-order interaction terms (see text for
29 details) are shown here. Fixed effects refer to characteristics of appendages, except for song duration, which refers to the duration of
30 the song itself and was modeled as a categorical fixed effect with two levels (standard and shortened song, standard is the reference
31 category). Position is modeled as a categorical fixed effect with two levels (lagging and leading appendage position, lagging is the
32 reference category). Significant *P* values are highlighted in bold.

33

34


Experiment	Fixed effect	Parameter estimate (\pm SE)	z	P
1. Noise appendage, standard song	Intercept	0.45 ± 0.11	4.1	<0.001
	Duration	$-4.08 \times 10^{-4} \pm 1.95 \times 10^{-4}$	-2.1	0.03
	Delay	$-6.58 \times 10^{-4} \pm 3.62 \times 10^{-4}$	-1.8	0.07
	Position	$0.060 \pm .045$	1.34	0.18
	Duration ²	$-3.05 \times 10^{-7} \pm 2.47 \times 10^{-7}$	-1.24	0.22
	Delay ²	$1.90 \times 10^{-7} \pm 8.64 \times 10^{-7}$	0.22	0.83
	Duration \times delay	$7.17 \times 10^{-7} \pm 2.42 \times 10^{-7}$	3.0	0.003
	Duration \times position	$-2.44 \times 10^{-3} \pm 2.45 \times 10^{-4}$	-10.0	<0.001
	Delay \times position	$-1.59 \times 10^{-3} \pm 5.07 \times 10^{-4}$	-3.1	0.002
	Duration ² \times position	$1.34 \times 10^{-6} \pm 3.19 \times 10^{-7}$	4.2	<0.001
	Delay ² \times position	$3.11 \times 10^{-6} \pm 1.24 \times 10^{-6}$	2.5	0.012
2. Noise appendage, shortened song	Intercept	-0.528 ± 0.214	-2.5	0.014
	Duration	0.015 ± 0.044	0.34	0.74
	Position	-0.895 ± 0.069	-13.0	<0.001

	Duration × position	-0.392 ± 0.071	-5.5	<0.001
3. Noise appendage, gappy song	Intercept	-3.2 ± 0.28	-11.4	<0.001
	Duration	$8.20 \times 10^{-3} \pm 7.61 \times 10^{-4}$	10.8	<0.001
	Delay	$-7.30 \times 10^{-4} \pm 5.27 \times 10^{-4}$	-1.4	0.17
	Position	$-1.23 \times 10^{-2} \pm 7.82 \times 10^{-2}$	-0.16	0.88
	Duration ²	$-1.99 \times 10^{-5} \pm 1.87 \times 10^{-6}$	-10.6	<0.001
	Delay ²	$2.03 \times 10^{-6} \pm 1.25 \times 10^{-6}$	1.6	0.11
	Duration × position	$-2.88 \times 10^{-3} \pm 1.02 \times 10^{-3}$	-2.82	0.005
	Delay × position	$-9.42 \times 10^{-4} \pm 2.55 \times 10^{-4}$	-3.69	<0.001
	Duration ² × position	$5.27 \times 10^{-6} \pm 2.59 \times 10^{-6}$	2.04	0.04
4. Synthetic heterospecific appendage	Intercept	0.579 ± 0.227	2.6	0.011
	Species (<i>C. b. hedickei</i>)	-0.073 ± 0.230	-0.3	0.75
	Species (<i>C. mollis</i>)	0.118 ± 0.119	1.0	0.32
	Position	-1.07 ± 0.12	-8.97	<0.001
	Song duration	-1.20 ± 0.33	-3.6	<0.001

	Position x song duration	-0.313 ± 0.152	-2.1	0.039
	Position x species (<i>C. b. hedickei</i>)	0.323 ± 0.205	1.6	0.11
	Position x species (<i>C. mollis</i>)	-0.068 ± 0.146	-0.5	0.64
	Song duration x species (<i>C. b. hedickei</i>)	0.272 ± 0.200	1.4	0.17
	Song duration x species (<i>C. mollis</i>)	-0.060 ± 0.147	-0.41	0.68
5. Natural <i>C. b. hedickei</i> appendage	Intercept	1.31 ± 0.19	6.9	<0.001
	Exemplar 2	-0.464 ± 0.116	-4.0	<0.001
	Exemplar 3	-0.574 ± 0.116	-5.0	<0.001
	Position	-0.405 ± 0.109	-3.7	<0.001
	Song duration	-1.09 ± 0.11	-10.1	<0.001
	Position × song duration	0.486 ± 0.106	4.6	<0.001
	Position × exemplar 2	-0.046 ± 0.130	-0.4	0.72
	Position × exemplar 3	0.071 ± 0.130	0.5	0.58
	Song duration × exemplar 2	-0.166 ± 0.130	-1.3	0.20
	Song duration × exemplar 3	-0.196 ± 0.130	-1.5	0.13

36 Figure S1: Responses of females in Experiment 1 to complex songs with noise appendages of
37 varying duration, appended to the standard song stimulus. Appendages were placed either after
38 the song (lagging appendages, open circles) or before the song (leading appendages, filled
39 circles) with a delay of 8 ms. Each point shows the mean of the differences between each
40 female's response to the complex stimulus with the appendage duration indicated by the x-axis
41 value, and its response to the standard song, which had no appendage. Female response was
42 measured as the proportion of stimulus repetitions to which she emitted a response song. Error
43 bars represent 95% confidence intervals of the mean. Sample sizes are given in Table S1. Lines
44 are cubic splines calculated from general additive models on the mean response values (see
45 Methods, main text, for more details) to enable visualisation of the shape of the preference
46 functions for appendage duration. The smoothing parameter was selected using the model
47 algorithm with the constraint that it must be greater than 0.05. Solid line, leading appendages;
48 dashed line, lagging appendages.

49




50

51

52

53 Figure S2: Responses of females in Experiment 1 to complex songs with noise appendages of
54 varying duration, appended to the standard song stimulus with a delay of 32 ms. Interpretation
55 as in Figure S1.




56

57

58


59 Figure S3: Responses of females in Experiment 1 to complex songs with noise appendages of
60 varying duration, appended to the standard song stimulus with a delay of 64 ms. Interpretation
61 as in Figure S1.



62

63


64 Figure S4: Responses of females in Experiment 1 to complex songs with noise appendages of
65 varying duration, appended to the standard song stimulus with a delay of 100 ms. Interpretation
66 as in Figure S1.



67

68

69 Figure S5: Responses of females in Experiment 1 to complex songs with noise appendages of
70 varying duration, appended to the standard song stimulus with a delay of 200 ms. Interpretation
71 as in Figure S1.




72

73

74


75 Figure S6: Responses of females in Experiment 1 to complex songs with noise appendages of
76 varying duration, appended to the standard song stimulus with a delay of 300 ms. Interpretation
77 as in Figure S1.



78

79

80 Figure S7: Responses of females in Experiment 1 to complex songs with noise appendages of
81 varying duration, appended to the standard song stimulus with a delay of 400 ms. Interpretation
82 as in Figure S1.




83

84

85


86 Figure S8: Responses of females to the noise appendage stimuli. For these stimuli, the noise
87 appendage was presented in isolation, without any base calling song. Dotted line represents
88 response to the negative control, a 3.24 s noise stimulus ($n = 180$). Numbers above bars indicate
89 sample sizes (this figure combines data from females in Experiments 1 and 3 because these
90 stimuli were presented to females in both experiments). Bar height represents mean response (the
91 mean proportion of stimulus repetitions to which females emitted a response song); error bars
92 represent 95% confidence intervals of the mean. Sample sizes are given in Table S1.



93

94


95 Figure S9: Responses of females in Experiment 3 to complex songs with noise appendages of
96 varying duration, appended to the gappy song stimulus with a delay of 8 ms. Interpretation as in
97 Figure S1. Sample sizes are given in Table S1.



98

99


100 Figure S10: Responses of females in Experiment 3 to complex songs with noise appendages of
101 varying duration, appended to the gappy song stimulus with a delay of 32 ms. Interpretation as
102 in Figure S1. Sample sizes are given in Table S1.



103

104


105 Figure S11: Responses of females in Experiment 3 to complex songs with noise appendages of
106 varying duration, appended to the gappy song stimulus with a delay of 64 ms. Interpretation as
107 in Figure S1. Sample sizes are given in Table S1.



108

109


110 Figure S12: Responses of females in Experiment 3 to complex songs with noise appendages of
111 varying duration, appended to the gappy song stimulus with a delay of 100 ms. Interpretation as
112 in Figure S1. Sample sizes are given in Table S1.



113

114


115 Figure S13: Responses of females in Experiment 3 to complex songs with noise appendages of
116 varying duration, appended to the gappy song stimulus with a delay of 200 ms. Interpretation as
117 in Figure S1. Sample sizes are given in Table S1.



118

119


120 Figure S14: Responses of females in Experiment 3 to complex songs with noise appendages of
121 varying duration, appended to the gappy song stimulus with a delay of 300 ms. Interpretation as
122 in Figure S1. Sample sizes are given in Table S1.



123

124

125 Figure S15: Responses of females in Experiment 3 to complex songs with noise appendages of
126 varying duration, appended to the gappy song stimulus with a delay of 400 ms. Interpretation as
127 in Figure S1. Sample sizes are given in Table S1.




128

129

130 Figure S16: Responses of females in Experiment 4 to the heterospecific appendage stimuli. For
131 these stimuli, the appendage was presented in isolation, without any base calling song. Dotted
132 line represents the average response to the negative control, a 3.24 s noise stimulus ($n = 63$).
133 Numbers above bars indicate sample sizes. Otherwise, interpretation of figure as in Figure S8
134 and Figure 5 in main text.

135

136



137

138

139

140