



This is a repository copy of *Rearing success does not improve with apparent pair coordination in offspring provisioning*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/153248/>

Version: Published Version

---

**Article:**

Ihle, M., Pick, J.L., Winney, I.S. et al. (3 more authors) (2019) Rearing success does not improve with apparent pair coordination in offspring provisioning. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 7. 405.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2019.00405>

---

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>



# Rearing Success Does Not Improve With Apparent Pair Coordination in Offspring Provisioning

Malika Ihle<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Joel L. Pick<sup>2,3,4</sup>, Isabel S. Winney<sup>2</sup>, Shinichi Nakagawa<sup>4</sup>, Julia Schroeder<sup>5</sup> and Terry Burke<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Entomology and Nematology, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, United States, <sup>2</sup> Department of Animals and Plants Sciences, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom, <sup>3</sup> Institute of Evolutionary Biology, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom, <sup>4</sup> School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia, <sup>5</sup> Department of Life Sciences, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom

## OPEN ACCESS

### Edited by:

Camilla Anne Hinde,  
Wageningen University &  
Research, Netherlands

### Reviewed by:

Fumiaki Nomano,  
Graduate University for Advanced  
Studies (SOKENDAI), Japan  
Amanda R. Ridley,  
University of Western  
Australia, Australia

### \*Correspondence:

Malika Ihle  
malika\_ihle@hotmail.fr

### Specialty section:

This article was submitted to  
Behavioral and Evolutionary Ecology,  
a section of the journal  
Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution

**Received:** 24 April 2019

**Accepted:** 09 October 2019

**Published:** 30 October 2019

### Citation:

Ihle M, Pick JL, Winney IS,  
Nakagawa S, Schroeder J and  
Burke T (2019) Rearing Success Does  
Not Improve With Apparent Pair  
Coordination in Offspring Provisioning.  
*Front. Ecol. Evol.* 7:405.  
doi: 10.3389/fevo.2019.00405

In species with biparental care, behavioral coordination in the provisioning of the progeny is hypothesized to increase the number of offspring that survive to independence. Coordination is often quantified by two metrics, alternation and synchrony. Turn-taking (leading to an alternation pattern) can result when one parent's investment strategy is based on the investment of its partner (i.e., conditional cooperation). This should increase the overall provisioning rate and improve offspring body condition. Synchrony might equalize food delivery among offspring and therefore decrease the variance in offspring body condition within the brood. Overall, offspring survival could be increased by parental coordination. Finally, pairs with low coordination, and with potentially lower reproductive success, are expected to be more likely to divorce. In this study, we use a dataset on 473 pairs of house sparrows in a natural insular population to test these hypotheses. We found no effect of the pair's apparent coordination on offspring condition, offspring survival, or divorce rate, questioning the adaptive significance of this behavior. We argue that, in this species, the detection of a higher frequency of alternation and synchrony, when compared to chance expectation, might be induced by the environment, rather than result from an emergent pair behavior selected for fitness benefits.

**Keywords:** breeding success, house sparrow, divorce, fitness, pairbond, double hierarchical model, brood size, male age

## INTRODUCTION

In most animal species, some form of interaction between males and females is necessary to ensure each parent's reproductive success, with examples ranging from courtship display to obligatory biparental care. In this context, the synergy between the two individuals' phenotypes or behavior could be crucial. The emergent property of a pair at the phenotypic level has been shown to be a potential target of mate choice and can lead to large fitness consequences (Ihle et al., 2015). In species with biparental care, the importance of the phenotypic interaction between parents is likely to peak during offspring provisioning, and could take the form of behavioral coordination. Behavioral coordination could potentially improve with familiarity (i.e., pairbond duration; Black, 1996, but see Naves et al., 2007) or be determined by the combination of both partners' personality types (e.g., Both et al., 2005, but see Schielzeth et al., 2011).

Behavioral coordination could take different forms and has sparked significant recent interest (e.g., Mariette and Griffith, 2012, 2015; van Rooij and Griffith, 2013; Johnstone et al., 2014; Bebbington and Hatchwell, 2016; Koenig and Walters, 2016; Iserbyt et al., 2017; Khwaja et al., 2017; Savage et al., 2017; Takahashi et al., 2017; Tyson et al., 2017; Leniowski and Węgrzyn, 2018). First, synchronized feeding (i.e., simultaneous feeding) could potentially ensure that food gets delivered equally to each offspring, limiting sibling competition (Shen et al., 2010). Synchrony could also reduce the conspicuousness of the nest to predators by potentially halving the number of nest visit bouts if parents always visit simultaneously, as opposed to perfectly asynchronously (Mariette and Griffith, 2012, 2015; Bebbington and Hatchwell, 2016). Second, alternated provisioning (or “turn-taking”) could promote greater overall investment by parents, as it has been argued to constitute a simple form of reciprocal cooperation between parents trading-off their current vs. future reproductive effort (Johnstone et al., 2014). Under the conditional cooperation hypothesis, pair members would engage in a tit-for-tat style of provisioning by increasing their return rate to feed the young after their partner has fed, potentially by withholding provisioning until their partner has provisioned (Johnstone et al., 2014). This strategy should lead to alternation (where 100% alternation is when parents take strict turns to provision offspring) and encourage each parent to provide an equal share of care. Theoretically, if pair members follow this rule in real time, an increase in one parent’s feeding rate should also lead to an increase in the partner’s feeding rate, which would benefit the offspring (Johnstone et al., 2014). Overall, synchrony and alternation, separately or in conjunction, could, at least partly, determine the pair’s rearing success. The pair members’ behavioral compatibility could also, subsequently, influence the male’s or female’s decision to retain or divorce their partner.

We aim at testing these hypotheses using the breeding and provisioning data gathered on a wild island population of house sparrows (*Passer domesticus*) monitored closely for over 12 years where, overall, male and female care are interdependent (Schroeder et al., 2019). In a previous study, we found that alternation and synchrony were higher than expected by chance, but we also demonstrated how this outcome could, in principle, still be explained by passive processes, namely that parents could show correlated behaviors due to their shared environment (Ihle et al., 2019). Therefore, this result was insufficient (albeit necessary) to speculate on the adaptiveness of behavioral coordination.

In the present study, we investigate whether the pair’s coordination in provisioning predicts its success in terms of offspring fledging success. In addition, as theory suggests that turn-taking could increase the total number of feeds to the offspring, while synchrony could reduce the effect of sibling competition, we also analyse nestling body condition and within-brood variance in nestling body condition, respectively. Finally, we test whether the degree of pair coordination predicts the likelihood of divorce.

## METHODS

### Parental Rearing Success

We used data collected on a house sparrow population breeding in nestboxes on Lundy, a small island located 19 km off the coast of south-west England (51°10’N, 4°40’W). This population has been closely studied since 2000, and all birds are marked with a unique combination of color rings and a metal ring supplied by the British Trust for Ornithology (Simons et al., 2015).

Each breeding pair was monitored from late April to late August each year. All hatchlings had their blood sampled for later parentage analyses. To construct our population pedigree, we used 13 microsatellite loci to assign genetic parentage (see detailed procedures in Schroeder et al., 2012). In addition, around 50% of the nestlings were cross-fostered 1 or 2 days after they hatched. Nestlings were usually exchanged along with all or some of their siblings among two or three nests, without affecting the original brood size (Winney et al., 2015). We will assume that receiving foreign offspring does not affect parental provisioning (no effect was found in the males of our population: Lattore et al., 2019; no parent-offspring co-adaptation was found in blue tits (*Cyanistes caeruleus*) despite high power: Lucass et al., 2016; Thomson and Hadfield, 2019). After this cross-fostering event, nestling were measured and weighed when between 4 and 6 days old (hatching = day 0). Finally, nestlings were ringed, weighed, and measured when between 11 and 14 days old. Nestling were weighed with a digital scale with a 0.1 g accuracy and their tarsus length (“minimum tarsus” as defined in the British Trust for Ornithology ringer’s manual) were measured with a digital caliper with a 0.01 mm resolution. Offspring body condition was not calculated—its analysis (see below) uses chick mass as the dependent variable and tarsus length as a covariate. Typically, offspring will fledge soon after that date and, therefore, we assumed that each bird that received a ring will have fledged successfully. We chose to analyse offspring survival to fledging (rather than whether offspring bred in the following year, for instance) to maximize our chances of detecting a potential effect of the parents’ behavioral compatibility, assuming that fledging survival after leaving the nest is determined to a much greater degree by factors other than parental care.

In addition to being monitored closely during the breeding season, almost half of the individuals were caught over one or two intense but brief events of mist netting in the winter, allowing relatively accurate information on which individuals were alive during the breeding season (Simons et al., 2015). We considered an individual to have divorced its partner after a given breeding attempt when either or both pair members subsequently engaged in a breeding event with a new partner (in the same or later year), while their former partner was still alive, as judged from sightings, captures, social breeding, and genetic parentage. In 68 broods (from 38 males and 48 females) out of 621 broods that were followed by a subsequent breeding event by the male with an identified female, the male switched to breed with another female before reverting to breed again with their former partner (either fully sequentially or overlapping). Such



**TABLE 1** | Model estimates and standard errors (SE) for each of the predictors of offspring survival to fledging ( $N = 2,482$  offspring alive at age 5, 2,112 survived to ringing).

Offspring survival	Variable	Estimate	SE	$\chi^2$	$p$
<b>Fixed Effects</b>					
	Intercept	2.384	0.170	–	–
	Number of days between checks	–0.004	0.069	0.004	0.948
	Average total provisioning rate	1.309	0.104	227.574	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
	Average total provisioning rate 2	–0.256	0.050	20.246	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
	Brood size (at age 5)	–0.633	0.084	69.553	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
	Mean A deviation	–0.154	0.072	4.554	<b>0.033</b>
	Mean S deviation	0.022	0.067	0.105	0.746
	Day of the breeding season	0.483	0.074	41.569	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
	Pair brood number	0.062	0.079	0.636	0.425
	Tenure (yes)	0.108	0.145	0.551	0.458
	Cross-fostered (yes)	0.104	0.141	0.542	0.462
<b>Random Effects</b>					
	Natal brood	0.159			
	Rearing brood	0.000			
	Pair	0.214			
	Year	0.000			


$\chi^2$  statistics from likelihood ratio tests and  $p$ -values are indicated for each fixed effect. Degrees of freedom in each case is 1. Variances of random effects are provided. Bold highlights significant results.

this population. Because, in our population, only chicks that survived until age 2 or 3 days were cross fostered, cross fostering would be expected to artifactually positively predict offspring survival when considering survival from hatching to fledging (Winney et al., 2015). To avoid this artifact, we only analyzed chick survival after cross fostering, i.e., from when they were measured between days 4 and 6 until ringing, and added the number of days between the first measurement and ringing (or the average number of days to ringing when no offspring survived to a later stage within a brood) as a covariable (to account for the number of days between survival checks). Social pair identity, breeding year, and the natal and rearing brood identities were modeled as random effects. This analysis pools all observations (range: 1–3) made on a given brood by averaging provisioning rate and coordination per brood, assuming that parental effort has some level of consistency over the brood stage (from age 5 to 12 days) and that parental coordination at different stages does not have different effects on chick survival. This may not be the case and could be investigated in larger datasets.

Offspring body condition at 11–14 days old (nestling mass with tarsus length as a covariate), was modeled with the same predictors and random effects, with the exception of brood size, which, here, was the number of offspring that were ringed, and the number of days between survival checks, which was replaced here by offspring age at the last measurement. As chicks were cross fostered between nests, the intra-brood variance might have been inflated due to differences in the relatedness of chicks within the same nest. In order to account for this, we used an animal model—a linear mixed effects model that used the relatedness structure among individuals (i.e., the pedigree)—to

account for additive genetic effects (Henderson, 1988; Kruuk, 2004). This model was run in a double hierarchical model framework where both the mean and the variance of a trait are modeled simultaneously (Cleasby et al., 2015), so allowing the residual variance in offspring mass to vary across nests. This framework is necessary to test simultaneously the expected positive effect of alternation and synchrony on offspring body condition (in line with the hypothesis of reduction in parental sexual conflict) and the expected negative effect of synchrony on the offspring body condition variance within nest (in line with the hypothesis of increased similarity in food delivery thanks to synchrony). The within-nest standard deviations were assumed to come from a log normal distribution, and were modeled as a function of synchrony, brood size and the interaction between the two. The test of the interaction term was included in order to explore whether the effects of synchrony were more pronounced in nests with more competition (i.e., with larger brood size).

Finally, we modeled whether or not divorce occurred following a specific recorded brood using a generalized mixed effects model with binomial error and a logit link function (0: the pair does not divorce after this brood, 1: the pair does divorce after this brood). Predictors were the deviation in alternation and synchrony, the pair clutch number, male and female ages, the mean total provisioning rate, and the absolute difference in pair members' provisioning rates as a measure of parental investment and asymmetry in parental investment, and the number of ringed nestlings as a measure of reproductive success. We also included whether the brood the pair cared for was mixed (i.e., contained foster offspring). Random effects were the male and female identities, and the breeding year.



**FIGURE 2 |** Effect of the pairs' deviation in alternation and synchrony averaged within brood observations and transformed on the log scale on: (top row) the probability of offspring surviving from age 5 days to ringing (middle row), offspring mass at 11 days old (bottom row), the pair's probability of divorcing. Blue curves are dotted when the effects are not significant, and plain when the effect is significant. Note that the only significant effect is opposite expectation. Raw data (top row: offspring survived: 1, offspring did not survive to fledge: 0; bottom row: divorce: 1, did not divorce: 0) are also shown.

Data handling, selection and randomization were performed in R version 3.5.3 (R Development Core Team, 2019) and all codes are available in a permanent repository (<http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3459642>). The generalized mixed effects models (offspring survival and parental divorce analyses) were performed with the lme4 package (Bates et al., 2015) in R version 3.5.3 (R Development Core Team, 2019), using the bobyqa optimizer. Significance of the predictors was obtained using likelihood ratio tests, comparing nested models with and without the parameter of interest (with the function “drop1”). All predictors, which were all selected *a priori*, were kept in the model regardless of their significance. The double hierarchical model (offspring mass analysis) was run in Stan (Carpenter

et al., 2017) through the RStan package (Stan Development Team, 2019), using 4 chains each with 30,000 iterations (without thinning) and a warmup of 15,000 iterations. Convergence of individual chains was visually assessed, as well as ensuring that the Gelman–Rubin diagnostic (R-hat) across chains was <1.1 (Gelman and Rubin, 1992). Normality of residuals was visually assessed. A *p*-value for the fixed effects in this double hierarchical model was approximated (pMCMC) as two times the smaller of the number of iterations where (i)  $a < 0$  or (ii)  $a > 0$ , where  $a$  is the parameter value (see e.g., Hadfield et al., 2013). Non-categorical predictors were scaled (i.e., giving them a mean of zero and standard deviation of 1) in all models.

## RESULTS

### Offspring Survival

The survival of offspring within each brood was negatively affected by the mean deviation in alternation and not affected by the mean deviation in synchrony observed for each brood [effect opposite to expectation for the mean log alternation deviation: odds ratio = 0.86, 95% confidence interval (CI) = 0.74–0.99; mean log deviation in synchrony: odds ratio = 1.02, CI = 0.90–1.17; **Table 1, Figure 2**]. Offspring survival was also negatively affected by brood size while it was positively affected by hatching date and the total provisioning rate, although it declined (or at least reached a plateau) at high provisioning rates (i.e., the quadratic term was significantly negative, **Table 1, Supplementary Figure 1**).

### Offspring Body Condition

Offspring body condition was not affected by the mean deviation in alternation or synchrony observed for each nestling's rearing brood but was negatively affected by brood size (fixed effects on mean, **Table 2, Figure 2**). There was no significant interactive effect of synchrony and brood size on within-brood variance in offspring body condition ( $pMCMC = 0.099$ ; trend opposite to expectation, i.e., the effect of synchrony on within brood variance in body condition is more positive as brood size increases, fixed effect on residual variance, **Table 2**). There was also no main effect of synchrony on within brood variance in body condition (i.e., at average brood sizes there is no effect of synchrony; fixed effect on residual variance, **Table 2, Figure 2**).

### Divorce

The likelihood of pairs divorcing was not affected by the deviation in alternation or synchrony observed in their previous brood (A: odds ratio = 1.08, CI = 0.82–1.44; S: odds ratio = 0.95, CI = 0.70–1.27; **Table 3, Figure 2**). Pair divorce was significantly negatively affected by male age (older males were less likely to divorce; **Table 3**).

## DISCUSSION

In a previous study, we showed that alternation and synchrony in offspring provisioning in this wild population of house sparrows was higher than expected by chance. This was true when comparing observed data to all of our null models (Ihle et al., 2019). However, such comparisons are not sufficient to allow us to tease apart the patterns due to parental coordination from those induced by the parents each reacting to a shared environment. In this study, we did not find a positive association between offspring survival or body condition and the coordination deviation from randomness, nor did we find that the level of parental coordination predicts the likelihood of divorce. We discuss how these results may fit into, rather than contrast with, the current literature.

Despite increasing interest in behavioral coordination (Mariette and Griffith, 2012, 2015; van Rooij and Griffith, 2013; Johnstone et al., 2014; Bebbington and Hatchwell, 2016; Koenig and Walters, 2016; Iserbyt et al., 2017; Khwaja et al., 2017;

**TABLE 2 |** Model estimates and 95% credible intervals (CRI) for each of the predictors of offspring body condition ( $N = 2,098$  offspring that were measured around 12 days old).

Offspring mass	Estimate (95% CRI)	pMCMC
<b>Fixed Effects on Mean</b>		
Intercept	22.298 (21.681, 22.929)	–
Tarsus	3.146 (3.046, 3.246)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Offspring age	0.061 (–0.056, 0.177)	0.305
Average total provisioning rate	–0.020 (–0.197, 0.157)	0.827
Average total provisioning rate 2	0.043 (–0.036, 0.123)	0.284
Day of the breeding season	–0.080 (–0.207, 0.047)	0.216
Pair brood number	0.069 (–0.073, 0.208)	0.329
Brood size	–0.327 (–0.483, –0.172)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Mean A deviation	–0.048 (–0.177, 0.081)	0.469
Mean S deviation	–0.042 (–0.171, 0.087)	0.523
Tenure (yes)	–0.093 (–0.345, 0.158)	0.465
Cross-fostered (yes)	0.030 (–0.216, 0.274)	0.805
<b>Random Effects on Mean</b>		
Natal brood	0.882 (0.612, 1.114)	
Rearing brood	0.685 (0.217, 0.998)	
Year	0.636 (0.346, 1.113)	
Pair	0.556 (0.223, 0.798)	
Additive genetic	1.226 (0.951, 1.512)	
<b>Fixed Effects on Residual Variance</b>		
Intercept	0.224 (0.047, 0.352)	–
Brood size	0.003 (–0.065, 0.076)	0.939
Mean S deviation	–0.013 (–0.084, 0.059)	0.718
Brood size × Mean S deviation	0.055 (–0.011, 0.123)	0.099
<b>Random Effects on Residual Variance</b>		
Residual	0.279 (0.148, 0.409)	

*Approximated p-values (pMCMC) are also provided. In a double hierarchical model, the mean and the variance of the predicted variable are modeled at the same time with two different sets of fixed effects and random effects. Bold highlights significant results, italic highlights trends.*

Savage et al., 2017; Takahashi et al., 2017; Tyson et al., 2017; Leniowski and Wegrzyn, 2018), the fitness consequences of this emergent property for a pair have been assessed in only a few instances, when coordination was indeed observed to be higher than expected by chance. In an earlier study, a link between coordination in provisioning and provisioning rate itself was presented as evidence for an impact of coordination on fitness (Bebbington and Hatchwell, 2016); however, these variables are mathematically correlated (see Ihle et al., 2019) and, therefore, this evidence should be treated with caution. In Ihle et al. (2019), we showed that even when using a modeling approach intended to account for a mathematical relationship between dependent and independent variables, we could not prevent spurious effects from emerging when correlating coordination deviation and provisioning rate (we could only prevent spurious effects between coordination and variables correlated with provisioning rate). In other passerine species, and in line with our observations, coordination did not affect nestling survival or condition (Mariette and Griffith, 2012, 2015; van Rooij and Griffith, 2013; Bebbington and

**TABLE 3** | Model estimates and standard errors (SE) for each of the predictors of pair divorce ( $N = 553$  broods, subsequent to which 103 divorces occurred).

Divorce	Variable	Estimate	SE	$\chi^2$	$p$
<b>Fixed Effects</b>					
	Intercept	-2.073	0.266	–	–
	Mean Log S deviation	-0.053	0.151	0.12	0.725
	Mean Log A deviation	0.080	0.142	0.32	0.571
	Mother's age	-0.105	0.160	0.44	0.506
	Father's age	-0.514	0.191	8.25	<b>0.004</b>
	Pair brood number	-0.085	0.206	0.17	0.680
	Average total provisioning rate	-0.365	0.202	3.38	0.066
	Absolute difference in partners' mean provisioning rates	0.221	0.146	2.25	0.134
	Brood size (at ringing)	0.222	0.178	1.57	0.210
	Mixed brood (yes)	0.518	0.276	3.62	0.057
<b>Random Effects</b>					
	Social father	0.000			
	Social mother	0.731			
	Year	0.000			

$\chi^2$  statistics from likelihood ratio tests and  $p$ -values are indicated for each fixed effect. Bold highlights significant results, italic highlights trends.

Hatchwell, 2016; Iserbyt et al., 2017), nor parental survival (Bebbington and Hatchwell, 2016). Nevertheless, evidence suggests that coordination (and especially synchrony of visits at the nest) could reduce the likelihood of depredation (Raihani et al., 2010; Mariette and Griffith, 2012, 2015; van Rooij and Griffith, 2013; Bebbington and Hatchwell, 2016; Leniowski and Wegrzyn, 2018). In contrast, in dual-foraging seabirds (alternating long trips to feed themselves and short trips to provision offspring), coordination in provisioning could prove crucial and strict coordination might be the only way to prevent starvation of the offspring or the partner (Takahashi et al., 2017; Tyson et al., 2017; Wojczulanis-Jakubas et al., 2018). Finally, following the idea that familiarity between partners could positively impact reproductive success through some sort of pair coordination (Black, 1996, but see Naves et al., 2007), one could hypothesize that familiarity between partners specifically increases coordination in provisioning (Westneat and Hatch, 2008). Similarly, pairs with increased coordination, possibly due to an increase in their pairbond duration, might be less likely to divorce. However, we did not find that pair-bond duration was linked to either better coordination in provisioning (Ihle et al., 2019) or improved reproductive success (this study), nor did we find that divorce was predicted by pairbond duration or higher alternation or synchrony (this study). Overall, the fitness consequences of behavioral compatibility in terms of pair coordination in raising offspring have yet to be demonstrated.

While coordination did not impact offspring survival and body condition (apart from an effect opposite expectation), and also did not predict parental divorce, other factors were important. Brood size had a negative effect on offspring mass and on offspring survival, while hatching date within the breeding season of this multi-brooded species positively affected nestling survival. These effects are known and have been discussed in detail elsewhere (e.g., Ringsby et al., 1998; Cleasby et al., 2010;

Winney et al., 2015). We also found that the probability of parental divorce declined with male age. This effect has not been shown previously and invites further investigations. Because of the sex-specificity of this age effect, one could explore further the link between mate retention and territoriality, age, and breeding success (e.g., see Bai and Severinghaus, 2012; Culina et al., 2015), as well as with the potentially changing mating strategies with age in males (Hsu et al., 2015; Girndt et al., 2018).

If the adaptive significance of parental coordination in provisioning through conditional cooperation is questioned, how then can we explain that the observed patterns of alternation and synchrony exceed the magnitudes expected by chance alone? We cannot exclude a link between coordination and other aspects of the pairbond (e.g., benefits associated with foraging as a pair), nor can we exclude that taking into account more factors into the randomizations (i.e., subsetting our dataset to nest watches that meet specific criteria) could reveal the effects we expected or, to the contrary, extinguish the difference between the observed and random coordination. However, the positive deviation from randomness might simply be attributable to the coordination of both individuals' behavior to the environment surrounding their nest. As explained extensively in Schlicht et al. (2016), Ihle et al. (2019), and Santema et al. (2019), both pair members might have correlated patterns of inter-feeding intervals due to experiencing the same environmental conditions, which could lead to a pattern of apparently coordinated visits to the nest. Teasing apart environmentally induced patterns of alternation and synchrony from patterns of true coordination emerging from conditional cooperation will not be possible without measuring all environmental parameters (which is in itself probably impossible) or conducting logistically challenging experiments (e.g., Santema et al., 2017). It will therefore be crucial in further studies of pair coordination to explore fitness consequences, instead of solely

showing that alternation or synchrony is higher than expected by chance.

## DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All datasets generated for this study are available in a permanent repository (<http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3459642>).

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

MI conceived the study with input from JP, IW, and TB. SN, JS, and TB provided the raw data. MI and JP did the analyses. MI drafted and revised the manuscript with input from all co-authors.

## REFERENCES

- Bai, M.-L., and Severinghaus, L. L. (2012). Disentangling site and mate fidelity in a monogamous population under strong nest site competition. *Anim. Behav.* 84, 251–259. doi: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.05.004
- Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *J. Stat. Softw.* 67, 1–48. doi: 10.18637/jss.v067.i01
- Bebbington, K., and Hatchwell, B. J. (2016). Coordinated parental provisioning is related to feeding rate and reproductive success in a songbird. *Behav. Ecol.* 27, 652–659. doi: 10.1093/beheco/arv198
- Black, J. M. (1996). *Partnership in Birds: the Study of Monogamy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Both, C., Dingemanse, N. J., Drent, P. J., and Tinbergen, J. M. (2005). Pairs of extreme avian personalities have highest reproductive success. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 74, 667–674. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2005.00962.x
- Carpenter, B., Gelman, A., Hoffman, M. D., Lee, D., Goodrich, B., Betancourt, M., et al. (2017). Stan: a probabilistic programming language. *J. Stat. Softw.* 76:1–32. doi: 10.18637/jss.v076.i01
- Cleasby, I. R., Nakagawa, S., Gillespie, D. O. S., and Burke, T. (2010). The influence of sex and body size on nestling survival and recruitment in the house sparrow. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* 101, 680–688. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-8312.2010.01515.x
- Cleasby, I. R., Nakagawa, S., and Schielzeth, H. (2015). Quantifying the predictability of behaviour: statistical approaches for the study of between-individual variation in the within-individual variance. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 6, 27–37. doi: 10.1111/2041-210X.12281
- Culina, A., Radersma, R., and Sheldon, B. C. (2015). Trading up: the fitness consequences of divorce in monogamous birds. *Biol. Rev.* 90, 1015–1034. doi: 10.1111/brv.12143
- Gelman, A., and Rubin, D. B. (1992). Inference from iterative simulation using multiple sequences. *Stat. Sci.* 7, 457–472. doi: 10.1214/ss/1177011136
- Girndt, A., Chng, C. W. T., Burke, T., and Schroeder, J. (2018). Male age is associated with extra-pair paternity, but not with extra-pair mating behaviour. *Sci. Rep.* 8:8378. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-26649-1
- Hadfield, J. D., Heap, E. A., Bayer, F., Mittell, E. A., and Crouch, N. M. A. (2013). Intraclutch differences in egg characteristics mitigate the consequences of age-related hierarchies in a wild passerine. *Evolution* 67, 2688–2700. doi: 10.1111/evo.12143
- Henderson, C. R. (1988). Theoretical basis and computational methods for a number of different animal models. *J. Dairy Sci.* 71, 1–16. doi: 10.1016/S0022-0302(88)79974-9
- Hsu, Y.-H., Schroeder, J., Winney, I., Burke, T., and Nakagawa, S. (2015). Are extra-pair males different from cuckolded males? A case study and a meta-analytic examination. *Mol. Ecol.* 24, 1558–1571. doi: 10.1111/mec.13124
- Ihle, M., Kempnaers, B., and Forstmeier, W. (2015). Fitness benefits of mate choice for compatibility in a socially monogamous species. *PLoS Biol.* 13:e1002248. doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1002248

## FUNDING

MI was funded by a grant from the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC, J024597/1) awarded to TB. JP was funded by a Swiss National Science Foundation Early Mobility grant (P2ZHP3 164962). IW was funded by a grant from the Volkswagen Foundation awarded to JS.

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fevo.2019.00405/full#supplementary-material>

- Ihle, M., Pick, J. L., Winney, I. S., Nakagawa, S., and Burke, T. (2019). Measuring up to reality: null models and analysis simulations to study parental coordination in provisioning offspring. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* 7:142. doi: 10.3389/fevo.2019.00142
- Iserbyt, A., Fresneau, N., Kortenhoff, T., Eens, M., and Muller, W. (2017). Decreasing parental task specialization promotes conditional cooperation. *Sci. Rep.* 7:6565. doi: 10.1038/s41598-017-06667-1
- Johnstone, R. A., Manica, A., Fayet, A. L., Stoddard, M. C., Rodriguez-Gironés, M. A., and Hinde, C. A. (2014). Reciprocity and conditional cooperation between great tit parents. *Behav. Ecol.* 25, 216–222. doi: 10.1093/beheco/art109
- Khwaja, N., Hatchwell, B. J., Freckleton, R. P., and Green, J. P. (2017). Sex allocation patterns across cooperatively breeding birds do not support predictions of the repayment hypothesis. *Am. Nat.* 190, 547–556. doi: 10.1086/693532
- Koenig, W. D., and Walters, E. L. (2016). Provisioning patterns in the cooperatively breeding acorn woodpecker: does feeding behaviour serve as a signal? *Anim. Behav.* 119, 125–134. doi: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.06.002
- Kruuk, L. E. B. (2004). Estimating genetic parameters in natural populations using the “animal model”. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 359, 873–890. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2003.1437
- Lattore, M., Plaza, M., Nakagawa, S., Burke, T., and Schroeder, J. (2019). No evidence for kin recognition in a passerine bird. *bioRxiv* 560870. doi: 10.1101/560870
- Leniowski, K., and Węgrzyn, E. (2018). Synchronisation of parental behaviours reduces the risk of nest predation in a socially monogamous passerine bird. *Sci. Rep.* 8:7385. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-25746-5
- Lucass, C., Korsten, P., Eens, M., and Müller, W. (2016). Within-family parent-offspring co-adaptation in a wild bird: on static traits, behavioural reaction norms, and sex differences. *Funct. Ecol.* 30, 274–282. doi: 10.1111/1365-2435.12492
- Mariette, M. M., and Griffith, S. C. (2012). Nest visit synchrony is high and correlates with reproductive success in the wild zebra finch *Taeniopygia guttata*. *J. Avian Biol.* 43, 131–140. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-048X.2012.05555.x
- Mariette, M. M., and Griffith, S. C. (2015). The adaptive significance of provisioning and foraging coordination between breeding partners. *Am. Nat.* 185, 270–280. doi: 10.1086/679441
- Nakagawa, S., Gillespie, D. O. S., Hatchwell, B. J., and Burke, T. (2007). Predictable males and unpredictable females: sex difference in repeatability of parental care in a wild bird population. *J. Evol. Biol.* 20, 1674–1681. doi: 10.1111/j.1420-9101.2007.01403.x
- Naves, L. C., Cam, E., and Monnat, J. Y. (2007). Pair duration, breeding success and divorce in a long-lived seabird: benefits of mate familiarity? *Anim. Behav.* 73, 433–444. doi: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2006.10.004
- Pelletier, K., Oedewaldt, C., and Westneat, D. F. (2016). Surprising flexibility in parental care revealed by experimental changes in offspring demand. *Anim. Behav.* 122, 207–215. doi: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.10.011

- R Development Core Team (2019). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. Available online at: <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Raihani, N. J., Nelson-Flower, M. J., Moyes, K., Browning, L. E., and Ridley, A. R. (2010). Synchronous provisioning increases brood survival in cooperatively breeding pied babblers. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 79, 44–52. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2009.01606.x
- Ringsby, T. H., Sæther, B.-E., and Solberg, E. J. (1998). Factors affecting juvenile survival in house sparrow *Passer domesticus*. *J. Avian Biol.* 29, 241–247. doi: 10.2307/3677106
- Santema, P., Schlicht, E., and Kempenaers, B. (2019). Testing the conditional cooperation model: what can we learn from parents taking turns when feeding offspring? *Front. Ecol. Evol.* 7:94. doi: 10.3389/fevo.2019.00094
- Santema, P., Schlicht, E., Schlicht, L., and Kempenaers, B. (2017). Blue tits do not return faster to the nest in response to either short- or long-term begging playbacks. *Anim. Behav.* 123, 117–127. doi: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.10.016
- Savage, J. L., Browning, L. E., Manica, A., Russell, A. F., and Johnstone, R. A. (2017). Turn-taking in cooperative offspring care: by-product of individual provisioning behavior or active response rule? *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 71:162. doi: 10.1007/s00265-017-2391-4
- Schielzeth, H., Bolund, E., Kempenaers, B., and Forstmeier, W. (2011). Quantitative genetics and fitness consequences of neophilia in zebra finches. *Behav. Ecol.* 22, 126–134. doi: 10.1093/beheco/arq184
- Schlicht, E., Santema, P., Schlicht, R., and Kempenaers, B. (2016). Evidence for conditional cooperation in biparental care systems? A comment on Johnstone et al. *Behav. Ecol.* 27:e2–e5. doi: 10.1093/beheco/arw036
- Schroeder, J., Burke, T., Mannarelli, M. E., Dawson, D. A., and Nakagawa, S. (2012). Maternal effects and heritability of annual productivity. *J. Evol. Biol.* 25, 149–156. doi: 10.1111/j.1420-9101.2011.02412.x
- Schroeder, J., Hannah, L., Dugdale, Shinichi, N., Alex, S., and Terry, B. (2019). Social Genetic Effects (IGE) and genetic intra- and intersexual genetic correlation contribute to the total heritable variance in parental care. *EcoEvoRxiv*. doi: 10.32942/osf.io/nh8m2
- Shen, S.-F., Chen, H.-C., Vehrencamp Sandra, L., and Yuan, H.-W. (2010). Group provisioning limits sharing conflict among nestlings in joint-nesting Taiwan yuhinas. *Biol. Lett.* 6, 318–321. doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2009.0909
- Simons, M. J. P., Winney, I., Nakagawa, S., Burke, T., and Schroeder, J. (2015). Limited catching bias in a wild population of birds with near-complete census information. *Ecol. Evol.* 5, 3500–3506. doi: 10.1002/ece3.1623
- Stan Development Team (2019). *RStan: The R Interface to Stan*. R package version 2.19.2. Available online at: <http://mc-stan.org/>
- Takahashi, L. S., Storey, A. E., Wilhelm, S. I., and Walsh, C. J. (2017). Turn-taking ceremonies in a colonial seabird: does behavioral variation signal individual condition? *Auk* 134, 530–541. doi: 10.1642/AUK-17-26.1
- Thomson, C. E., and Hadfield, J. D. (2019). No evidence for sibling or parent-offspring coadaptation in a wild population of blue tits, despite high power. *Evolution* 73, 28–41. doi: 10.1111/evo.13642
- Tyson, C., Kirk, H., Fayet, A., Van Loon, E. E., Shoji, A., Dean, B., et al. (2017). Coordinated provisioning in a dual-foraging pelagic seabird. *Anim. Behav.* 132, 73–79. doi: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2017.07.022
- van Rooij, E. P., and Griffith, S. C. (2013). Synchronised provisioning at the nest: parental coordination over care in a socially monogamous species. *PeerJ* 1:e232. doi: 10.7717/peerj.232
- Westneat, D. F., and Hatch, M. I. (2008). Familiarity between mates improves few aspects of reproductive performance in house sparrows. *Behaviour* 145, 365–376. doi: 10.1163/156853908783402867
- Winney, I., Nakagawa, S., Hsu, Y. H., Burke, T., and Schroeder, J. (2015). Troubleshooting the potential pitfalls of cross-fostering. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 6, 584–592. doi: 10.1111/2041-210X.12341
- Wojczulanis-Jakubas, K., Araya-Salas, M., and Jakubas, D. (2018). Seabird parents provision their chick in a coordinated manner. *PLoS ONE* 13:e0189969. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0189969
- Yamamura, K. (1999). Transformation using  $(x+0.5)$  to stabilize the variance of populations. *Res. Popul. Ecol.* 41, 229–234. doi: 10.1007/s101440050026

**Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2019 Ihle, Pick, Winney, Nakagawa, Schroeder and Burke. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.