Does habitat specialization shape the evolutionary potential of wild bird populations?

Martinossi-Allibert I.^{1,2} imartinossi@gmail.com

Clavel J.^{1,3} joanne.clavel@gmail.com

Ducatez S.⁴ simon.ducatez@gmail.com

Le Viol I.¹ ileviol@mnhn.fr

Teplitsky C.¹ celine.TEPLITSKY@cefe.cnrs.fr

¹ Centre pour les Sciences de la conservation, UMR7204 CNRS / MNHN / UPMC

² Department of Ecology and Genetics, Evolutionary Biology Center, University of Uppsala, Sweden

³ Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management, University of California, Berkeley, USA

⁴ School of Biological Sciences, University of Sydney, NSW 2006 Australia

Running title: Specialization and evolutionary potential.

Type of article: Research paper **Abstract:** 156 words, **Main text:** 4127 words. **References:** 57, **Table count:** 3, **Figures count:** 2.

To whom correspondence should be sent:

Ivain Martinossi-Allibert, imartinossi@gmail.com, 01 40 79 57 38

Author contributions: C.T, I.L, J.C designed the project. C.T. and I.M. collected genetic data and performed statistical analyzes. S.D provided specialization data. I.M wrote the first draft of the manuscript and all authors contributed substantially to revisions.

Abstract

Because specialist species evolved in more temporally and spatially homogeneous environments than generalist species, they are supposed to experience less fluctuating selection. For this reason, we expect specialists to show lower overall genetic variation as compared to generalists. We also expect populations from specialist species to be smaller and more fragmented, with lower neutral genetic diversity. We tested these hypotheses by investigating patterns of genetic diversity along a habitat specialization gradient in wild birds, based on estimates of heritability, coefficients of variation of additive genetic variance, and heterozygosity available in the literature. We found no significant effect of habitat specialization on any of the quantitative genetic estimators but generalists had higher heterozygosity. This effect was mainly a consequence of the larger population size of generalists. Our results suggest that evolutionary potential does not differ at the population level between generalist and specialist species, but the trend observed in heterozygosity levels and population sizes may explain their difference in susceptibility to extinction.

Keywords: heritability; additive genetic variance; neutral diversity; individual specialization; niche width

Introduction

Native specialist species are becoming less abundant in disturbed landscape to the benefit of generalist species (Shultz et al. 2005, Le Viol et al. 2012). There is some evidence that climate (Davey et al. 2013) and land use (Devictor et al. 2008a, b) changes are driving this decline of specialization in wild communities, leading to a functional biotic homogenization (Clavel et al. 2011). The higher sensitivity of specialists to global changes is expected to result from their narrower ecological niche, which is associated with smaller and more fragmented populations, more vulnerable to the destruction of their habitat. The persistence of species will ultimately depend upon two mechanisms: range shift or adaptation to environmental changes, through phenotypic plasticity or microevolution (Lynch and Lande 1993). Anthropogenic changes are now considered as the greatest evolutionary force (Palumbi 2001, Steffen et al. 2011) and it therefore becomes crucial to determine how specialist and generalist species differ in their ability to respond to these changes. Assessing whether generalist and specialist species differ in terms of evolutionary potential should give valuable information on their respective ability to defer extinction through evolution.

The two alternative strategies (specialist vs generalist) are generally thought to arise depending on fitness trade-offs between alternate phenotypes across environments (Richmond et al. 2005, Poisot et al. 2011): spatially and temporally variable environments should favour generalist strategies, because generalists can achieve higher average performance than specialists across multiple environments. In turn, stable environments should favour specialists which are able to exploit more efficiently a single resource (see Moran 1992 for theoretical evidence, and Kassen 2002 for experimental evidence). Expressed in terms of selection pressures, heterogeneous environments generate fluctuating selection, while in a homogeneous or stable environment, selection is more likely to be stabilising, or persistently directional (Keightley and Hill 1988). Additionally, generalist strategies may become less

profitable under high levels of local stabilizing selection, because trade-offs for the performance in different niches become accordingly strong (Svardal et al. 2014). Specialists can therefore be expected to evolve under stronger and more consistent selection pressures that could deplete overall genetic variability. In contrast, the exposure of generalists to a variety of environments, and to spatially and temporally fluctuating selection, could help maintain a higher genetic diversity. For these reasons, we expect to find higher evolutionary potential in generalist species than in specialist ones, which could partly explain the highest sensitivity of specialists to environmental changes.

Only a scarce number of empirical studies support this prediction so far. Hägele and Rowell-Rahier (2000) showed in a herbivorous insect genera that host specialist species have a lower heritability (and thus a lower evolutionary potential) of growth rate than host generalists. A review of selection experiments in bacteria by Kassen (2002) also suggests that environmental heterogeneity may be driving both the quantity of genetic variation in a population and the niche width of individuals, resulting in the evolution of generalists and the maintenance of genetic variation in heterogeneous environments. However, the link between specialization and evolutionary potential is largely unknown in wild populations.

Here, we review available estimates of evolutionary potential in relation to habitat specialisation and population size in wild bird populations. As emphasised in the univariate breeder's equation, $R = h^2 S$ (Lande 1979), the predicted evolutionary response (R) depends on the selection gradient (S) and on the evolutionary potential of a trait, measured as its heritability (h^2 , the ratio between the amount of genetic additive variance and total phenotypic variance). We thus mainly focused on estimates of heritability and additive genetic variance as they also represent the most widely reported estimates of evolutionary potential for quantitative traits (Postma 2014). We predict higher genetic variance for generalist species (heritability,

hereafter h^2 , and the additive genetic coefficient of variation, hereafter CV_A , are the two standardized estimates of genetic variance we used).

We also reviewed estimates of heterozygosity (hereafter H_z), a widely available measure of genetic diversity known to depend on demographic processes such as inbreeding level, drift and population size (Soulé 1976, Frankham et al. 2002). H_z is not a direct estimator of evolutionary potential, as it does not relate to additive genetic variance, but rather a proxy for overall genetic diversity, which is often considered in conservation study as an indicator of population health. More specifically, H_z has been correlated with extinction risks (Evans and Sheldon 2008) and population fitness (Reed and Frankham 2003). On this topic again, little empirical work can be found, but a study carried out on the bark beetle (Kelley et al. 2000) indicated that specialist sister-species indeed had reduced levels of H_z when compared to generalist ones. Simply because of a narrower ecological niche, specialist species have access to a more limited range of habitats than generalist ones. For this reason, populations of specialists may be smaller and more fragmented which is likely to negatively impact genetic diversity by limiting effective population size and gene flow (Whitlock and Barton 1997). We therefore predict that specialists should have lower H_z than generalists, mainly as a result of smaller population size.

Material & Methods

Data collection

Habitat specialization indexes

Assessing specialization by categorizing habitat types has been criticized as too subjective and unrealistic (Bazzaz 1991, Thompson et al. 1998, Fridley et al. 2007). Therefore, we used two different indices based on independent methods: The Species Specialization Index (SSI), as defined by Julliard et al. (2006) and the relative niche width measurement (θ) as introduced in plants by Fridley et al (2007) and in birds by Ducatez et al. (2014). Both indices use different approaches and are therefore not strongly correlated, but rather represent the diversity of methods available to measure habitat specialisation.

The SSI is defined as the coefficient of variation of a species abundance across a set of predefined habitats (Julliard et al. 2004). A high SSI thus implies that a species abundance varies strongly across habitats. Specialist species have higher values of SSI, generalists have lower values. SSI was calculated for 234 species at the European scale, the territory being partitioned into 98 habitat categories defined in the EUNIS database (see Le Viol et al., 2012 for details). Affinity of each species for nesting and foraging in a given habitat is coded by experts on three levels (3: primary habitats; 2: secondary; 1: others). Note that because the coefficient of variation is the standard deviation scaled to the mean, SSI does not depend on population size.

The niche width (θ) is based on the expectation that a generalist species occurs in a range of habitat categories that vary considerably in species composition, whereas a specialist species is found in habitats that contain a consistent suite of other species. The idea of using the compositional diversity of species that co-occur with a target species to measure the degree of specialization was introduced by Colwell and Futuyma (1971). Specialist species have lower values of θ , generalists have higher values. To avoid a bias due to differences in species range, this index is based on habitat co-occurrence (rather than realized species co-

occurrence), meaning that two species that occupy the same habitat type in different places are considered as co-occurring, even if their range does not overlap, e.g. this avoids island species to be automatically considered as specialists. The niche width was estimated using species co-occurrence data within each of the 82 IUCN habitat subcategories, and considering all extant 9870 species listed by the IUCN (see Ducatez et al., 2014 for details). For a given species, habitat width was measured as $\theta = \gamma / \mu(\alpha)$, where γ is the cumulative number of species in the habitats used by a given species and $\mu(\alpha)$ is the mean habitat species richness calculated over the different habitats inhabited by that species. This specialization index is positively correlated with population size (Pearson's product-moment correlation $\rho = 0.25$, 95 % Confidence Interval [0.044, 0.43], p-value = 0.02, see supplementary material S1 for the correlation of both specialization indexes with population size).

Habitat specialization was chosen over other available specialization indices as it gathers the greatest number of niche axes in one parameter and is consequently the most integrative. Indeed, temperature and food availability depend on habitat, which makes habitat specialization linked with thermic and food specialization (Barnagaud et al. 2012). Our dataset of quantitative estimates of evolutionary potential (i.e. quantitative genetic parameters) includes species that cover a range of 3.1 in SSI (from 2.3 to 5.4) and of 6.4 in niche width (from 1.58 to 8), and the neutral diversity data (i.e. Hz) covers a range of 4.6 in SSI (from 2.3 to 6.9) and of 10.6 in niche width (from 1 to 10.6), when the total range available for SSI is 8, ranging from 1.8 to 9.9 and the total range for niche width is 13.54, ranging from 1 to 14.54. The distributions of both specialization index for each of our datasets can be found in supplementary figure S2.

Population size

Information on local population size was not available so the population size data we used was extracted from the BirdLife International website in May 2014 (<http://www.birdlife.org/>). Population sizes correspond to the total number of individuals in the world according to the censuses published by BirdLife (2005, 2008).

Quantitative data: heritability and coefficient of additive genetic variance

We chose the bird taxon because it gathers the greatest number of quantitative estimators across all taxa (Postma, 2014). In order to gather estimates of evolutionary potential (h^2 and CV_A) in bird populations, we performed a search in the *Web Of Knowledge* research engine. We used the key-words: Topic= (« bird* ») AND (« heritabil* » OR « genetic* estimate* ») and the search was performed in February 2013. When studies aimed at quantifying the response of quantitative parameters to different environmental conditions (e.g. food quality), only parameters estimated under natural conditions were used. These references were further checked against the list gathered by Postma (2014), in order to maximize the number of references providing estimates of heritability and coefficients of additive genetic variance. h^2 and CV_{AS} can be estimated with two different methods: the parent offspring regression and the animal model. The former is the earliest method and has been used since the end of the 19th century. It estimates heritability by the phenotypic correlation between parents and offspring (Lynch and Walsh 1998). The latter, the *animal model*, has been applied in ecology for merely more than a decade. The animal model is a mixed model using information about relatedness among individuals to infer the part of phenotypic variance due to additive genetic variance (Henderson 1973, Kruuk 2004). Because parent offspring regression may overestimate heritability (shared environments increase the resemblance between parents and offspring), the method used to estimate quantitative parameters was specified in our dataset and subsequent analyses.

Only life-history and morphological traits (See supplementary material, table S3 for trait classification) were kept, as for behavioural traits the type of traits were extremely heterogeneous and for physiological traits, data were available for only four traits from two studies. We considered here that pooling heritabilities or CV_A s from different traits measured in a population is relevant, as we were not looking for an accurate estimate of evolutionary potential, but for an estimate of the general level of additive genetic variance in the population. Both h^2 and CV_A represent standardised measures of additive genetic variance, respectively to the total phenotypic variance and to the mean.

Genetic diversity

We used the heterozygosity (Hz) data published by Evans and Sheldon (2008). They collected Hz values measured at microsatellite loci for wild bird species in the literature and used expected Hz because it is less sensitive to sample size (Nei 1978) and the occurrence of null alleles (Callen et al. 1993). When multiple studies were available for one species, Evans & Sheldon (2008) kept the study with the largest sample size and the highest number of microsatellites loci used to estimate Hz. Thus, while the quantitative genetics estimates are available for several populations in some species, the estimates for Hz are only available for one population per species. We used the Hz values for the 54 species that matched our SSI specialization index and for the 183 species in their dataset that matched our estimation of the niche width (θ).

Phylogeny

To account for the non-independence of species, we used species relatedness extracted from phylogenetic trees. Phylogenetic trees were obtained from the website www.birdtree.org that provides subsets of the first complete bird phylogeny (Jetz et al. 2012). Each model was run with 100 alternative trees.

218

219 ***Statistical analyses***

220 To assess the effect of habitat specialization on evolutionary potential (h^2 , CV_A) or neutral
221 genetic diversity (H_z) we used linear mixed models. Ideally, models should include as fixed
222 effects population size (log-transformed) and an estimator of habitat specialization (SSI or
223 niche width Θ). However, for h^2 and CV_A , population size was only available for few species,
224 resulting in a too small sample size to run our models. We thus included population size in
225 models considering H_z but not in models considering h^2 and CV_A . In terms of random
226 variables, a phylogeny effect was included in all models to account for species non-
227 independence.

228 Because of a more complex data structure, analyses of h^2 and CV_A included several additional
229 fixed and random effects compared to models run for heterozygosity. First, we expected
230 systematic differences between certain types of traits (morphological or life history traits,
231 Postma, 2014). Consequently, we added “Type of trait” as a fixed effect in models with two
232 levels, “morphological” and “life-history”. Similarly, as the method used to estimate
233 heritabilities (animal model or parent-offspring regression) entails a systematic difference, we
234 added an “Estimation method” fixed effect in models investigating heritability.

235 Second, h^2 and CV_A estimates are trait and population specific because they are based
236 on observations of some characteristics of individuals sampled from a given population.
237 Therefore it was necessary to include in the models two additional random effects:
238 “population identity” and “trait”, with a nested structure. “Trait” was nested within
239 “population identity” and “population identity” within “phylogeny”. The MCMCglmm R
240 package (Hadfield 2013) does not model nested effects, but the variables were designed in
241 order to account for this nested structure: each species/population/trait combination was given
242 a unique ID allowing to take into account each level in a meaningful way (phylogeny

(species), population within species, trait within population within species). Some species (e.g. *Fulica atra*) were represented by one estimator for only one population when others (e.g. *Passer domesticus*) were represented by multiple populations, and multiple traits for each population. The random effects “population identity” and “trait” allow taking this lack of balance into account.

Finally, the standard error associated with heritability estimates was included as a random effect to account for measurement error. Unfortunately, this was not possible with CV_A , due to the paucity of errors reported, nor with heterozygosity for which standard errors were not available. The random effects were assumed to follow normal distributions with a mean of 0 and a variance equal to $\sigma_a^2 \mathbf{A}$ for the phylogeny (where σ_a^2 is the phylogenetic variance and $\mathbf{A}$ is the phylogenetic relatedness matrix), a variance equal to $\sigma_m^2 \mathbf{M}$ for the error effect (where σ_m^2 is the measurement error variance and $\mathbf{M}$ is a diagonal matrix containing the square standard error of the published estimates; we fixed the variance σ_m^2 to 1 as the sampling variances are known, see Hadfield & Nakagawa 2009 for details) and variances equal to $\sigma^2 \mathbf{I}$ for the remaining effects (where σ^2 represents the population variance within species, the trait variance within population within species or the residual variance; $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity matrix).

These models were run using Bayesian methods as implemented in the MCMCglmm R package. 1 000 000 iterations of each model were run. The first 50 000 iterations were used to initiate the chain, not to estimate parameters, and the thinning interval was set to 10. The amount of iterations was considered sufficient as autocorrelations were low (<0.06) for fixed and random effects.

An inverse-gamma prior for random effects was used ($V = 1$ and $nu = 0.002$), in order to minimise the effect of prior information on posterior distribution. To assess prior sensitivity, the same models were run using a parameter expanded prior ($V = 1$, $nu = 1$,

alpha.mu = 0, alpha.V = 10000) and a weakly informative prior ($V = \sigma/4$, $n = 1$ where σ is the total variance of the dependent variable). Using different priors did not affect the results (Supplementary Table S5 and S6).

To account for phylogeny uncertainty, each model was run with each of the 100 alternative trees provided by Jetz et al. (2012), and the estimates presented in the result section represent the average over the 100 models.

Results

Available data for quantitative genetics estimates

For the analysis using the SSI index, 520 estimates of h^2 and 150 estimates of CV_A from respectively 64 and 13 studies were gathered, with an average of 3.52 traits per study for h^2 and 6.62 per studies for CV_A . Variance among studies in number of estimates is large, ranging from 1 to 48 for h^2 and from 1 to 14 for CV_A . The number of estimates calculated from parent offspring regression is 363 for h^2 against 157 from “animal model” and 39 for CV_A against 111 from “animal model”. Only life-history and morphological traits were kept, with respectively 132 and 388 estimates for h^2 , and 43 and 107 for CV_A .

For the analysis using the niche width measurement (θ), a total of 923 h^2 and 190 CV_A estimates from respectively 64 and 20 studies were gathered, with an average of 2.6 traits per study for h^2 and 5.7 per study for CV_A . Variance among studies in the number of estimates was large, ranging from 1 to 48 for h^2 and from 1 to 14 for CV_A . 707 h^2 estimates came from parent-offspring regressions and 216 from “animal models”. For CV_A , 52 were estimated from parent offspring regression and 139 from “animal models”. Only life-history and morphological traits were kept in the analyses (due to the low number of physiological and behavioural traits), with respectively 176 and 747 estimates for h^2 , and 61 and 129 for CV_A .

Effect of specialization on additive genetic variance (h^2 , CVA)

Heritability was not predicted by specialization, whether considering the SSI (Table 1, posterior mean = 0.054, 95% CI [-0.022, 0.14], pMCMC = 0.13, Fig 2a) or the niche width (θ , Table 2, posterior mean = -0.018 95% CI [-0.057, 0.023], pMCMC = 0.36, Fig 3a) as indices of habitat specialization. Morphological traits had higher heritability than life-history traits in both data sets (Table1 & Table 2), and estimates from the animal model were lower than estimates from parent-offspring regressions for the SSI data (Table1).

Similarly, CV_A was not predicted by either the SSI (posterior mean = 0.66, 95% CI [-1.3, 2.7], pMCMC = 0.48, Fig 2b) or the niche width (θ) (Table2, posterior mean = -0.26, 95% CI [-1.9, 1.5], pMCMC = 0.71, Fig 3b).

Effect of specialization and population size on genetic diversity (H_z)

Heterozygosity was not predicted by either the SSI (Table 3, posterior mean=0.014, 95% CI [-0.025, 0.053], pMCMC = 0.48) or the niche width (Table 3, posterior mean=0.051, 95% CI [-0.021, 0.12], pMCMC = 0.16), but population size did have a significant effect on heterozygosity (Table 3, posterior mean=0.044, 95% CI [0.023, 0.064], $P < 0.001$, and posterior mean=0.036, 95% CI [0.020, 0.054], $P < 0.001$). Species with larger global population sizes had higher levels of heterozygosity. Because niche width and population size are positively correlated (Pearson's product-moment correlation=0.25, $df=88$, $P=0.020$), an effect of niche width on heterozygosity appears when population size is not part of the model (posterior mean=0.071, 95% CI [0.022, 0.12], pMCMC =0.0045). The SSI however was not correlated to population size (Pearson's product-moment correlation=-0.27, $df=35$, $P=0.10$).

Discussion

The ability of wild populations to persist in a changing environment depends largely on their evolutionary potential (Hoffmann and Sgrò 2011, Vander Wal et al. 2013). We expected a

higher evolutionary potential in generalists as compared to specialists, based on the different selection pressures their ecology suggests they are exposed to. In contrast with this, across 36 wild bird populations and using two different specialization indexes, we found no significant effect of specialization on evolutionary potential -as estimated by quantitative genetics estimates, h^2 and CV_A . Specialization did not correlate with genetic diversity measured by H_z either, but we found a significant positive relationship between population size and heterozygosity. In turn, population size correlates positively with niche width (but not with the SSI index), indicating that species with larger niches (generalists) also tend to exhibit more genetic diversity, as a consequence of their larger population sizes. The fact that populations of generalist species are larger than populations of specialist species can be explained by several factors, such as larger available habitat patches, better connectivity between patches, or higher dispersal rates (Kattan 1992, Stireman 2005). In turn, higher genetic diversity in larger populations is in line with theoretical and empirical expectations (Soulé 1976, Frankham 1996). Our results thus suggest that the effect of specialization on genetic diversity results from demographic processes rather than evolutionary processes such as long-term differences in selection pressures. Indeed, we found that specialization had an effect on heterozygosity through population size, but not on quantitative genetic estimates: neutral markers are tightly linked to demography, migration, drift and mutation while selection is expected to shape variance of quantitative traits (Sgrò et al. 2011).

The prediction that specialists should have in general lower evolutionary potential than generalists due to stronger and more consistent selection pressures was not confirmed by this study. So far, the empirical support for this hypothesis was limited, to our knowledge, to two local scale study in insects (Hagele & Rowell-Rahier 2000 and Kelley et al. 2000) and to experimental evolution in bacteria, as reviewed by Kassen (2002). Several reasons (outlined

below) may explain the absence of pattern, but in any case, the generality of this result will need to be confirmed (or infirmed) by more empirical studies from wild populations.

First, we know little about the origin of generalism. For example, if a species niche is fully covered by specialized populations, each population exploiting a part of the niche only, the species will be described as generalist. In this case, high genetic diversity is expected among populations, but not necessarily within populations, making the pattern undetectable when genetic parameters are sampled at the population level (as it is the case for h^2 and CV_A). This particular genetic structure may have evolved under large spatial scale environmental variation. The ability of populations to respond to new selection pressures may then depend on the amount of gene flow among populations. To provide further insights in this direction, an informative index would be the F_{ST} , which compares within population genetic variation to among-population genetic variation, a core question in our investigation. Unfortunately, estimating F_{ST} requires heterozygosity measures in multiple populations for each studied species, which would be available only after implementing new field studies.

A second major issue is the definition of “evolutionary potential”. Because it was the most readily provided estimate of additive genetic variance in natural populations and because of its central role in the breeder’s equation, we used heritability. However, because it is a ratio and because of its univariate definition, heritability can be a misleading estimate of evolutionary potential. Heritability is a ratio of variances and as such its direction of variation can be interpreted in multiple ways, i.e. higher heritability can be the result of either higher additive genetic variance or lower environmental variance. This is of fundamental importance here since environmental variance could be larger for generalist species dealing with more heterogeneous environments than specialist species, hence masking any potential increase in additive genetic variance. A solution around this issue is the use of coefficients of variation of additive genetic variance rather than heritability (Houle 1992, Hansen et al. 2003, 2011,

Hansen and Houle 2008). Unfortunately, CV_A was reported for only 15 species, and often published without associated standard errors. Moreover, 45% of those estimators are likely to be biased (Garcia-Gonzalez et al. 2012). It was thus not possible to reliably assess the effect of specialisation on CV_A but this is an avenue worthwhile pursuing in the future. Another aspect through which heritability may not be a suitable estimate of evolutionary potential is its univariate and trait specific nature as it may not reflect overall evolvability and constraints (e.g. genetic correlations, Sih et al. 2004). Multivariate approaches are therefore be needed to bring further light on these issues (Walsh and Blows 2009, Hansen et al. 2011, Teplitsky et al. 2014).

Third, on a more functional note, the absence of patterns for quantitative genetic estimates in our study may also be explained by a lack of knowledge about the functionality of the traits. Indeed, in the study of Hagele & Rowell-Rahier (2000), growth rate heritability was related to a diet specialization index. As a selection pressure resulting from food availability is expected to directly impact growth rate, the niche parameter used to assess specialization index was thus tightly linked to the trait for which evolutionary potential was measured. In this way, the effect of selection pressure is more likely to be detected when measuring heritability. However, this would not mean overall lower evolutionary potential in specialists, but only for a subset of traits closely associated to the specialization parameter. In our case, with the dataset obtained from the literature, such a clear functional link between traits and habitat specialization is not available: we chose a integrative specialization parameters and investigated the additive genetic variance for all available traits together. However, a population can be submitted to strong selection pressures, for instance on wing size (Hall et al. 2004) or beak shape (Grant, B., Grant 2003), that would reduce genetic variance for these traits, a pattern that would not be detected in our analyses because we pooled genetic variance estimates irrespectively of the traits' function. In the case of reduced

390 overall evolutionary potential, we would expect a decreased genetic variance in traits closely
391 associated to fitness. We thus tried to restrict the data to heritability estimates related to
392 fitness traits (e.g. clutch size, breeding success) but the sample size was drastically reduced in
393 this case (90 heritabilities for 24 species), which didn't allow us to estimate effects properly.

394 In conclusion, our study indicates that there is no detectable effect of habitat
395 specialization on evolutionary potential in birds, at least when considering estimates of
396 additive genetic variance currently available in the literature. However, this does not mean
397 that specialist and generalist species stand the same chances when facing environmental
398 changes: our study suggests that species with narrower habitat niches have smaller
399 populations with reduced levels of neutral genetic diversity, which indicate increased
400 extinction risks (Evans and Sheldon 2008). In the close future, new estimates of additive
401 genetic variance for wild populations may be available, such as multivariate ones, allowing
402 for further exploration of the relationship between specialization and evolutionary potential.

403

404

405 **Acknowledgements**

406 This project was funded by the French ANR (ANR-12-ADAP-0006). We also thank two
407 anonymous reviewers and Darren Irwin for comments that greatly improved the clarity of our
408 manuscript.

409 **Supporting information**

410 S1 Correlation between both specialization indexes and population size.

411 S2 Specialization indexes distributions

412 S3 Trait Classification

413 S4 Phylogenetic trees

414 S5 Results with weakly informative priors

415 S6 Results with parameter expanded priors

416 S7 References for heritability

417 S8 References for CV_{AS}

418 S9 List of species taken from Evans & Sheldon (2007)

419 S10 Visualization for heritability data

420

421 **References**

422 Barnagaud, J. Y., Devictor, V., Jiguet, F., Barbet-Massin, M., Viol, I. and Archaux, F. 2012.

423 Relating habitat and climatic niches in birds. - PLoS One 7: e32819.

424 Bazzaz, F. A. 1991. Habitat Selection in Plants. - Am. Nat. 137: S116–S130.

425 BirdLife, F. 2005. Birds in Europe: population estimates, trends and conservation status. - Br.

426 Birds 98: 269–271.

427 Callen, D. F., Thompson, a D., Shen, Y., Phillips, H. a, Richards, R. I., Mulley, J. C. and

428 Sutherland, G. R. 1993. Incidence and origin of “null” alleles in the (AC)_n microsatellite
 429 markers. - *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* 52: 922–927.

430 Clavel, J., Julliard, R. and Devictor, V. 2011. Worldwide decline of specialist species: Toward
 431 a global functional homogenization? - *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 9: 222–228.

432 Colwell, R. and Futuyma, D. 1971. On the measurement of niche breadth and overlap.pdf. -
 433 *Ecology* 52: 567–576.

434 Davey, C., Devictor, V. and Jonzen, N. 2013. Impact of climate change on communities:
 435 revealing species’ contribution. - *J. Anim. Ecol.* 82: 551–561.

436 Devictor, V., Julliard, R., Couvet, D. and Jiguet, F. 2008a. Birds are tracking climate
 437 warming, but not fast enough. - *Proc. R. Soc. London B Biol. Sci.* 275: 2743–2748.

438 Devictor, V., Julliard, R., Clavel, J., Jiguet, F., Lee, a and Couvet, D. 2008b. Functional
 439 biotic homogenization of bird communities in disturbed landscapes. - *Glob. Ecol.*
 440 *Biogeogr.* 17: 252–261.

441 Ducatez, S. D., Ingley, R. T. and SHine, R. 2014. Using species co-occurrence patterns to
 442 quantify relative habitat breadth in terrestrial vertebrates. - *Ecosphere* 5: 1–12.

443 Evans, S. R. and Sheldon, B. C. 2008. Interspecific patterns of genetic diversity in birds:
 444 correlations with extinction risk. - *Conserv. Biol.* 22: 1016–25.

445 Frankham, R. 1996. Relationship of genetic variation to population size in wildlife. - *Conserv.*
 446 *Biol.* 10: 1500–1508.

447 Frankham, R., Ballou, J. D. and Briscoe, D. A. 2002. *Introduction to Conservation Genetics.*

448 Fridley, J. D., Vandermaast, D. B., Kuppinger, D. M., Manthey, M. and Peet, R. K. 2007. Co-
 449 occurrence based assessment of habitat generalists and specialists: A new approach for
 450 the measurement of niche width. - *J. Ecol.* 95: 707–722.

451 Garcia-Gonzalez, F., Simmons, L. W., Tomkins, J. L., Kotiaho, J. S. and Evans, J. P. 2012.
 452 Comparing evolvabilities: Common errors surrounding the calculation and use of

453 coefficients of additive genetic variation. - *Evolution* (N. Y). 66: 2341–2349.
 454 Grant, B., Grant, P. 2003. What Darwin's Finches can Teach Us about the Evolutionary
 455 Origin and Regulation of Biodiversity. - *Bioscience* 53: 965–975.
 456 Hadfield, A. J. 2013. Package "MCMCglmm ." in press.
 457 Hägele, B. F. and Rowell-Rahier, M. 2000. Choice, performance and heritability of
 458 performance of specialist and generalist insect herbivores towards cactolol and
 459 seneciophylline, two allelochemicals of *Adenostyles alpina* (Asteraceae). - *J. Evol. Biol.*
 460 13: 131–142.
 461 Hall, K. S. S., Rytman, H., Fransson, T. and Stolt, B. O. 2004. Stabilising selection on wing
 462 length in reed warblers *Acrocephalus scirpaceus*. - *J. Avian Biol.* 35: 7–12.
 463 Hansen, T. F. and Houle, D. 2008. Measuring and comparing evolvability and constraint in
 464 multivariate characters. - *J. Evol. Biol.* 21: 1201–19.
 465 Hansen, T. F., Armbruster, W., Carlson, M. and Pelabon, C. 2003. Evolvability and genetic
 466 constraints in *Dalechampia* Blossoms: genetic correlations and conditional evolvability. -
 467 *J. Evol. Biol.* 16: 754–766.
 468 Hansen, T. F., Pélabon, C. and Houle, D. 2011. Heritability is not Evolvability. - *Evol. Biol.*
 469 38: 258–277.
 470 Henderson, C. R. 1973. Sire evaluation and genetic trends. - *Proc. Anim. Breed. Genet. Symp.*
 471 Honour J.L. Lush.: 10–41.
 472 Hoffmann, A. and Sgrò, C. 2011. Climate change and evolutionary adaptation. - *Nature* 470:
 473 479–485.
 474 Houle, D. 1992. Comparing evolvability and variability of quantitative traits. - *Genetics* 130:
 475 195–204.
 476 International, B. 2008. State of the World's Birds - indicators for our changing world. -
 477 Database

478 Jetz, W., Thomas, G. H., Joy, J. B., Hartmann, K. and Mooers, a O. 2012. The global
479 diversity of birds in space and time. - *Nature* 491: 444–8.

480 Julliard, R., Jiguet, F. and Couvet, D. 2004. Common birds facing global changes: What
481 makes a species at risk? - *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 10: 148–154.

482 Julliard, R., Clavel, J., Devictor, V., Jiguet, F. and Couvet, D. 2006. Spatial segregation of
483 specialists and generalists in bird communities. - *Ecol. Lett.* 9: 1237–44.

484 Kassen, R. 2002. The experimental evolution of specialists, generalists, and the maintenance
485 of diversity. - *J. Evol. Biol.* 15: 173–190.

486 Kattan, G. H. 1992. Rarity and vulnerability: the birds of the cordillera central of Colombia.
487 - *Conserv. Biol.* 6: 64–70.

488 Keightley, P. D. and Hill, W. G. 1988. Quantitative genetic variability maintained by
489 mutation-stabilizing selection balance in finite populations. - *Genet. Res.* 54: 33–43.

490 Kelley, S. T., Farrell, B. D. and Mitton, J. B. 2000. Effects of specialization on genetic
491 differentiation in sister species of bark beetles. *Heredity* 84: 218–227. - *Heredity*
492 (Edinb). in press.

493 Kruuk, L. 2004. Estimating genetic parameters in natural populations using the “animal
494 model.” - *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London B Biol. Sci.* 359: 873–890.

495 Lande, R. 1979. Quantitative Genetic Analysis of Multivariate Evolution, Applied to Brain:
496 Body Size Allometry. - *Genet. Anal.* 33: 402–416.

497 Lynch, M. and Lande, R. 1993. Evolution and extinction in response to environmental
498 change. - In: *Biotic interactions and global change*. pp. 234–250.

499 Lynch, M. and Walsh, B. 1998. Genetics and analysis of quantitative traits.

500 Moran, N. A. 1992. The evolutionary maintenance of alternative phenotypes. - *Am. Nat.* 139:
501 971–989.

502 Nei, M. 1978. Estimation of Average Heterozygosity and genetic distance from a small

503 number of individuals. - *Genetics* 89: 583–590.

504 Palumbi, S. R. 2001. Evolution - Humans as the world's greatest evolutionary force. -
505 *Science* (80-.). 293: 1786–1790.

506 Poisot, T., Bever, J. D., Nemri, A., Thrall, P. H. and Hochberg, M. E. 2011. A conceptual
507 framework for the evolution of ecological specialization. - *Ecol. Lett.* 14: 841–851.

508 Postma, E. 2014. Four decades of estimating heritabilities in wild vertebrate populations:
509 Improved methods, more data, better estimates? - In: *Quantitative Genetics in the Wild*.
510 pp. 16–33.

511 Reed, D. H. and Frankham, R. 2003. Correlations between fitness and genetic diversity. -
512 *Conserv. Biol.* 17: 230–237.

513 Richmond, C., Breitburg, D. L. and Rose, K. A. 2005. The role of environmental generalist s
514 ecies in ecosystem function. - *Ecol. Modell.* 188: 279–295.

515 Sgrò, C. M., Lowe, A. J. and Hoffmann, A. A. 2011. Building evolutionary resilience for
516 conserving biodiversity under climate change: {Conserving} biodiversity under climate
517 change. - *Evol. Appl.* 4: 326–337.

518 Shultz, S., Bradbury, R. and Evans, K. 2005. Brain size and resource specialization predict
519 long-term population trends in British birds. - *Proc. R. Soc. London B Biol. Sci.* 272:
520 2305–2311.

521 Sih, A., Bell, A. and Johnson, J. 2004. Behavioal syndroms: an ecological and evolutionary
522 overview. - *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 19: 372–378.

523 Soulé, M. 1976. Allozyme variation, its determinants in space and time. - In: Ayala, F. (ed),
524 *Molecular evolution*. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts., pp. 60–77.

525 Steffen, W., Persson, Å., Deutsch, L. and Zalasiewicz, J. 2011. The Anthropocene: From
526 Global Change to Planetary Stewardship. - *Ambio* 19: 142–151.

527 Stireman, J. O. 2005. The evolution of generalization? Parasitoid flies and the perils of

- 528 inferring host range evolution from phylogenies. - J. Evol. Biol. 18: 325–336.
- 529 Svardal, H., Rueffler, C. and Doebeli, M. 2014. Organismal complexity and the potential for
530 evolutionary diversification. - Evolution (N. Y). 68: 3248–3259.
- 531 Teplitsky, C., Robinson, M. R. and Merilä, J. 2014. Evolutionary potential and constraints in
532 wild populations. - In: Quantitative genetics in the wild. pp. 190–208.
- 533 Thompson, K., Hodgson, J. G. and Gaston, K. J. 1998. Abundance-range size relationships in
534 the herbaceous flora of central England. - J. Ecol. 86: 439–448.
- 535 Vander Wal, E., Garant, D., Festa-Bianchet, M. and Pelletier, F. 2013. Evolutionary rescue in
536 vertebrates: evidence, applications and uncertainty. - Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B.
537 Biol. Sci. 368: 20120090.
- 538 Viol, I. Le, Jiguet, F. and Brotons, L. 2012. More and more generalists: two decades of
539 changes in the European avifauna. - Biol. Lett. 8: 780–782.
- 540 Walsh, B. and Blows, M. W. 2009. Abundant Genetic Variation + Strong Selection =
541 Multivariate Genetic Constraints: A Geometric View of Adaptation. - Annu. Rev. Ecol.
542 Evol. Syst. 40: 41–59.
- 543 Whitlock, M. C. and Barton, N. H. 1997. The effective size of subdivided population. -
544 Genetics 146: 427–441.

552 **Table1. Effect of Species Specialization Index (SSI) on two quantitative estimates of evolutionary potential: heritability and coefficient of variation of**
553 **additive genetic variance (CV_A).** Estimates of effects are given by posterior means (Post. Mean) and their associated 95% confidence intervals (CI 95%). pMCMC
554 values are also given for fixed effects. For the effect of type of trait, the reference level is ‘life history’ as compared to ‘morphological’. For the effect of the
555 estimation method, the reference level is ‘animal model’ as compared to ‘parent offspring regression’.

Explanatory var.		Heritability			CV _A		
Effect		Post. mean	CI 95%	Pc	Post.mean	CI 95%	Pc
Fixed	Intercept	0.0299	-0.261/0.281	0.866	9.81	2.79/16.5	0.013 ^{**}
	SSI	0.0535	-0.0218/0.139	0.128	0.664	-1.31/2.67	0.479
	Type of trait: morphological	0.192	0.130/0.252	<0.001 ^{***}	-8.25	-11.3/-5.03	<0.001 ^{***}
	Estimation method: regression	0.0452	0.00283/0.0871	0.036 [*]	-0.848	3.71/1.96	0.549
Random	Phylogeny	0.004	0.000/0.017		4.07	0.000/18.7	
	Population	0.002	0.000/0.013		0.677	0.000/3.39	
	Trait	0.021	0.016/0.029		17.3	8.25/30.7	
	Residual	0.004	0.003/0.006		25.8	19.0/36.0	

556

557 **Table2 Effect of species niche width Index (θ) on two estimates of genetic variance: heritability and coefficient of variation of additive genetic variance (CV_A).**
558 Estimates of effects are given by posterior means (Post. Mean) and their associated 95% confidence intervals (CI 95%). pMCMC values are also given for fixed effects. For the
559 effect of type of trait, the reference level is 'life history' as compared to 'morphological'. For the effect of the estimation method, the reference level is 'animal model' as
560 compared to 'parent offspring regression'.

Explanatory var.		Heritability			CVa		
Effect		Post.mean	CI 95%	Pc	Post.mean	CI 95%	Pc
Fixed	Intercept	0.34	0.086 / 0.59	0.011	12	4 / 20	0.012
	θ	-0.018	-0.057 / 0.023	0.36	-0.26	-1.9 / 1.5	0.71
	Type of trait : Morphological	0.21	0.17 / 0.25	<0.001	-7.0	-10 / -4.0	<0.001
	Estimation method : regression	-0.00097	-0.045 / 0.044	0.97	-1.5	-5.4 / 2.2	0.44
Random	Phylogeny	0.040	0.012 / 0.074		3.8	0.00013 / 19	
	Population	0.0060	0.0026 / 0.0096		1.7	0.00012 / 8.1	
	Trait	0.0061	0.0020 / 0.011		4.8	0.00014 / 21	
	Residual	0.017	0.014 / 0.021		74	54 / 93	

561
562

563 **Table3. Effect of species niche width (θ) and Species Specialization Index (SSI) on heterozygosity (Hz).** Estimates of effects are given by posterior means (Post.
564 Mean) and their associated 95% confidence intervals (CI 95%). pMCMC values are also given for fixed effects. The second model includes population size as a fixed effect.
565

Explanatory var.		Heterozygosity			Response var.	Heterozygosity		
Effect		Post.mean	CI 95%	Pc	Effect	Post.mean	CI 95%	Pc
Fixed	Intercept	0.047	-0.21 / 0.29	0.71	Intercept	0.058	-0.28 / 0.39	0.72
	θ	0.051	-0.021 / 0.12	0.16	SSI	0.014	-0.025 / 0.053	0.48
	Log Population size	0.044	0.023 / 0.064	<0.001	Log Population size	0.036	0.020 / 0.054	<0.001
Random	Phylogeny	0.0047	0.00023 / 0.012		Phylogeny	0.010	0.00020 / 0.030	
	Residual	0.020	0.014 / 0.028		Residual	0.014	0.0044 / 0.024	

566
567
568

569

570

571 **Fig1** Distribution of coefficients of variation of genetic additive variance (CV_A , a), heritabilities (b) and heterozygosity (c) along gradient of
572 habitat specialization (SSI).

573

574 **Fig2** Distribution of coefficients of variation of genetic additive variance (CV_A , a), heritabilities (b) and heterozygosity (c) along gradient of
575 habitat niche width (θ).

576

577
578
579
580
581
582

Fig2 Distribution of coefficient of additive genetic variance (a), heritability (b), and heterozygosity (c) along a habitat niche width gradient. Each Θ value represents a species.

S1. Pearson's product-moment correlation of both the Species Specialization Index and Niche width with population size

584
585
586

S2. Distribution of specialization indexes, SSI and niche width, for available data.

Table S3. List of traits for heritability and coefficient of additive genetic variance data sorted in “life-history” and “morphology” trait categories.

Life-history (h^2)		
actual egg weight	female first-year recruits	mean chroma (egg colour trait)
actual egg weight adjusted for annual variation	female life span	mean egg size
adult survival probability	female lifetime fledging success	mean egg weight
age at first reproduction	female lifetime reproductive success	mean lightness (egg colour trait)
age at last reproduction	first egg volume	median egg size
annual productivity	hatch date	nr of eggs fledged
arrival date	hatch weight	nr of eggs hatched
breeding time	laying date	number of fledglings
calendar hatching date	laying date elevation	number of nesting attempts per year
clutch size	laying date plasticity	relative hatching date
clutch size adjusted for annual variation	life span	SD chroma (egg colour trait)
delay before breeding	lifetime fledgling production	SD lightness (egg colour trait)
egg breadth	lifetime reproductive success	settling date
egg length	lifetime reproductive success	sex ratio at 6 days old
egg mass	log10-transformed recruiting age	sex ratio at independence
egg shape	longevity	standardized laying date
egg size	male annual fitness	start of wing moult
egg volume	male extra-pair reproductive success	time of laying
elevation of the laying date-temperature reaction norm	male first-year fledging success	total number of eggs laid per year
estimated egg weight	male first-year recruits	total number of young raised to 30 days of age
estimated egg weight adjusted for annual variation	male life span	total number of young raised to 6 days of age
femal annual fitness	male lifetime fledging success	.
female annual fitness	male lifetime reproductive success	.
female extra-pair paternity rate	max chroma (egg colour trait)	.
female first-year fledging success	max lightness (egg colour trait)	.

Morphology (h ²)			
Backcolour	culmen depth	head-length poor condition	PC2-bill (excl. Extra pair youngs)
badge size	culmen length	height of white patch	PC2-body
bill depth	culmen width	male bill depth	PC2-body (excl. Extra pair youngs)
bill depth (excl. Extra pair youngs)	Drostan colour	male bill length	skull length
bill length	fat breeding season	male body condition index	tail length
bill length (excl. Extra pair youngs)	fat winter	male body mass	tail white
bill length . fall-spring	feather growth bar width	male nestling mass	tarsus length
bill length . summer	female bill depth	male tarsus length	tarsus length (excl. Extra pair youngs)
bill length at 2 days	female bill length	male wing length	tarsus length . fall-spring
bill width	female body condition index	mate's forehead patch size	tarsus length . summer
bill width (at a depth of 4mm)	female body mass	muscle breeding season	tarsus length at day 10
bill width (excl. Extra pair youngs)	female nestling mass	muscle insertion length left	tarsus length at day 5
bill width . fall-spring	female tarsus length	muscle insertion length right	total badge size (black throat badge; sexual ornament)
bill width . summer	female wing length	muscle winter	UV/bluesvsGreen/Red
body condition index	first primary length	nestling mass	UVvsBlue
body mass	flattened wing chord	nestling tarsus length	visible badge size
body mass . fall-spring	forehead patch size	offspring condition	weight
body mass . summer	forehead patch size old	outer tail length	Weight (excl. Extra pair youngs)
body mass at day 10	forehead patch size young	patch heigth	width of white patch
body mass at day 5	forhead patch size of a female's mate	patch width	Wing
Brownness scores	GreenvsRed	PC1-bill	Wing (excl. Extra pair youngs)
Capcolour	head length	PC1-bill (excl. Extra pair youngs)	wing length
central tail length	head size	PC1-body	wing patch size old
Chestcolour	head-length good condition	PC1-body (excl. Extra pair youngs)	wing patch size young
chick condition	head-length normal condition	PC2-bill	wing projection

Life-history (C _{Va})		
age at first reproduction	egg laying date standardized spring temperature 1	lifetime reproductive success
age at last reproduction	egg laying date standardized spring temperature -1	lifetime reproductive success
annual fitness	egg mass	log10-transformed recruiting age
annual reproductive success	female fitness	longevity
breeding time	female mate choice	male extra-pair reproductive success
clutch size	first egg volume	male fitness
clutch size standardized spring temperature 0	first-year fledging success	mean egg weight
clutch size standardized spring temperature 1	first-year recruits	nr of eggs fledged
clutch size standardized spring temperature -1	laying date	nr of eggs hatched
clutch size standardized spring temperature NA	life span	nr of seasons bred
egg laying date	lifetime fledging success	.
egg laying date standardized spring temperature 0	lifetime fledgling production	.

Morphology (C _{Va})		
adult body mass	forehead patch size	SD lightness (egg colour trait)
adult tarsus length	head-length good condition	skull length
bill depth	head-length normal condition	tail length
bill length	head-length poor condition	tarsus length
bill width	max chroma (egg colour trait)	total badge size (black throat badge; sexual ornament)
body mass	max lightness (egg colour trait)	visible badge size
culmen depth	mean chroma (egg colour trait)	weight
culmen length	mean lightness (egg colour trait)	wing length
culmen width	nestling mass	wing patch size
feather growth bar width	patch height	wing projection
first primary length	patch width	
fledgling mass	SD chroma (egg colour trait)

S4.a Phylogenetic tree for heritability data

S4.b Phylogenetic tree for coefficient of additive genetic variance data

593

594 **Table S3** Estimators (Post.mean), confidence intervals (CI) and critical probabilities (Pc) for the fixed and random effects of the three mixed
 595 models corresponding to each estimator of evolutionary potential: heritability, CVa and Heterozygosity. **For weakly informative priors.**

Response var.		Heritability			CVa			Heterozygosity		
Effect	Post.mean	CI 95%	pMCMC	Post.mean	CI 95%	Pc	Post.mean	CI 95%	pMCMC	
Fixed	Intercept	0.050	-0.210/0.309	0.680	9.21	-1.63/20.1	0.088**	0.657	0.419/0.887	<10 ^{-5***}
	SSI	0.046	-0.023/0.117	0.139	0.740	-2.24/3.82	0.607	-0.003	-0.047/0.041	0.158
	Type of Trait : morphologique	0.198	0.140/0.256	<10 ^{-5***}	-7.77	-11.28/-4.24	2.10 ^{-5***}			
	Calcul method : regression	0.046	0.005/0.088	0.030*	-1.40	-4.36/1.61	0.355			
	Phylogeny	0.008	0.001/0.021		13.7	1.01/39.7		0.025	0.000/0.072	
Random	Population	0.007	0.001/0.014		5.75	1.02/13.53				
	Trait	0.021	0.015/0.027		18.74	8.18/30.12				
	Residual	0.004	0.003/0.006		27.19	19.1/36.2		0.016	0.015/0.031	

596

597

598 **Table S4** Estimators (Post.mean), confidence intervals (CI) and critical probabilities (Pc) for the fixed and random effects of the three mixed
599 models corresponding to each estimator of evolutionary potential: heritability, CVa and Heterozygosity. For parameter expanded prior.

Response var.		Heritability			CVa			Heterozygosity		
Effect	Post.mean	CI 95%	pMCMC	Post.mean	CI 95%	Pc	Post.mean	CI 95%	pMCMC	
Fixed	Intercept	0.053	-0.162/0.270	0.579	9.59	-0.194/19.9	0.057.	0.695	0.411/0.980	<10 ^{-5***}
	SSI	0.044	-0.018/0.103	0.136	0.656	--2.05/3.37	0.583	-0.012	-0.078/0.052	0.704
	Type of trait : morphological	0.198	0.142/0.255	<10 ^{-5***}	-7.93	-11.2/-4.49	<10 ^{-5***}			
	Estimation									
	method : regression	0.048	0.007/0.090	0.022 [*]	--1.17	-4.05/1.74	0.426			
Random	Phylogeny	0.004	0.000/0.017		14.8	0.000/55.8		0.007	0.000/0.026	
	Population	0.005	0.000/0.013		2.03	0.000/7.81				
	Trait	0.022	0.015/0.028		19.6	9.03/31.6				
	R�sidual	0.004	0.002/0.006		26.6	18.8/35.3		0.052	0.030/0.077	

600

601

Fig S7. References for heritability data

- Akesson, M., Bensch, S., & Hasselquist, D. (2007). Genetic and phenotypic associations in morphological traits : a long term study of great reed warblers *Acrocephalus arundinaceus*. *Journal of Avian Biology*, 38, 58–72. doi:10.1111/j.2007.0908-8857.03669.x
- Alatalo, R., Lundberg, A. (1989) Heritability and selection on tarsus length in the Pied Flycatcher (*Ficedula hypoleuca*). *Evolution*, 40(3), 574–583.
- Alatalo, R. V., Gustafsson, L., & Lundberg, A. (1990). Phenotypic Selection on Heritable Size Traits : Environmental Variance and Genetic Response. *The American Naturalist*, 135(3), 464–471.
- Barbraud . C. (2000). Natural selection on body size traits in a long-lived bird, the snow petrel *Pagodroma nivea*. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* (13). 81–88. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2409649>
- Björklund, M. (1997). Variation in growth in the blue tit (*Parus caeruleus*). *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 10, 139 – 155.
- Boag . P. T. (1983). The Heritability of External Morphology in Darwin’s Ground Finches (*Geospiza*) on Isla Daphne Major . Galapagos. *Evolution* . 37(5) . 877.
- Bonneaud, C., Sinsheimer, J. S., Richard, M., Chastel, O., & Sorci, G. (2009). Mhc polymorphisms fail to explain the heritability of phytohaemagglutinin-induced skin swelling in a wild passerine. *Biology letters*, 5(6), 784–7. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2009.0435
- Boulinier . T. . Sorci . G. . Monnat . J.-Y. . & Danchin . E. (1997). Parent–offspring regression suggests heritable susceptibility to ectoparasites in a natural population of kittiwake. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* . 10(1) . 77. Retrieved from <http://apps.webo>
- Brommer, J. E., Merilä, J., Sheldon, B. C., & Gustafsson, L. (2005). Natural selection and genetic variation for reproductive reaction norms in a wild bird population. *Evolution; international journal of organic evolution*, 59(6), 1362–71.
- Brommer . J. E. . & Rattiste . K. (2008). “Hidden” reproductive conflict between mates in a wild bird population. *Evolution; international journal of organic evolution* . 62(9) . 2326–33. doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00451.x
- Caro, S. P., Charmantier, A., Lambrechts, M. M., Blondel, J., Balthazart, J., & Williams, T. D. (2009). Local adaptation of timing of reproduction: females are in the driver’s seat. *Functional Ecology*, 23(1), 172–179. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2008.01486.x
- Charmantier, A., & Réale, D. (2005). How do misassigned paternities affect the estimation of heritability in the wild ? *Molecular Ecology*, 14, 2839–2850. doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2005.02619.x
- Charmantier . A. . Keyser . A. J. . & Promislow . D. E. L. (2007). First evidence for heritable variation in cooperative breeding behaviour. *Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society* . 274(1619) . 1757–61. doi:10.1098/rspb.2007.0012
- Charmantier, A., Kruuk, L. E. B., & Lambrechts, M. M. (2004). PARASITISM REDUCES THE POTENTIAL FOR EVOLUTION IN A WILD BIRD POPULATION. *Evolution*, 58(1), 203–206.
- Charmantier, A., Perrins, C., McCleery, R. H., & Sheldon, B. C. (2006). Evolutionary response to selection on clutch size in a long-term study of the mute swan. *The American naturalist*, 167(3), 453–65. doi:10.1086/499378
- Cuervo, J.J., Moller, A.P., De Lope, F., (2007), Haematocrit is weakly related to condition in nestling Barn Swallow *Hirundo rustica*, *Ibis*, 149, 128–134.
- Dhondt, A. A. (1982). Heritability of Blue Tit Tarsus Length from Normal and Cross-Fostered Broods. *Evolution*, 36(2), 418. doi:10.2307/2408064
- Duckworth . R. a . & Kruuk . L. E. B. (2009). Evolution of genetic integration between dispersal and colonization ability in a bird. *Evolution; international journal of organic evolution* . 63(4) . 968–77. doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2009.00625.x
- Findlay . C. S. . & Cooke . F. (1982). Breeding Synchrony in the Lesser Snow Goose (*Anser caerulescens caerulescens*). I. Genetic and Environmental Components of Hatch Date Variability and their Effects on Hatch Synchrony. *Evolution* . 36(2) . 342. doi:10.2307/2
- Findlay . C. S. . & Cooke . F. (1983). Genetic and Environmental Components of Clutch Size Variance in a Wild Population of Lesser Snow Geese (*Anser caerulescens caerulescens*). *Evolution* . 37(4) . 724–734.

656 Flux . J. E. C. . & Flux . M. M. (1982). Artificial selection and gene flow in wild starlings . *Sturnus*
657 *vulgaris*. *Naturwissenschaften* . 69(2) . 96–97. doi:10.1007/BF00441236

658 Freeman-Gallant . C. . & Rothstein . M. (1999). Apparent heritability of parental care in Savannah
659 Sparrows. *Auk* . 116(4) . 1132–1136. Retrieved from [http://apps.webofknowledge.com/full](http://apps.webofknowledge.com/fullrecord.do?product=UA&search mode=CitingArticles&qid=41&SID=N2kchoHKHEH15ja)
660 [record.do?product=UA&search mode=CitingArticles&qid=41&SID=N2kchoHKHEH15ja](http://apps.webofknowledge.com/fullrecord.do?product=UA&search mode=CitingArticles&qid=41&SID=N2kchoHKHEH15ja)

661 Frentiu . F. D. . Clegg . S. M. . Blows . M. W. . & Owens . I. P. F. (2007). Large body size in an
662 island-dwelling bird: a microevolutionary analysis. *Journal of evolutionary biology* . 20(2) . 639–49.
663 doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2006.01242.x

664 Garant, D., Sheldon, B. C., & Gustafsson, L. (2004). CLIMATIC AND TEMPORAL EFFECTS ON
665 THE EXPRESSION OF SECONDARY SEXUAL CHARACTERS : GENETIC AND
666 ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENTS. *Evolution*, 58(3), 634–644.

667 Garant, D., Hadfield, J. D., Kruuk, L. E. B., & Sheldon, B. C. (2008). Stability of genetic variance and
668 covariance for reproductive characters in the face of climate change in a wild bird population.
669 *Molecular ecology*, 17(1), 179–88. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2

670 Garant, D., Kruuk, L. E. B., McCleery, R. H., & Sheldon, B. C. (2004). Evolution in a changing
671 environment: a case study with great tit fledging mass. *The American naturalist*, 164(5), E115–29.
672 doi:10.1086/424764

673 Garant, D., Kruuk, L. E. B., Wilkin, T. a, McCleery, R. H., & Sheldon, B. C. (2005). Evolution driven
674 by differential dispersal within a wild bird population. *Nature*, 433(7021), 60–5.
675 doi:10.1038/nature03051

676 Gibbs . H. L. (1988). Heritability and Selection on Clutch Size in Darwin’s Medium Ground Finches
677 (*Geospiza fortis*). *Evolution* . 42(4) . 750–762.

678 Gienapp, P., Postma, E., & Visser, M. E. (2006). WHY BREEDING TIME HAS NOT RESPONDED
679 TO SELECTION FOR EARLIER BREEDING IN A SONGBIRD POPULATION. *Evolution*, 60(11),
680 2381–2388.

681 Gosler, A. G., & Harper, D. G. C. (2000). Assessing the heritability of body condition in birds: a
682 challenge exemplified by the great tit *Parus major* L. (Aves). *Biological Journal of the Linnean*
683 *Society*, 71(1), 103–117.

684 Grant . P. R. . & Grant . B. R. (1995). Predicting Microevolutionary Responses to Directional
685 Selection on Heritable Variation. *Evolution* . 49(2) . 241. doi:10.2307/2410334

686 Griffith, SC Owens, IPF Burke, T. (1999). Environmental determination of a sexually selected trait.
687 *Nature*, 400(6742), 358–560. doi:10.1038/22536

688 Gustafsson, L. (1986). Lifetime Reproductive Success and Heritability: Empirical Support for Fisher’s
689 Fundamental Theorem. *The American Naturalist*, 128(5), 761. doi:10.1086/284601

690 Hadfield, J.D, Nutall,A., Osorio,D., Owens, I.P.F., (2006), Testing the phenotypic gambit: phenotypic,
691 genetic and environmental correlations of colour, *European society for evolutionary biology*, 20, 549-
692 557.

693 Hadfield, J.D., Owens,I.P.F., (2006), strong environmental determination of carotenoid-based plumage
694 trait is not mediated by carotenoid availability, *European society for evolutionary biology*, 19, 1104-
695 1114.

696 Hasselquist, D., Bensch, S., & Schantz, T. V. (1995). Estimating cuckoldry in birds : the heritability
697 method and DNA fingerprinting give different results. *Oikos*, 72(2), 173–178.

698 Hegyi, G., Herényi, M., Wilson, A. J., Garamszegi, L. Z., Rosivall, B., Eens, M., & Török, J. (2010).
699 Breeding experience and the heritability of female mate choice in collared flycatchers. *PloS one*,
700 5(11), e13855. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0013855

701 Husby, A., Hille, S. M., & Visser, M. E. (2011). Testing mechanisms of Bergmann’s rule: phenotypic
702 decline but no genetic change in body size in three passerine bird populations. *The American*
703 *naturalist*, 178(2), 202–13. doi:10.1086/660834

704 Jakober, H., Stauber,W., (2000) Werden die neutöter (*Lanius collurio*) kleiner?, *J.Ornithol*, 141, 408-
705 417.

706 Jensen, H., Steinsland, I., Ringsby, T. H., & Saether, B.-E. (2008). Evolutionary dynamics of a sexual
707 ornament in the house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*): the role of indirect selection within and between
708 sexes. *Evolution*;

Jensen, H., Saether, B.-E., Ringsby, T. H., Tufto, J., Griffith, S. C., & Ellegren, H. (2003). Sexual variation in heritability and genetic correlations of morphological traits in house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*). *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 16(6), 321–332. doi:10.1111/j.1095-8312.1990.tb00542.x

Johnson . S. G. . & Johnston . R. F. (1990). Environmental variation and quantitative genetic parameters in the feral pigeon . *Columba livia*. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* . 40(4) .

Keller . L. F. . Grant . P. R. . Grant . B. R. . & Petren . K. (2001). Heritability of morphological traits in Darwin ’ s Finches : misidenti ® ed paternity and maternal effects. *Heredity* . 87 . 325–336.

Kim . S.-Y. . Drummond . H. . Torres . R. . & Velando . a. (2011). Evolvability of an avian life history trait declines with father’s age. *Journal of evolutionary biology* . 24(2) . 295–302. doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2010.02165.x

Kontiainen, P., Brommer, J.E., Karell, P., Pieieäinen, H., (2007), Heritability, plasticity and canalization of Ural owlegg size in a cyclic environment, *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 21, 88-97.

Kvalnes, T., Ringsby, T.H., Jensen, H., Saether, B.-E., (2013) Correlates of egg size variation in a population of house sparrow *Passer domesticus*, *Oecologia*, 171(2), 391-402.

Larsson, K., & Forslund, P. (1992). Genetic and Social Inheritance of Body and Egg Size in the Barnacle Goose (*Branta leucopsis*). *Evolution*, 46(1), 235–244.

Larsson . K. . Rattiste . K. . & Lilleleht . V. (1997). Heritability of head size in the common gull *Larus canus* in relation to environmental conditions during offspring growth. *Heredity* . 79 . 201–207.

Larsson, K. (1993). Inheritance of body size in the Barnacle Goose under different environmental conditions. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 6(2), 195–208

Lessells . C. M. . Cooke . F. . & Rockwell . R. F. (1989). Is there a trade-off between egg weight and clutch size in wild Lesser Snow Geese (*Anser c . caerulescens*)? *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* . 2 . 457–472.

Lessells, C. M., & Ovenden, G. N. (1989). Heritability of Wing Length and Weight in European Bee-Eaters (*Merops apiaster*). *The Condor*, 91(1), 210. doi:10.2307/1368167

Liedvogel, M., Cornwallis, C. K., Sheldon, B.C., (2012) Integrating candidate gene and quantitative genetic approaches to understand variation in timing of breeding in wild tit populations, *Journal of evolutionary Biology*, 25(5), 813-823

Lifjeld, T., Slagsvold, T., (1990) Manipulations of male parental investment in polygynous pied flycatchers, *Ficedula hypoleuca*, *Behavioral Ecology*, 1(1), 48-54.

McCleery, R. H., Pettifor, R. a, Armbruster, P., Meyer, K., Sheldon, B. C.,

Fig S8. List of References for C_va data.

Akesson, M., Bensch, S., Hasselquist, D., Tarka, M., & Hansson, B. (2008). Estimating heritabilities and genetic correlations: comparing the “animal model” with parent-offspring regression using data from a natural population. *PloS one*, 3(3), e1739. doi:1

Akesson, M., Bensch, S., & Hasselquist, D. (2007). Genetic and phenotypic associations in morphological traits : a long term study of great reed warblers *Acrocephalus arundinaceus*. *Journal of Avian Biology*, 38, 58–72. doi:10.1111/j.2007.0908-8857.03669.x

MacColl, A. D. C., & Hatchwell, B. J. (2003). HERITABILITY OF PARENTAL EFFORT IN A PASSERINE BIRD. *Evolution*, 57(9), 2191. Retrieved from http://apps.webofknowledge.com/full_record.do?product=UA&search_mode=GeneralSearch&qid=3&SID=U2A@f1BJ8oI6n889kJf&page

Charmantier, A., Kruuk, L. E. B., & Lambrechts, M. M. (2004). PARASITISM REDUCES THE POTENTIAL FOR EVOLUTION IN A WILD BIRD POPULATION. *Evolution*, 58(1), 203–206.

Nilsson, J., Akesson, M., & Nilsson, J. F. (2009). Heritability of resting metabolic rate in a wild population of blue tits. *Journal of evolutionary biology*, 22(9), 1867–74. doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2009.01798.x

Charmantier, A., Perrins, C., McCleery, R. H., & Sheldon, B. C. (2006). Quantitative genetics of age at reproduction in wild swans: support for antagonistic pleiotropy models of senescence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States*.

Charmantier, A., Keyser, A. J., & Promislow, D. E. L. (2007). First evidence for heritable variation in cooperative breeding behaviour. *Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society*, 274(1619), 1757–61. doi:10.1098/rspb.2007.0012

Charmantier, A., Perrins, C., McCleery, R. H., & Sheldon, B. C. (2006). Evolutionary response to selection on clutch size in a long-term study of the mute swan. *The American naturalist*, 167(3), 453–65. doi:10.1086/499378

Merilä, J., & Sheldon, B. (2000). Lifetime Reproductive Success and Heritability in Nature. *The American naturalist*, 155(3), 301–310. doi:10.1086/303330

Qvarnström, A., Brommer, J. E., & Gustafsson, L. (2006). Testing the genetics underlying the co-evolution of mate choice and ornament in the wild. *Nature*, 441(7089), 84–6. doi:10.1038/nature04564

Garant, D., Sheldon, B. C., & Gustafsson, L. (2004). CLIMATIC AND TEMPORAL EFFECTS ON THE EXPRESSION OF SECONDARY SEXUAL CHARACTERS : GENETIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENTS. *Evolution*, 58(3), 634–644.

Tschirren, B., Sendecka, J., Groothuis, T. G. G., Gustafsson, L., & Doligez, B. (2009). Heritable variation in maternal yolk hormone transfer in a wild bird population. *The American naturalist*, 174(4), 557–64. doi:10.1086/605379

Morales, J., Kim, S.-Y., Lobato, E., Merino, S., Tomás, G., Martínez-de la Puente, J., & Moreno, J. (2010). On the heritability of blue-green eggshell coloration. *Journal of evolutionary biology*, 23(8), 1783–91. doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2010.02044.x

Brommer, J. E., Rattiste, K., & Wilson, a. (2010). The rate of ageing in a longlived bird is not heritable. *Heredity*, 104(4), 363–70. doi:10.1038/hdy.2009.125

Larsson, K., Rattiste, K., & Lilleleht, V. (1997). Heritability of head size in the common gull *Larus canus* in relation to environmental conditions during offspring growth. *Heredity*, 79, 201–207.

Teplitsky, C., Mills, J. a, Yarrall, J. W., & Merilä, J. (2009). Heritability of fitness components in a wild bird population. *Evolution; international journal of organic evolution*, 63(3), 716–26. doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00581.x

Reid, J. M., Arcese, P., Sardell, R. J., & Keller, L. F. (2011). Additive genetic variance, heritability, and inbreeding depression in male extra-pair reproductive success. *The American naturalist*, 177(2), 177–87. doi:10.1086/657977

Husby, A., Hille, S. M., & Visser, M. E. (2011). Testing mechanisms of Bergmann's rule: phenotypic decline but no genetic change in body size in three passerine bird populations. *The American naturalist*, 178(2), 202–13. doi:10.1086/660834

Husby, A., Nussey, D. H., Visser, M. E., Wilson, A. J., Sheldon, B. C., & Kruuk, L. E. B. (2010). Contrasting patterns of phenotypic plasticity in reproductive traits in two great tit (*Parus major*) populations. *Evolution; international journal of organic*

Garant, D., Hadfield, J. D., Kruuk, L. E. B., & Sheldon, B. C. (2008). Stability of genetic variance and covariance for reproductive characters in the face of climate change in a wild bird population. *Molecular ecology*, 17(1), 179–88. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2

McCleery, R. H., Pettifor, R. a, Armbruster, P., Meyer, K., Sheldon, B. C., & Perrins, C. M. (2004). Components of variance underlying fitness in a natural population of the great tit *Parus major*. *The American naturalist*, 164(3), E62–72. doi:10.1086/42266

Garant, D., Kruuk, L. E. B., Wilkin, T. a, McCleery, R. H., & Sheldon, B. C. (2005). Evolution driven by differential dispersal within a wild bird population. *Nature*, 433(7021), 60–5. doi:10.1038/nature03051

Garant, D., Kruuk, L. E. B., McCleery, R. H., & Sheldon, B. C. (2004). Evolution in a changing environment: a case study with great tit fledging mass. *The American naturalist*, 164(5), E115–29. doi:10.1086/424764

Jensen, H., Steinsland, I., Ringsby, T. H., & Saether, B.-E. (2008). Evolutionary dynamics of a sexual ornament in the house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*): the role of indirect selection within and between sexes. *Evolution; international journal of organic*

Jensen, H., Saether, B.-E., Ringsby, T. H., Tufto, J., Griffith, S. C., & Ellegren, H. (2003). Sexual variation in heritability and genetic correlations of morphological traits in house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*). *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 16(6),

Gienapp, P., & Merilä, J. (2010). Genetic and environmental effects on a condition-dependent trait: feather growth in Siberian jays. *Journal of evolutionary biology*, 23(4), 715–23. doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2010.01949.x

Duckworth, R. a, & Kruuk, L. E. B. (2009). Evolution of genetic integration between dispersal and colonization ability in a bird. *Evolution; international journal of organic evolution*, 63(4), 968–77. doi:10.1111/j.15585646.2009.00625.x

Kim, S.-Y., Drummond, H., Torres, R., & Velando, a. (2011). Evolvability of an avian life history trait declines with father's age. *Journal of evolutionary biology*, 24(2), 295–302. doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2010.02165.x

Frentiu, F. D., Clegg, S. M., Blows, M. W., & Owens, I. P. F. (2007). Large body size in an island-dwelling bird: a microevolutionary analysis. *Journal of evolutionary biology*, 20(2), 639–49. doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2006.01242.x

Fig S9. List of references from Evans & Sheldon (2008)

- Abbott, C. L., and M. C. Double. 2003. Genetic structure, conservation genetics and evidence of speciation by range expansion in shy and white-capped albatrosses. *Molecular Ecology* 12: 2953-2962.
- Adcock, G. J., and R. A. Mulder. 2002. Polymorphic microsatellite loci for paternity analysis in the Madagascar paradise flycatcher (*Terpsiphone mutata* : Aves). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 2: 287-289.
- Adcock, G. J., N. E. Langmore, R. A. Mulder, and R. M. Kilner. 2005. Microsatellite loci for population and behavioural studies of Horsfield's bronzecuckoo (*Chalcites basalis* : Aves). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 619-621.
- Akst, E. P., P. D. Boersma, and R. C. Fleischer. 2002. A comparison of genetic diversity between the Galapagos Penguin and the Magellanic Penguin. *Conservation Genetics* 3: 375-383.
- Asai, S., C. Shimoda, I. Nishiumi, K. Eguchi, and S. Yamagishi. 1999. Isolation of microsatellite loci for paternity testing in the rufous vanga *Schetba rufa*. *Molecular Ecology* 8: 513-514.
- Bardeleben, C. 2004. Isolation of polymorphic tetranucleotide microsatellite markers for the little greenbul (*Andropadus virens*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 4: 698-700.
- Bardeleben, C., and M. M. Gray. 2005. Isolation of polymorphic tetranucleotide microsatellite markers for the pygmy kingfisher *Ceyx picta*. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 478-480.
- Bardeleben, C., R. L. Moore, J. A. Nicholls, J. J. Austin, and T. E. Robson. 2005. Isolation of polymorphic tetranucleotide microsatellite markers in the satin bowerbird, *Ptilonorhynchus violaceus*. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 305-307.
- Bardeleben, C., M. M. Gray, J. Austin, and I. A. do Rosario. 2005. Isolation of polymorphic tetranucleotide microsatellite for the large-billed scrubwren (*Sericomis magnirostris*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 143-145.
- Bardeleben, C., K. S. Delaney, J. Austin, and R. L. Moore. 2005. Isolation of polymorphic tetranucleotide microsatellite markers for the grey-headed robin (*Poecilodryas albispecularis*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 146-148.
- Beck, N., R. Peakall, and R. Heinsohn. 2003. Isolation and characterization of polymorphic microsatellite markers in the white-winged chough (*Corcorax melanorhamphos*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 3: 586-588.
- Benson, D. P. 2002. Low extra-pair paternity in White-tailed Ptarmigan. *Condor* 104:192-197.
- Blanchard, L., and J. S. Quinn. 2001. The characterization of microsatellite loci in the communally breeding smooth-billed ani (*Crotophaga ani*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 1: 152-154.
- Bouzat, J. L., H. H. Cheng, H. A. Lewin, R. L. Westemeier, J. D. Brawn, and K. N. Paige. 1998. Genetic evaluation of a demographic bottleneck in the Greater Prairie Chicken. *Conservation Biology* 12: 836-843.
- Bouzat, J. L., and K. Johnson. 2004. Genetic structure among closely spaced leks in a peripheral population of lesser prairie-chickens. *Molecular Ecology* 13: 499-505.
- Bulgin, N. L., H. L. Gibbs, P. Vickery, and A. J. Baker. 2003. Ancestral polymorphisms in genetic markers obscure detection of evolutionarily distinct populations in the endangered Florida grasshopper sparrow (*Ammodramus savannarum floridanus*). *Molecular Ecology* 12: 831-844.
- Burg, T. M. 1999. Isolation and characterization of microsatellites in albatrosses. *Molecular Ecology* 8: 338-341.
- Burg, T. M., A. J. Gaston, K. Winker, and V. L. Friesen. 2005. Rapid divergence and postglacial colonization in western North American Steller's jays (*Cyanocitta stelleri*). *Molecular Ecology* 14: 3745-3755.
- Burgess, S. L., and R. C. Fleischer. 2006. Isolation and characterization of polymorphic microsatellite loci in the Hawaiian flycatcher, the elepaio (*Chasiempis sandwichensis*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 6: 14-16.

912 Busch, J. D., T. E. Katzner, E. Bragin, and P. Keim. 2005. Tetranucleotide microsatellites for aquila and
 913 haliaeetus eagles. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 3941.
 914 Byers, B. E., H. L. Mays, I. R. K. Stewart, and D. F. Westneat. 2004. Extrapair paternity increases
 915 variability in male reproductive success in the chestnutsided warbler (*Dendroica pensylvanica*), a
 916 socially monogamous songbird. *Auk* 121: 788-795.
 917 Cabe, P. R., and K. E. Marshall. 2001. Microsatellite loci from the house wren (*Troglodytes aedon*).
 918 *Molecular Ecology Notes* 1: 155-156.
 919 Caizergues, A., O. Ratti, P. Helle, L. Rotelli, L. Ellison, and J. Y. Rasplus. 2003. Population genetic
 920 structure of male black grouse (*Tetrao tetrix* L.) in fragmented vs. continuous landscapes. *Molecular*
 921 *Ecology* 12: 2297-2305.
 922 Caizergues, A., A. Bernard-Laurent, J. F. Brenot, L. Ellison, and J. Y. Rasplus. 2003. Population genetic
 923 structure of rock ptarmigan *Lagopus mutus* in Northern and Western Europe. *Molecular Ecology* 12:
 924 2267-2274.
 925 Caparroz, R., C. Y. Miyaki, and A. J. Baker. 2003. Characterization of microsatellite loci in the Blue-
 926 and-gold Macaw, *Ara ararauna* (Psittaciformes : Aves). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 3: 441-443.
 927 Cathey, J. C., J. A. DeWoody, and L. M. Smith. 1998. Microsatellite markers in Canada geese (*Branta*
 928 *canadensis*). *Journal of Heredity* 89: 173-175.
 929 Chbel, F., D. Broderick, Y. Idaghdour, A. Korrida, and P. McCormick. 2002. Characterization of 22
 930 microsatellites loci from the endangered Houbara bustard (*Chlamydotis undulata undulata*).
 931 *Molecular Ecology Notes* 2: 484-487.
 932 Clegg, S. M., J. F. Kelly, M. Kimura, and T. B. Smith. 2003. Combining genetic markers and stable
 933 isotopes to reveal population connectivity and migration patterns in a Neotropical migrant, Wilson's
 934 warbler (*Wilsonia pusilla*). *Molecular Ecology* 12: 819-830.
 935 Dasmahapatra, K. K., C. M. Lessells, A. C. Mateman, and W. Amos. 2004. Microsatellite loci in the
 936 European bee-eater, *Merops apiaster*. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 4: 500-502.
 937 Dawson, D. A., O. Hanotte, C. Greig, I. R. K. Stewart, and T. Burke. 2000. Polymorphic microsatellites
 938 in the blue tit *Parus caeruleus* and their crossspecies utility in 20 songbird families. *Molecular Ecology*
 939 9: 1941-1944.
 940 Dawson, D. A., F. M. Hunter, J. Pandhal, R. Buckland, A. Parham, I. L. Jones, M.
 941 Bradshaw, R. Jehle, and T. Burke. 2005. Assessment of 17 new whiskered auklet (*Aethia pygmaea*)
 942 microsatellite loci in 42 seabirds identifies 5-15 polymorphic markers for each of nine Alcinae species.
 943 *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 289-297. Delaney, K. S., and R. K. Wayne. 2005. Adaptive units for
 944 conservation:
 945 Population distinction and historic extinctions in the Island Scrub-Jay.
 946 *Conservation Biology* 19: 523-533.
 947 Denk, A. G., B. Gautschi, K. Carter, and B. Kempenaers. 2004. Seven polymorphic microsatellite loci
 948 for paternity assessment in the mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 4: 506-508.
 949 Doerr, E. D. 2005. Characterization of microsatellite loci in the brown treecreeper (*Climacteris*
 950 *picumnus*) and cross-species amplification in the white-throated treecreeper (*Cormobates*
 951 *leucophaeus*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 654-656.
 952 Dowling, D. K., J. Adcock, and R. A. Mulder. 2003. Novel polymorphic microsatellite markers for
 953 paternity analysis in the red-capped robin (*Petroica goodenovii* : Aves). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 3:
 954 517-519.
 955 Duval, E. H., and K. J. Nutt. 2005. Isolation and characterization of polymorphic microsatellite loci in
 956 the lance-tailed manakin (*Chiroxiphia lanceolata*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 112-114.
 957 Eggert, L. S., and R. C. Fleischer. 2004. Isolation of polymorphic microsatellite loci in the Hawaii
 958 amakihi (*Hemignathus virens*) and their use in other honeycreeper species. *Molecular Ecology Notes*
 959 4: 725-727.
 960 Estoup, A., and S. M. Clegg. 2003. Bayesian inferences on the recent island colonization history by the
 961 bird *Zosterops lateralis lateralis*. *Molecular Ecology* 12: 657-674.
 962 Fields, R. L., and K. T. Scribner. 1997. Isolation and characterization of novel waterfowl microsatellite
 963 loci: Cross-species comparisons and research applications. *Molecular Ecology* 6: 199-202.

964 Francisco, M. R., P. M. Galetti, and L. Gibbs. 2004. Isolation and characterization of microsatellite loci
 965 in the blue manakin, *Chiroxiphia caudata* (Aves, Pipridae). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 4: 758-760.
 966 Galbusera, P., M. Githiru, L. Lens, and E. Matthysen. 2004. Genetic equilibrium despite habitat
 967 fragmentation in an Afrotropical bird. *Molecular Ecology* 13: 1409-1421.
 968 Gautschi, B., I. Tenzer, J. P. Muller, and B. Schmid. 2000. Isolation and characterization of
 969 microsatellite loci in the bearded vulture (*Gypaetus barbatus*) and cross-amplification in three Old
 970 World vulture species. *Molecular Ecology* 9: 2193-2195.
 971 Gautschi, B., M. K. Arter, R. E. Husi, W. Wettstein, and B. Schmid. 2002. Isolation and characterization
 972 of microsatellite loci in the globally endangered Corncrake, *Crex crex* Linne. *Conservation Genetics* 3:
 973 451-453.
 974 Gay, L., P. D. Du Rau, J. Y. Mondain-Monval, and P. A. Crochet. 2004.
 975 Phylogeography of a game species: the red-crested pochard (*Netta rufina*) and consequences for its
 976 management. *Molecular Ecology* 13: 1035-1045.
 977 Gibbs, H. L., L. M. Tabak, and K. Hobson. 1999. Characterization of microsatellite DNA loci for a
 978 neotropical migrant songbird, the Swainson's thrush (*Catharus ustulatus*). *Molecular Ecology* 8: 1551-
 979 1552.
 980 Gibbs, H. L., R. J. G. Dawson, and K. A. Hobson. 2000. Limited differentiation in microsatellite DNA
 981 variation among northern populations of the yellow warbler: evidence for male-biased gene flow?
 982 *Molecular Ecology* 9: 2137-2147.
 983 Goetz, J. E., K. P. McFarland, and C. C. Rimmer. 2003. Multiple paternity and multiple male feeders in
 984 Bicknell's Thrush (*Catharus bicknelli*). *Auk* 120: 1044-1053.
 985 Gonzalez, E. G., A. M. Castilla, and R. Zardoya. 2005. Novel polymorphic microsatellites for the red-
 986 legged partridge (*Alectoris rufa*) and cross-species amplification in *Alectoris graeca*. *Molecular*
 987 *Ecology Notes* 5: 449-451.
 988 Grant, P. R., B. R. Grant, J. A. Markert, L. F. Keller, and K. Petren. 2004. Convergent evolution of
 989 Darwin's finches caused by introgressive hybridization and selection. *Evolution* 58: 1588-1599.
 990 Griffith, S. C., I. R. K. Stewart, D. A. Dawson, I. P. F. Owens, and T. Burke. 1999. Contrasting levels of
 991 extra-pair paternity in mainland and island populations of the house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*): is
 992 there an 'island effect'? *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 68: 303-316.
 993 Guay, P. J., and R. A. Mulder. 2005. Isolation and characterization of microsatellite markers in musk
 994 duck (*Biziura lobata* : Aves), and their application to other waterfowl species. *Molecular Ecology*
 995 *Notes* 5: 249-252. Haavie, J., G. P. Saetre, and T. Moum. 2000. Discrepancies in population
 996 differentiation at microsatellites, mitochondrial DNA and plumage colour in the pied flycatcher -
 997 inferring evolutionary processes. *Molecular Ecology* 9: 1137-1148.
 998 Hale, A. M., and C. R. Hughes. 2003. Characterization of polymorphic microsatellite loci in a
 999 neotropical wood-quail, *Odontophorus leucolaemus*. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 3: 508-510.
 1000 Hamao, S., and D. S. Saito. 2005. Extrapair fertilization in the black-browed reed warbler
 1001 (*Acrocephalus bistrigiceps*): Effects on mating status and nesting cycle of cuckolded and cuckolder
 1002 males. *Auk* 122: 1086-1096.
 1003 Hammond, E. L., A. J. Lymbery, G. B. Martin, D. Groth, and J. D. Wetherall. 2002. Microsatellite
 1004 analysis of genetic diversity in wild and farmed emus (*Dromaius novaehollandiae*). *Journal of*
 1005 *Heredity* 93: 376-380.
 1006 Hanotte, O., C. Zanon, A. Pugh, C. Greig, A. Dixon, and T. Burke. 1994. Isolation and Characterization
 1007 of Microsatellite Loci in a Passerine Bird - the Reed Bunting *Emberiza schoeniclus*. *Molecular Ecology*
 1008 3: 529-530.
 1009 Hansson, B., H. Westerdahl, D. Hasselquist, M. Akesson, and S. Bensch. 2004. Does linkage
 1010 disequilibrium generate heterozygosity-fitness correlations in great reed warblers? *Evolution* 58:
 1011 870-879.
 1012 Hasegawa, O., Y. Ishibashi, and S. Abe. 2000. Isolation and characterization of microsatellite loci in
 1013 the red-crowned crane *Grus japonensis*. *Molecular Ecology* 9: 1677-1678.
 1014 Hasegawa, O., Y. Ishibashi, and S. Abe. 2005. Polymorphic microsatellite DNA markers for the
 1015 rhinoceros auklet (*Cerorhinca monocerata*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 637-638.

1016 Hawley, D. M. 2005. Isolation and characterization of eight microsatellite loci from the house finch
 1017 (*Carpodacus mexicanus*). Molecular Ecology Notes 5: 443-445.
 1018 Hille, S. M., M. Nesje, and G. Segelbacher. 2003. Genetic structure of kestrel populations and
 1019 colonization of the Cape Verde archipelago. Molecular Ecology 12: 2145-2151.
 1020 Hsu, Y.-C., Severinghaus, L. L., Lin, Y.-S. & Li, S.-H. 2003. Isolation and characterization of
 1021 microsatellite DNA markers from the Lanyu scops owl (*Otus elegans botelensis*). Molecular Ecology
 1022 Notes 3: 595-597.
 1023 Huang, Y. J., C. S. Chen, and S. H. Li. 2004. Polymorphic tetranucleotide microsatellite loci in the
 1024 Hwamei (*Garrulax canorus canorus*) (Timaliidae).
 1025 Molecular Ecology Notes 4: 170-172.
 1026 Hughes, C. R., and D. M. Deloach. 1997. Developing microsatellites when they are rare: Trinucleotide
 1027 repeat loci in the northern mockingbird *Mimus polyglottos*. Molecular Ecology 6: 1099-1102.
 1028 Hughes, C. R., and T. R. Robinson. 2001. Characterization of microsatellite loci developed for song
 1029 wrens *Cyphorhinus phaeocephalus*. Molecular Ecology Notes 1: 165-167.
 1030 Hughes, J. M., P. B. Mather, A. Toon, J. Ma, I. Rowley, and E. Russell. 2003. High levels of extra-group
 1031 paternity in a population of Australian magpies *Gymnorhina tibicen*: evidence from microsatellite
 1032 analysis. Molecular Ecology 12: 3441-3450.
 1033 Ishibashi, Y., O. Mikami, and S. Abe. 2000. Isolation and characterization of microsatellite loci in the
 1034 Japanese marsh warbler *Locustella pryeri*. Molecular Ecology 9: 373-375.
 1035 Jeffery, K. J., L. F. Keller, P. Arcese, and M. W. Bruford. 2001. The development of microsatellite loci
 1036 in the song sparrow, *Melospiza melodia* (Aves) and genotyping errors associated with good quality
 1037 DNA. Molecular Ecology Notes 1: 11-13.
 1038 Ji, Y. J., Y. D. Liu, C. Q. Ding, and D. X. Zhang. 2004. Eight polymorphic microsatellite loci for the
 1039 critically endangered crested ibis, *Nipponia nippon* (Ciconiiformes : Threskiornithidae). Molecular
 1040 Ecology Notes 4: 615-617.
 1041 Johnson, P. C. D., M. K. Fowlie, and W. Amos. 2005. Isolation of microsatellite loci from the common
 1042 buzzard, *Buteo buteo* (Aves : Accipitridae). Molecular Ecology Notes 5: 208-211.
 1043 King, T. L., M. S. Eackles, A. P. Henderson, C. I. Bocetti, D. Currie, and J. M. Wunderle. 2005.
 1044 Microsatellite DNA markers for delineating population
 1045 structure and kinship among the endangered Kirtland's warbler (*Dendroica kirtlandii*). Molecular
 1046 Ecology Notes 5: 569-571.
 1047 Koopman, M. E., N. A. Schable, and T. C. Glenn. 2004. Development and optimization of
 1048 microsatellite DNA primers for boreal owls (*Aegolius funereus*). Molecular Ecology Notes 4: 376-378.
 1049 Kraaijeveld, K., P. J. Carew, T. Billing, G. J. Adcock, and R. A. Mulder. 2004. Extra-pair paternity does
 1050 not result in differential sexual selection in the mutually ornamented black swan (*Cygnus atratus*).
 1051 Molecular Ecology 13:
 1052 1625-1633.
 1053 Kretzmann, M. B., N. Capote, B. Gautschi, J. A. Godoy, J. A. Donazar, and J. J. Negro. 2003. Genetically
 1054 distinct island populations of the Egyptian vulture (*Neophron percnopterus*). Conservation Genetics 4:
 1055 697-706.
 1056 Lambert, D. M., T. King, L. D. Shepherd, A. Livingston, S. Anderson, and J. L. Craig. 2005. Serial
 1057 population bottlenecks and genetic variation: Translocated populations of the New Zealand
 1058 Saddleback (*Philesturnus carunculatus rufusater*). Conservation Genetics 6: 1-14.
 1059 Latch, E. K., E. J. Smith, and O. E. Rhodes. 2002. Isolation and characterization of microsatellite loci in
 1060 wild and domestic turkeys (*Meleagris gallopavo*). Molecular Ecology Notes 2: 176-178.
 1061 Li, S. H., Y. J. Huang, and J. L. Brown. 1997. Isolation of tetranucleotide microsatellites from the
 1062 Mexican jay *Aphelocoma ultramarina*. Molecular Ecology 6: 499-501.
 1063 Lieckfeldt, D., A. Schmidt, and C. Pitra. 2001. Isolation and characterization of microsatellite loci in
 1064 the great bustard, *Otis tarda*. Molecular Ecology Notes 1: 133-134.
 1065 Loyau, A., B. Moureau, M. Richard, P. Christe, P. Heeb, and G. Sorci. 2005. Cross-amplification of
 1066 polymorphic microsatellites reveals extra-pair paternity and brood parasitism in *Sturnus vulgaris*.
 1067 Molecular Ecology Notes 5: 135-139.

- Maak, S., K. Wimmers, S. Weigend, and K. Neumann. 2003. Isolation and characterization of 18 microsatellites in the Peking duck (*Anas platyrhynchos*) and their application in other waterfowl species. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 3: 224-227.
- MacDougall-Shackleton, E. A., and S. A. MacDougall-Shackleton. 2001. Cultural and genetic evolution in mountain white-crowned sparrows: Song dialects are associated with population structure. *Evolution* 55: 2568-2575.
- Mank, J. E., J. E. Carlson, and M. C. Brittingham. 2004. A century of hybridization: Decreasing genetic distance between American black ducks and mallards. *Conservation Genetics* 5: 395-403.
- Martinez, J. G., T. Burke, D. Dawson, J. J. Soler, M. Soler, and A. P. Moller. 1998. Microsatellite typing reveals mating patterns in the brood parasitic great spotted cuckoo (*Clamator glandarius*). *Molecular Ecology* 7: 289-297.
- Martinez, J. G., J. J. Soler, M. Soler, A. P. Moller, and T. Burke. 1999. Comparative population structure and gene flow of a brood parasite, the great spotted cuckoo (*Clamator glandarius*), and its primary host, the magpie (*Pica pica*). *Evolution* 53: 269-278.
- Martinez-Cruz, B., V. A. David, J. A. Godoy, J. J. Negro, S. J. O'Brien, and W. E. Johnson. 2002. Eighteen polymorphic microsatellite markers for the highly endangered Spanish imperial eagle (*Aquila adalberti*) and related species. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 2: 323-326.
- Maurer, G., M. L. Hale, M. H. Verduijn, and K. Wolff. 2005. Polymorphic microsatellite loci in pheasant coucal (*Centropus phasianinus*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 337-339.
- McDonald, D. B., and W. K. Potts. 1994. Cooperative Display and Relatedness among Males in a Lek-Mating Bird. *Science* 266: 1030-1032.
- McGuire, H. L., and M. A. F. Noor. 2002. Microsatellite loci for great white herons and great blue herons (Aves, Ardeidae, *Ardea herodias*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 2: 170-172.
- McInnes, L. M., I. R. Dadour, M. E. Stewart, W. G. F. Ditcham, P. Mawson, and P. B. S. Spencer. 2005. Characterization of polymorphic microsatellite markers for the Carnaby's cockatoo (*Calyptorhynchus latirostris*) and related black cockatoo species. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 504-506.
- McRae, S. B., and W. Amos. 1999. Characterization of hypervariable microsatellites in the cooperatively breeding white-browed sparrow weaver *Plocepasser mahali*. *Molecular Ecology* 8: 903-904.
- McRae, S. B., S. T. Emlen, D. R. Rubenstein, and S. M. Bogdanowicz. 2005. Polymorphic microsatellite loci in a plural breeder, the grey-capped social weaver (*Pseudonigrita arnaudi*), isolated with an improved enrichment protocol using fragment size-selection. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 16-20.
- Mira, S., C. Billot, T. Guillemaud, L. Palma, and M. L. Cancela. 2002. Isolation and characterization of polymorphic microsatellite markers in Eurasian vulture *Gyps fulvus*. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 2: 557-558.
- Mira, S., K. Wolff, and M. L. Cancela. 2005. Isolation and characterization of microsatellite markers in Bonelli's eagle (*Hieraetus fasciatus*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 493-495.
- Muniz, L. S. B., R. H. F. Macedo, and J. Graves. 2003. Isolation and characterization of dinucleotide microsatellite loci in communally breeding Guira cuckoos (Aves : Cuculidae). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 3: 209-211.
- Munoz-Fuentes, V., N. Gyllenstrand, J. J. Negro, A. J. Green, and C. Vila. 2005. Microsatellite markers for two stiff-tail ducks: the white-headed duck, *Oxyura leucocephala*, and the ruddy duck, *O. jamaicensis*. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 263-265.
- Nesje, M., and K. H. Roed. 2000. Microsatellite DNA markers from the gyrfalcon (*Falco rusticolus*) and their use in other raptor species. *Molecular Ecology* 9: 1438-1440.
- Nesje, M., K. H. Roed, J. T. Lifjeld, P. Lindberg, and O. F. Steen. 2000. Genetic relationships in the peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*) analysed by microsatellite DNA markers. *Molecular Ecology* 9: 53-60.
- Ost, M., E. Vitikainen, P. Waldeck, L. Sundstrom, K. Lindstrom, T. Hollmen, J. C. Franson, and M. Kilpi. 2005. Eider females form non-kin brood-rearing coalitions. *Molecular Ecology* 14: 3903-3908.
- Otsuka, R., I. Nishiumi, and M. Wada. 2003. Characterization of 12 polymorphic microsatellite loci in the Japanese bush warbler *Cettia diphone*. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 3: 44-46.

Oyler-McCance, S. J., J. St John, S. E. Taylor, A. D. Apa, and T. W. Quinn. 2005.
 Population genetics of Gunnison sage-grouse: Implications for management. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 69: 630-637.
 Pearce, J. M., S. L. Talbot, B. J. Pierson, M. R. Petersen, K. T. Scribner, D. L. Dickson, and A. Mosbech. 2004. Lack of spatial genetic structure among nesting and wintering King Eiders. *Condor* 106: 229-240.
 Petren, K., P. R. Grant, B. R. Grant, and L. F. Keller. 2005. Comparative landscape genetics and the adaptive radiation of Darwin's finches: the role of peripheral isolation. *Molecular Ecology* 14: 2943-2957.
 Piertney, S. B., A. D. C. MacColl, P. J. Bacon, and J. F. Dallas. 1998. Local genetic structure in red grouse (*Lagopus lagopus scoticus*): evidence from microsatellite DNA markers. *Molecular Ecology* 7: 1645-1654.
 Piertney, S. B., A. Goostrey, J. F. Dallas, and D. N. Carss. 1998. Highly polymorphic microsatellite markers in the great cormorant *Phalacrocorax carbo*. *Molecular Ecology* 7: 138-140.
 Piertney, S. B., L. Shorey, and J. Hoglund. 2002. Characterization of microsatellite DNA markers in the white-bearded manakin (*Manacus manacus*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 2:504-505.
 Primmer, C. R., A. P. Moller, and H. Ellegren. 1995. Resolving Genetic Relationships with Microsatellite Markers - a Parentage Testing System for the Swallow *Hirundo rustica*. *Molecular Ecology* 4: 493-498.
 Proudfoot, G., R. Honeycutt, and R. D. Slack. 2005. Development and characterization of microsatellite DNA primers for ferruginous pygmy-owls (*Glaucidium brasilianum*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 90-92.
 Randi, E., Tabarroni, C., Rimondi, V. L. & Sfougaris, A. 2003. Phylogeography of the rock partridge (*Alectoris graeca*). *Molecular Ecology* 12: 2201-2214.
 Rasner, C. A., P. Yeh, L. S. Eggert, K. E. Hunt, D. S. Woodruff, and T. D. Price. 2004. Genetic and morphological evolution following a founder event in the dark-eyed junco, *Junco hyemalis thurberi*. *Molecular Ecology* 13: 671-681.
 Richardson, D. S., F. L. Jury, D. A. Dawson, P. Salgueiro, J. Komdeur, and T. Burke. 2000. Fifty Seychelles warbler (*Acrocephalus sechellensis*) microsatellite loci polymorphic in Sylviidae species and their cross-species amplification in other passerine birds. *Molecular Ecology* 9: 2226-2231.
 Roeder, A. D., R. K. Marshall, A. J. Mitchelson, T. Visagathilagar, P. A. Ritchie, D. R. Love, T. J. Pakai, H. C. McPartlan, N. D. Murray, N. A. Robinson, K. R. Kerry, and D. M. Lambert. 2001. Gene flow on the ice: genetic differentiation among Adelie penguin colonies around Antarctica. *Molecular Ecology* 10: 1645-1656.
 Russello, M., D. Calcagnotto, R. DeSalle, and G. Amato. 2001. Characterization of microsatellite loci in the endangered St. Vincent Parrot, *Amazona guildingii*. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 1: 162-164.
 Sainsbury, J. P., E. S. Macavoy, and G. K. Chambers. 2004. Characterization of microsatellite loci in the Kaka, *Nestor meridionalis*. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 4: 623-625.
 Saito, D., I. Nishiumi, and M. Nakamura. 2001. Characterization of nine polymorphic microsatellite loci from the alpine accentor *Prunella collaris*. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 1:258-259.
 Saito, D. S., T. Saitoh, and I. Nishiumi. 2005. Isolation and characterization of microsatellite markers in Ijima's leaf warbler, *Phylloscopus ijimae* (Aves : Sylviidae). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 5: 666-668.
 Saladin, V., D. Bonfils, T. Binz, and H. Richner. 2003. Isolation and characterization of 16 microsatellite loci in the Great Tit *Parus major*. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 3: 520-522.
 Schable, N. A., B. C. Faircloth, W. E. Palmer, J. P. Carroll, L. W. Burger, L. A. Brennan, C. Hagen, and T. C. Glenn. 2004. Tetranucleotide and dinucleotide microsatellite loci from the northern bobwhite (*Colinus virginianus*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 4:415-419.
 Schlosser, J. A., T. W. J. Garner, J. M. Dubach, and A. G. McElligott. 2003. Characterization of microsatellite loci in Humboldt penguin (*Spheniscus humboldti*) and cross-amplification in other penguin species. *Molecular Ecology Notes* 3: 62-64.
 Scribner, K. T., M. R. Petersen, R. L. Fields, S. L. Talbot, J. M. Pearce, and R. K. Chesser. 2001. Sex-biased gene flow in spectacled eiders (anatidae): Inferences from molecular markers with contrasting modes of inheritance. *Evolution* 55: 2105-2115.

1172 Sefc, K. M., R. B. Payne, and M. D. Sorenson. 2001. Characterization of microsatellite loci in village
1173 indigobirds *Vidua chalybeata* and cross-species amplification in estrildid and ploceid finches.
1174 Molecular Ecology Notes 1: 252-254.

1175 Segelbacher, G., R. J. Paxton, G. Steinbruck, P. Trontelj, and I. Storch. 2000.
1176 Characterization of microsatellites in capercaillie *Tetrao urogallus* (AVES). Molecular Ecology 9:1934-
1177 1935.

1178 Strausberger, B. M., and M. V. Ashley. 2003. Breeding biology of brood parasitic brown-headed
1179 cowbirds (*Molothrus ater*) characterized by parent-offspring and sibling-group reconstruction. Auk
1180 120: 433-445.

1181 Szczys, P., C. R. Hughes, and R. V. Kesseli. 2005. Novel microsatellite markers used to determine the
1182 population genetic structure of the endangered Roseate Tern, *Sterna dougallii*, in Northwest Atlantic
1183 and Western Australia. Conservation Genetics 6: 461-466.

1184 Tarof, S. A., L. M. Ratcliffe, and P. T. Boag. 2001. Polymorphic microsatellite loci for assigning
1185 parentage in least flycatchers (*Empidonax minimus*). Molecular Ecology Notes 1:146-148.

1186 Tarr, C. L., S. Conant, and R. C. Fleischer. 1998. Founder events and variation at microsatellite loci in
1187 an insular passerine bird, the Laysan finch (*Telespiza cantans*). Molecular Ecology 7: 719-731.

1188 Tarr, C. L., and R. C. Fleischer. 1999. Population boundaries and genetic diversity in the endangered
1189 Mariana crow (*Corvus kubaryi*). Molecular Ecology 8: 941-949.

1190 Thuman, K. A., F. Widemo, and S. B. Pieltney. 2002. Characterization of polymorphic microsatellite
1191 DNA markers in the ruff (*Philomachus pugnax*). Molecular Ecology Notes 2: 276-277.

1192 Tirard, C., F. Helfenstein, and E. Danchin. 2002. Polymorphic microsatellites in the black-legged
1193 kittiwake *Rissa tridactyla*. Molecular Ecology Notes 2: 431-433.

1194 Tomasulo-Seccomandi, A. M., N. A. Schable, A. L. Bryan, I. L. Brisbin, S. N. Del Lama, and T. C. Glenn.
1195 2003. Development of microsatellite DNA loci from the wood stork (Aves, Ciconiidae, *Mycteria*
1196 *americana*). Molecular Ecology Notes 3:563-566.

1197 Topinka, J. R., and B. May. 2004. Development of polymorphic microsatellite loci in the northern
1198 goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*) and cross-amplification in other raptor species. Conservation Genetics 5:
1199 861-864.

1200 Van Dongen, W. F. D., and R. A. Mulder. 2005. Isolation and characterization of microsatellite
1201 markers for paternity assessment in the golden whistler (*Pachycephala pectoralis*: Aves). Molecular
1202 Ecology Notes 5: 4-6.

1203 Van Treuren, R., R. Bijlsma, J. M. Tinbergen, D. Heg, and L. Van de Zande. 1999. Genetic analysis of
1204 the population structure of socially organized oystercatchers (*Haematopus ostralegus*) using
1205 microsatellites. Molecular Ecology 8: 181-187.

1206 Veit, M. L., R. J. Robertson, P. B. Hamel, and V. L. Friesen. 2005. Population genetic structure and
1207 dispersal across a fragmented landscape in cerulean warblers (*Dendroica cerulea*). Conservation
1208 Genetics 6: 159-174.

1209 Wang, M. T., Y. C. Hsu, C. T. Yao, and S. H. Li. 2005. Isolation and characterization of 12
1210 tetranucleotide repeat microsatellite loci from the greenbacked tit (*Parus monticolus*). Molecular
1211 Ecology Notes 5: 439-442.

1212 Watson, C. J. W., A. A. Beheler, and O. E. Rhodes. 2002. Development of hypervariable microsatellite
1213 loci for use in eastern phoebes (*Sayornis phoebe*) and related Tyrannids. Molecular Ecology Notes 2:
1214 117-118.

1215 Westneat, D. F., and H. L. Mays. 2005. Tests of spatial and temporal factors influencing extra-pair
1216 paternity in red-winged blackbirds. Molecular Ecology 14: 2155-2167.

1217 Williams, D. A., E. C. Berg, A. M. Hale, and C. R. Hughes. 2004. Characterization of microsatellites for
1218 parentage studies of white-throated magpie-jays (*Calocitta formosa*) and brown jays (*Cyanocorax*
1219 *morio*). Molecular Ecology Notes 4: 509-511.

1220 Williams, C. L., A. M. Fedynich, D. B. Pence, and O. E. Rhodes. 2005. Evaluation of allozyme and
1221 microsatellite variation in Texas and Florida Mottled Ducks. Condor 107: 155-161.

Winker, K., T. C. Glenn, and G. R. Graves. 1999. Dinucleotide microsatellite loci in a migratory wood warbler (Parulidae : *Limnothlypis swainsonii*) and amplification among other songbirds. *Molecular Ecology* 8: 1553-1556.

Wright, T. F., A. M. Rodriguez, and R. C. Fleischer. 2005. Vocal dialects, sexbiased dispersal, and microsatellite population structure in the parrot *Amazona auropalliata*. *Molecular Ecology* 14: 1197-1205.

Yeung, C., Y. J. Huang, and S. H. Li. 2004. Development of polymorphic microsatellite markers for the Steere's Liocichla (*Liocichla steerii*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 4: 420-422.

Yodogawa, Y., I. Nishiumi, D. Saito, and K. Okanoya. 2003. Characterization of eight polymorphic microsatellite loci from the Bengalese finch (*Lonchura striata* var. *domestica*). *Molecular Ecology Notes* 3: 183-185.

S10. Data visualisation: heritability of body mass and tarsus length as a function of SSI and Niche width

In this figure we present heritability of tarsus length and body mass, the two most represented traits in our dataset, for families that had more than one species represented. Species belonging to the same family are linked by hand-drawn ellipses.

Heritability of Tarsus length

Heritability of Body mass