

**Prenatal maternal effects appear to be insensitive to experimental  
or natural environmental variation**

Caroline E. Thomson

Department of Zoology, Edward Grey Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1 3PS,  
United Kingdom

`caroline.thomson@zoo.ox.ac.uk`

Jarrold D. Hadfield

Institute of Evolutionary Biology, University of Edinburgh, UK

`j.hadfield@ed.ac.uk`

Received \_\_\_\_\_; accepted \_\_\_\_\_

*Short Title:* Environmental effects on egg traits

*Manuscript Type:* Article

*Word Count:* Abstract: 183; Main Text: 6622; Captions: 885

*Figures/Tables:* Figures: 2; Tables: 10

*Elements of Manuscript for online edition:* Supplementary Materials. Contains 5 Figures; 9  
Tables

*Correspondence:* Caroline Thomson

## Abstract

1. In many birds, hatching asynchrony is a common phenomenon, primarily driven by patterns of incubation behaviour. However, experimental results in blue tits (*Cyanistes caeruleus*) have shown that asynchrony is reduced by intrinsic properties of later eggs that accelerate pre-natal development.

2. These intrinsic differences between early and late eggs could be driven by changes in resource availability to females, which are then passively passed onto the egg. Alternatively, it may be due to an anticipatory maternal effect, wherein some signal or resource is actively placed within the egg, which is beneficial to those eggs laid late within the clutch.

3. In order to distinguish between these hypotheses we designed a supplementary feeding experiment, wherein females were provided with food at certain times during the laying phase. This had no discernible effect on development rate, or other egg characteristics, consistent with anticipatory maternal effects.

4. Using a larger data set we also tested whether natural environmental variation (weather) during egg formation affected maternal investment in eggs. Similarly, egg characteristics were found to be relatively insensitive to the environmental variation, supporting the experimental results.

**Keywords:** anticipatory maternal effect, *Cyanistes caeruleus*, development, eggs, food supplementation, passive effects, weather

## Introduction

Parents influence the phenotypes of their offspring, both through the genes they pass on, and by directly modulating the environment offspring experience. These parental

effects have been shown to be present in many systems, and can have a major causal contribution to an individual’s phenotype (Roach & Wulff 1987; Mousseau & Dingle 1991; Mousseau & Fox 1998; Badyaev & Uller 2009; Wolf & Wade 2009). The effects are often context-dependent – varying with the environment that the parents themselves experience (Rossiter 1996, 1998). This could occur through the direct response of a parent to changes in their own environment, which are then passed to offspring, regardless of the phenotypic or fitness consequences of these effects to the offspring. Alternatively, parents may use changes in their own environment to anticipate that which their offspring will experience, and actively modulate their offsprings’ phenotypes accordingly (Marshall & Uller 2007). Although the context-dependency of parental effects is unequivocal, whether anticipatory responses are a common feature of context-dependency remains contentious (Uller *et al.* 2013; Burgess & Marshall 2014). Anticipatory parental effects (Marshall & Uller 2007) are expected to occur when the environment experienced by parents is a predictor of the environment that will be experienced by the offspring (Burgess & Marshall 2014), and selection therefore favours parents producing offspring of an appropriate phenotype for that environment. Whilst there has been some convincing evidence for such effects, such as adaptation to maternal light environments (Galloway & Etterson 2007; Galloway 2005), and transgenerational induction of defences in plants and animals (Agrawal *et al.* 1999), a recent meta-analysis concluded that anticipatory effects were not widespread (Uller *et al.* 2013): In experiments that subjected parents and their offspring to two environments in a fully factorial design, there was only weak evidence that offspring do better when environments are matched rather than mismatched (Uller *et al.* 2013). Although at face value this suggests that evidence for anticipatory parental effects is limited, studies such as those included in the meta-analysis are open to the criticism that the environment parents are subject to is not necessarily a good predictor of the environment offspring would have experienced under natural conditions (Uller *et al.* 2013; Burgess & Marshall 2014)

In species that experience age-related sibling competition, anticipatory parental effects  
60 are hypothesised to evolve in order to mediate these age-related effects, and may be related  
to changes in the size and composition of eggs. Unlike those studies reviewed in Uller *et al.*  
62 (2013), parents are assumed to know (rather than predict) where offspring from specific  
eggs will be placed in any age hierarchy, and thus the competitive environment they may  
64 experience. As a consequence, anticipatory parental effects may more easily evolve. For  
example, Plaistow *et al.* (2007) found that female spider mites increase the size of their eggs  
66 as they age, and attributed this to female anticipation of the level of sibling competition  
later laid eggs will encounter. In birds, egg size (Slagsvold *et al.* 1984) and many egg  
68 constituents have been shown to vary, both between females and across the laying sequence  
of individuals (Williams 2012). These include carotenoids (Royle *et al.* 2001; Blount *et al.*  
70 2002; Török *et al.* 2007; Saino *et al.* 2002), vitamin E (Royle *et al.* 2001) and hormones  
(Gil 2008). Whilst egg size has downstream consequences on juvenile traits (Krist 2011),  
72 hormonal changes in particular have been invoked as mediators of anticipatory parental  
effects (e.g. Schwabl 1993; Schwabl *et al.* 1997; Lipar *et al.* 1999; Muller & Groothuis 2013),  
74 and have also been shown to have downstream effects on multiple aspects of offspring  
competitiveness (Schwabl 1993, 1996; Gorman & Williams 2005; Groothuis *et al.* 2005;  
76 Smiseth *et al.* 2011; Williams 2012).

There is an alternative explanation, however, that changes in egg components across  
78 the laying sequence may be the passive outcome of the response of females to their own  
changing environments, rather than acting in anticipation of the environment offspring  
80 will experience. For example, if dietary carotenoids increase over the season whilst eggs  
are being laid, then the change in eggs may simply reflect the direct effect of carotenoid  
82 availability (Török *et al.* 2007). Similarly, changes in female hormones may be seen in  
preparation for and upon the onset of incubation, leading to different hormonal exposure  
84 of eggs (Goldsmith & Williams 1980; Sockman & Schwabl 1999, 2000), reflecting changes

in cumulative exposure to the female’s endocrine state. Thus, care is needed to distinguish  
86 between anticipatory and passive parental effects.

Previously, we found that prenatal development in blue tits (*Cyanistes caeruleus*) is  
88 faster for eggs laid later in the laying sequence, and showed experimentally that this was in  
part caused by something intrinsic to the eggs at the time of laying (Hadfield *et al.* 2013b).  
90 Although consistent with an anticipatory parental effect that acts to reduce the extent of  
hatching asynchrony, we offered the alternative explanation that it may simply be a result  
92 of females being better able to provision later eggs as the amount of resource available to  
them increases as spring progresses (Hadfield *et al.* 2013b), as there is a rapid change in  
94 food availability in this time period (e.g. Dixon 1976). Here, we aim to test this hypothesis  
by manipulating a female’s resource availability during the laying period to see if this  
96 accelerates the prenatal development of her offspring. To ensure that any effects detected  
are the result of changes to the size or composition of the eggs and not due to any effect  
98 of the treatment on post-laying behaviour, we cross-fostered half the eggs of each nest on  
the day they were laid. We are primarily interested in any effects of this treatment on the  
100 hatching time of eggs, but also model whether it has any effect on egg weight or hatching  
success.

102 The results of our experiment showed little to no effect of the additional resources  
on prenatal development and other egg characteristics. An alternative explanation is  
104 that seasonal changes in the environment are causing laying-order effects on pre-natal  
development, but in a way that was not be recapitulated in the feeding treatment. Thus,  
106 using a larger data set we performed a more general (but correlative) test of whether the  
rate of pre-natal development varied systematically with three weather variables, which  
108 could be drivers of seasonal changes.

## Materials and Methods

110 The experiment was carried out during the springs of 2012 and 2013 on a nest box  
population of blue tits (*Cyanistes caeruleus*) on the Dalmeny estate, Edinburgh, UK. Nest  
112 boxes were placed approximately 30m apart, on two study sites – 180 boxes on Cragie Hill  
(grid reference NT 156 766) and 45 boxes along the Almond River (NT 179 758). From  
114 early in the spring, nest boxes were checked systematically to detect nesting and onset of  
laying. When nest boxes were empty, or had a very small amount of nesting material within  
116 them, they were checked every 4 days. When  $\geq 15$ mm of nesting material was present, boxes  
were checked every 2 days, and once the nest was lined it was checked every day. This  
118 method meant that in all but very few cases, nests were checked on the day in which laying  
began, and thus a single egg was found.

## Cross-foster Design

120 The study was carried out within an ongoing partial cross-foster design used in this  
population (for full details see Hadfield *et al.* 2013a). On the day of clutch initiation, nests  
122 were randomly allocated into groups of three where possible (or two, four, or five if not),  
between which eggs were switched. First eggs were then moved within triads, such that the  
124 egg from nest A was placed in nest B, that from nest B in nest C, and that from C placed in  
nest A. One egg is laid per day, so on alternate days, eggs were either moved between nests, or  
126 remained within their own nests, and every egg was weighed and marked. Crossing ceased  
when one or more nests had a laying pause and resumed when all nests recommenced  
128 laying. Daily checks ceased when the female was incubating for the second day in a row, or  
was found incubating after laying had ceased. The crossing of eggs within a triad stopped  
130 when one nest in a given triad finished laying.

## Feeding experiment

132

Within this cross foster design, a feeding experiment was also carried out in order  
134 to determine how food availability to parents affects the hatching time of eggs. We used  
those nests that were in crosses of 3 or more, and each group was assigned randomly to  
136 either a control group or one of two feeding treatments. When a group was assigned a  
feeding treatment, two nests within that group were fed, and the remaining nest (or nests  
138 if the group was larger than 3) remained as a control. Nests in the feeding treatments  
were provided with twenty wax worms (the larvae of the wax moth, *Gralleria mellonella*)  
140 per day, which were pinned to narrow tree branches close to the nest box (j5m) early each  
morning. On the following day, the number of wax worms consumed was recorded, and any  
142 uneaten wax worms were removed. We set up video cameras at some nests to check that  
the resident birds were taking the food. In some cases other birds were observed taking the  
144 wax worms, but this was relatively rare. Blue tits carry out high levels of courtship feeding  
during the egg laying period (Royama 1966; Krebs 1970; Cramp & Perrins 1993), so we  
146 hope that resources from any wax worms taken by the male are passed to feed the female,  
either directly or indirectly. Nests in the feeding treatments were split into an early group,  
148 which were provided with wax worms on days 1 to 4 of the laying sequence, and a late  
group that received wax worms on days 5 to 8. Both fed nests within a cross-fostering group  
150 were given the same treatment. If development of the embryo is resource limited we expect  
chicks from eggs laid in the treated nests to have more rapid prenatal development if the  
152 food provided lifts this constraint. We predict that this effect should be more pronounced  
in chicks from eggs in the early treatment if resource limitation is more acute at the onset  
154 of laying than later in the sequence. Development of eggs takes around 4 days from the  
onset of rapid yolk development (Haywood 1993), and so eggs 5-8 are expected to be the  
156 most affected in the early treatment, and 9 to 12 in the late treatment. During 2012 there  
were 20 nests in each of the early and late treatment, and 18 in each treatment in 2013, so

there were equal numbers in each treatment overall. There were 63 control nests in 2012, and 60 in 2013. In addition, those nests that were not in cross-fostering groups of three or more were never included within the feeding treatment, and so are classed as having no treatment, as they were not true controls. There were 29 such nests in 2012, and 17 in 2013. The mean number of wax worms eaten per day in the early treatment was 15.8, and 17.7 per day in the late treatment.

The clutch sizes of the nests included in each treatment are shown in Figure ??, along with the distribution of eggs within the laying sequences from each of these treatments. It is worth noting that the clutch size and maximum egg number (a measure for each egg of the days since the first egg was laid in a nest, with the first egg being numbered one) of a nest do not necessarily match due to interruptions in the laying sequence. For example, a female may lay a total of 9 eggs, but may pause in laying, such that eggs were not laid on day 3 and 4 (i.e. there are no eggs three or four), and the maximum egg number is 11 rather than 9. Thus although mean clutch size is 8.26, many nests have several eggs with egg numbers substantially greater than this, even if the total number of eggs in that nest is less than this mean.

*Figure ?? here*

## Hatching times

Nests were checked daily for hatching from 11 days after clutches had been completed. As nests were checked daily, we found chicks within twenty-four hours of the first individual hatching. On this occasion (day 0), the identities of any unhatched eggs were recorded, and



the same was done on the following two visits (day 1 and day 3). No eggs hatched after this  
180 point.

## Weather

182 Hourly temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), rain (ml), and wind speed (knots) measurements were  
obtained from the Met Office (UK Meteorological Office 1853-Current). Wind and  
184 temperature data were from Turnhouse weather station (NT15988 73905, 2.72km from  
Craigie Hill, and 2.69km from Almond River), whereas rain data were from Gogar Bank  
186 (NT17088 71601, 5.21km from Craigie Hill, and 4.27km from Almond River). Hourly data  
were used to calculate daily mean temperature, daily mean wind speed, and daily total  
188 rainfall.

## Analysis

190 Analyses were carried out in R (R Development Core Team 2012), using the package  
MCMCglmm (Hadfield 2010) to fit Bayesian generalized linear mixed models. For those  
192 models which had a binary or ordinal response, residual variances were fixed at 1, as these  
could not be estimated from the data. For other models a flat improper prior for residual  
194 variances was used. For the random effects, parameter expansion was used resulting in  
scaled  $F_{1,1}$  priors on the variances with scale 1000. Fixed effects had independent normal  
196 priors with zero mean and large variances ( $10^8$ ) except in binary/ordinal models. Here, a  
prior correlation matrix was defined as one in which the fixed effects are identically and  
198 independently distributed had the covariates been subject to Gelman’s (2008) scaling and  
centering. The prior correlation matrix was then scaled by six (which in all models was  
200 approximately the sum of the variance components) plus  $\pi^2/3$  or 1, depending on whether

the logit or probit link was used. Feeding models were run for 130000 iterations, with  
 202 a burn in of 30000 and a thinning interval of 50, whereas weather models were run for  
 1300000 iterations, with a burn in of 300000 and a thinning interval of 500 as the chains  
 204 within these models took much longer to mix well.

Fixed effects are considered significant if the 95% credible intervals did not overlap  
 206 zero, and pMCMC (twice the posterior probability that the estimate is either negative or  
 positive, depending on which is the smaller probability) is less than 0.05. For groups of  
 208 fixed effects (e.g. year, treatment) their significance was tested using omnibus Wald tests.

### *Feeding Experiment: egg-level effects*

210 A series of models were developed to look at the effect of the treatment on individual  
 egg characteristics. The main focus was on hatching time, although we also analysed  
 212 hatching success, egg weight, and pausing in laying. In all models, clutch size, year, day  
 of clutch initiation (from 1st April) and whether the egg was laid after a pause in the  
 214 laying sequence or not were fitted as fixed effects. Where necessary, we distinguish between  
 variables measured in the nest-of-origin and nest-of-rearing using the subscripts  $o$  and  $r$   
 216 respectively. The rank $_r$  of the egg (the number of days between it and the final egg in  
 the nest-of-rearing being laid), was fitted as a spline to capture any non-linearity in the  
 218 relationship induced by incubation behaviour (Hadfield *et al.* 2013b). In all models we  
 excluded eggs that had not been found on the day they were laid, and those from clutches  
 220 smaller than three eggs (due to early desertion of the clutch). We also excluded three  
 eggs that weighed less than 0.6g, as these were abnormally small (below half the mean egg  
 222 weight), and do not develop.

For each egg we also included the treatment group of its nest-of-origin (treatment $_o$ ) and

its nest-of-rearing ( $\text{treatment}_r$ ) as a fixed factor. Nests that were neither fed nor assigned as controls were included in the analysis as a fourth level in treatment group (coded as ‘none’). Generally, these were nests that initiated laying early or late in the season when few nests initiated, so that they could not be assigned to groups of three or more.

Eggs within nests of a given feeding treatment vary in when and how many wax worms were consumed by their mother during their development. For example, the fifth egg in an early-treated nest could be affected by up to 80 wax worms provided over the four consecutive days prior to it being laid, whereas the second egg could only be influenced by up to 20 wax worms on the day prior to it being laid. Blue tits are income breeders, and eggs develop over a period of four days (Haywood 1993), and thus the main eggs expected to be affected by the feeding are those laid around four days after feeding occurs (e.g. egg 5 for extra food given on day 1) if supplementary feeding has a direct effect on eggs. To accommodate this, we included the number of wax worms that were consumed on each day prior to the laying of an egg as multiple predictors. Their effects were modelled using a varying coefficient model (Wood 2006; Hastie & Tibshirani 1993): a type of spline that in this context allows changes in the effect of the predictor (number of wax worms eaten) to be a smooth function of some other covariate (the interval of time between the wax worms being eaten and the egg itself being laid). These models have recently been used in an ecological context (Roberts *et al.* 2015) and in our context can capture any physiological lags that exist between the consumption of food and any effect of that food on the egg. Separate varying coefficient splines were fitted for the early and late groups.

The degree to which the treatment splines improved model performance was assessed using 20-fold cross-validation (Stone 1974, 1977), where models were rerun using data with the  $k^{\text{th}}$  subset removed. The posterior mean predicted values for the omitted data were obtained with the random nest-of-origin and nest-of rearing effects marginalised using

posterior predictive simulation. Where responses were discrete, the correct classification  
of the response variable was used as a measure of predictive ability. For continuous  
responses the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) was used. Differences between models in  
their predictive ability were often small, and so we tested whether an increase in predictive  
ability relative to that of the null model (i.e. one without treatment splines) was greater  
than expected from Monte Carlo error (i.e. differences were not solely due to random  
allocation of observations to subsets). This was achieved using repeat-measure ANOVA  
with subset as a random effect.

Hatching time was analysed in two ways. Firstly, hatching asynchrony was fitted as  
an ordinal response, which considers the hatching interval of an egg within a clutch (i.e.  
the hatching day, relative to the first egg in the clutch to hatch, which could be 0, 1 or  
2-3). Secondly, as a censored Gaussian response, which fits the time from the final egg in a  
nest being layed to the hatching of each egg with the censoring points being the day/time  
of nest visits between which an egg hatched. Eggs were assumed to be laid at 6am, as  
the exact laying time was not known, but eggs had always been found after this time  
(Pullen 1946; Perrins 1979). This measure captured differences between nests in incubation  
behaviour of females (time to commence incubation, and duration of incubation), and  
within-nests it captures intrinsic differences in hatching time between eggs. Hatching  
success was analysed as a binary response (hatching/not-hatching) and all abandoned nests  
were excluded. Egg weight was analysed as a Gaussian response, and the probability of an  
egg being laid as a binary response (where an egg being laid was given the value 1). These  
two phenotypes are not dependent on post-laying (and therefore post-crossfostering) effects  
and so nest-of-rearing terms (both fixed and random) were dropped from the model. In  
addition, clutch size<sub>o</sub> was dropped from the model of pausing, as the two are confounded.

*Feeding Experiment: nest-level effects*

274 A second set of models investigated the nest-level effects of the feeding experiment,  
specifically how it affected clutch size and the onset of incubation. The onset of incubation  
276 is taken as the number of days before (negative value) or after (positive value) the last  
egg was laid that the female was found incubating, or the eggs were found to be warm.  
278 Both traits were treated as Gaussian and the models had the same form as above, although  
treatment was included only as a fixed effect, without spline terms, and egg rank was not  
280 included in the model. In addition, only nest-of-origin level terms were retained.

*Weather*

282 In addition to the main analyses, we ran the same models as those described above,  
but also included terms to model how weather (a measure of external conditions) affects  
284 egg- and nest-level characteristics. In these analyses we used comparable data collected in  
the previous two years (Hadfield *et al.* 2013b,a) although egg weight data were unavailable  
286 for 2010. Treated nests from 2012-13 were excluded, as were those eggs included in an  
experiment performed in 2010-2011 (Hadfield *et al.* 2013b). Consequently any terms  
288 associated with treatments were dropped from the model. The effect of weather variables  
(daily mean temperature, daily mean wind speed, and total daily rainfall) were modelled  
290 using varying coefficient splines, as was done for the effect of wax worm consumption. Thus  
each model had three varying coefficient splines within it. Daily weather 50 days prior to,  
292 and 40 days after, laying of a given egg was used in these splines, so that both long- and  
short-term effects of weather might be captured. The sample sizes for each model, along  
294 with those eggs and nests that have been excluded are shown in Table 1.

*Table 1 here*

## Results

### Feeding Experiment: egg-level effects

Overall, we found little support for any effects of the feeding treatment on hatching time and other egg characteristics. This is seen particularly in the fitting of treatment splines – in all models the treatment splines did not improve the predictive ability of the model, as evaluated using cross-validation (Table 2). Consequently, we report the results of these models with the treatment splines removed in the text and tables. However, in Figure 1, and Figure S2 in the Supporting Information, we present the predictions based on the full model.

*Figure 1 here*

*Table 2 here*

The fixed effects for the best model for hatching asynchrony are shown in Table 3. The 95% credible intervals of all fixed treatment effects overlapped zero, and thus there was no significant effect of treatment on asynchrony. There were significant positive effects of clutch size<sub>r</sub>, and the day of clutch initiation, showing nests are more asynchronous when clutches are larger and laid later in the season. The spline of egg rank (Figure S1a) shows that lower rank eggs hatch later (i.e. late laid eggs hatch late), although this ceases to be the case for eggs of rank > 3 which tend to have equivalent hatching times. Nest-of-origin explained a small amount of variance in hatching asynchrony (0.068 [0.018 - 0.149]), whereas the nest-of-rearing explained a greater proportion of variation in the spread of hatching, 0.562 [0.446 - 0.613].

*Table 3 here*

The fixed effects from the censored Gaussian model of hatching time (from the laying of the last egg in a nest) are summarised in Table 4, again this is the best model (without the treatment splines). Overall, the results are broadly similar to the hatching asynchrony model with all fixed treatment effects overlapping zero and therefore non-significant. There was a significant negative effect of clutch size<sub>r</sub>, with eggs hatching 0.287 days ([0.127 - 0.445],  $P < 0.001$ ) faster for each additional egg in a nest, and eggs in later clutches hatched faster by 0.106 days ([0.074 - 0.137],  $P < 0.001$ ) for each day later in the season. In addition the rank spline (Figure S1b) shows that there is a decrease in time from laying to hatching with increasing rank, although this change is most prominent for those eggs of low rank. The variance explained by the nest-of-origin was small, with an intraclass correlation of 0.002 [0.000 - 0.007], but the variance explained by the nest-of-rearing was much larger (0.972 [0.962 - 0.976]) as the censored Gaussian model also includes variation due to differences in incubation behaviour between females. However, the nest-of-origin effect within nest-of-rearing explained more variance (0.079 [0.000 - 0.202]).

*Table 4 here*

For the best model of hatching success, the fixed effects are summarised in Table 5 (no treatment splines were in the best model). No significant differences between treatment groups were found, although eggs in none-fed none-control nests were significantly less likely to hatch (-0.863 logits [-1.684 - -0.100]  $P = 0.040$ ). Eggs laid after a pause show a significantly lower probability of hatching than those not laid after a pause. The rank spline (Figure S1c) shows that later laid eggs in a clutch (low rank) are more likely to hatch than

earlier ones, and Figure 1c suggests this is mainly due to first eggs having lower hatching probability. Both the intraclass correlation for nest-of-origin (0.153 [0.000 - 0.264]), and nest-of-rearing (0.167 [0.055 - 0.287]) were reasonably small and of similar magnitude.

*Table 5 here*

The fixed effects from the best model of egg weight are summarised in Table 6; this model did not include any treatment splines. The 95% credible intervals of all treatment effects overlapped zero, thus treatment did not have an effect on egg weight. Eggs were significantly smaller (-0.080 g [-0.111 - -0.049]  $P < 0.001$ ) in 2013 than 2012 and egg weight increased by 0.002 g per day ([0.000 - 0.003],  $P = 0.028$ ) as clutch initiation day increased. There was also a significant effect of being laid after a pause, with eggs laid after an interruption in laying being 0.051 g ([0.043 - 0.059],  $P < 0.001$ ) heavier. The rank spline (Figure S1d) shows that there is a general decrease of egg weight with increasing rank, implying that late laid eggs tend to be heavier than earlier ones. A large proportion of the variance in egg weight was explained by nest-of-origin (0.800 [0.768 - 0.832]).

*Table 6 here*

The fixed effects from the best model of the probability of an egg being laid are summarised in Table 7 (treatment splines did not improve the model). These results suggest that feeding had no significant effect on the probability that an egg is laid. There is a significant negative effect of the day of clutch initiation, such that pausing occurs more frequently later in the season. The rank spline, Figure S1e, shows a negative effect of egg rank on the probability that an egg is laid, such that interruptions in the laying sequence



are more likely to happen early in a clutch. The intraclass correlation for nest-of-origin was moderate: 0.179 [0.088 - 0.312].

*Table 7 here*

### Feeding Experiment: nest-level effects

The fixed effects from the model of clutch size are summarised in Table 8. Neither treatment had a significant effect on clutch size – early treatment resulted in 0.413 more eggs ([−0.130 - 0.964],  $P=0.136$ ) than control nests; late treatment resulted in 0.386 more eggs ([−0.197 - 0.947],  $P=0.170$ ). The difference between early and late treatments overlapped zero (0.026 [−0.640 - 0.676]  $P=0.917$ ), and the omnibus test showed there was no overall significant effect from the treatments (Wald test  $\chi^2=3.172$ ,  $P=0.205$ ). There is a significant negative effect of the date on which the clutch started, with females laying 0.073 fewer eggs ([0.049 - 0.095],  $P<0.001$ ) with each additional day after April 1st that the clutch started.

*Table 8 here*

The fixed effects from the model of incubation onset are summarised in Table 9. There was a marginal effect of early treatments on the onset of incubation, with incubation commencing 0.639 days later ([−0.119 - 1.309],  $P=0.090$ ) than in controls. Although there was no effect of the late treatment, the difference between early and late treatments overlapped zero (0.703 [−0.164 - 1.609]  $P=0.107$ ). As with clutch size, there was a significant negative effect on the incubation onset of the clutch initiation day – incubation began 0.080

days ([0.048 - 0.114],  $P < 0.001$ ) earlier, relative to the final egg, with each day after 1st of  
380 April that the female commenced laying. Additionally, there is a significant negative effect  
of clutch size, such that incubation onset advanced by 0.261 days ([0.087 - 0.417],  $P = 0.003$ )  
382 for each additional egg in a clutch.

*Table 9 here*

## Weather

384  
Generally, we found little support for weather having effects on hatching time, and  
386 other egg characteristics. In all models, except the censored gaussian model of hatching  
time and the model of clutch size, the weather splines did not improve the predictive  
388 ability of the model as evaluated using cross-validation (Table 10). The results of the null  
models were qualitatively similar to the feeding treatment models and are presented in the  
390 supplementary information. The main difference was support for inter-annual differences  
in all models, even for those egg characteristics and nest effects for which no significant  
392 differences between 2012 and 2013 were found. In addition, the significant effect of eggs  
laid after a pause having a lower probability of hatching (-0.842 logits [-1.520 - -0.126]  
394  $P = 0.028$ ), were not replicated in the larger data set (-0.306 logits [-1.016 - 0.370]  $P = 0.377$ ).  
The splines for each weather variable are shown in Figures S3, S4 and S5.

396  
*Table 10 here*

The best supported model for the censored Gaussian model of hatching time was that  
398 with temperature and rain splines included, however the full model had a very similar

classification rate so there was little difference between models with and without wind  
400 included (correct classification rate of best model 0.2190; Full model 0.2189; Null model  
0.2181). The fixed effects from the best model are shown in Table S3, whilst those for the  
402 full and null model are shown in Table S2. The weather spline in Figure S4b shows that  
there was a positive effect of temperature on hatching time (days from last egg laid in a  
404 nest to hatching), up to three weeks prior to the egg being laid, implying that eggs that  
are developing in the female when conditions are warmer then hatch later. However, the  
406 converse appears to be the case post-laying, where there is a negative effect of temperature  
on hatching time, such that warm conditions after an egg has been laid leads to an  
408 acceleration in hatching time. Both rain (Figure S5b) and wind (Figure S3b) prior to laying  
appear to have little effect on hatching time in the full model, although the effect of rain  
410 is supported by cross validation. Year has a significant effect on hatching time in the best  
model (Wald test on year  $\chi^2=13.651$ ,  $P=0.003$ ), with the biggest estimated difference of  
412 an increase of 1.746 days ([0.721 - 2.675],  $P<0.001$ ) to hatching between 2011 and 2012.  
However, year effects were larger in the null model with an increase of 2.429 days ([2.045 -  
414 2.847],  $P<0.001$ ) to hatching between 2011 and 2012 (Wald test on year  $\chi^2=153.13$ ,  $P<0.001$ ),  
implying that year and weather effects may be confounded. Similarly, laydate was not  
416 significant in the best model, although it was in the null model. In contrast to the feeding  
model, clutch size<sub>r</sub> did not have a significant effect in the full model, but did in the null  
418 model, whereas clutch size<sub>o</sub> had a significant positive effect on hatching time in both the  
full and null model.

420 Inclusion of splines of temperature and wind improved the predictive ability of the  
model of clutch size ( $R^2=0.308$ ; Null model  $R^2=0.259$ ). The weather splines for wind and  
422 temperature are seen in Figures S3f and S4f respectively. Wind appears to have a negative  
effect on clutch size, such that females lay fewer eggs as mean daily wind speed increases.  
424 Similarly, temperature negatively affects clutch size, such that smaller clutches are laid

as daily mean temperature increases. Year has a non-significant effect (Wald test on year  
426  $\chi^2=0.305$ ,  $P=0.883$ ), although this then appears significant in the null model. Laydate did  
not have an effect on clutch size, although this was significant and negative in the null  
428 model, suggesting that seasonal effect as well as year are confounded with weather in this  
model.

## 430 Discussion

The experiment described above was designed to test whether the increased rate of  
432 prenatal development across the laying sequence of blue tits could be directly caused by an  
increase in the resource availability to the mother at the time of laying. We found little  
434 support for supplementary feeding accelerating prenatal development; If anything, there  
was a positive effect of food consumption on hatching time, i.e. hatching occurred later  
436 due to supplementary feeding. Thus, we conclude that the changes in resource availability  
are not likely to be responsible for the intrinsic acceleration of hatching of late laid eggs  
438 observed in Hadfield *et al.* (2013b). We do not see any significant effect of treatment on  
female behaviour, although the effect size for the fixed effect of treatment on clutch size  
440 is reasonable large (increased clutch size by half an egg), suggesting that we may lack the  
power to estimate this effect.

442 Our results suggest that differences between eggs across the laying sequence are the  
result of changes in the female that are independent of either the nutritive or climatic  
444 environment. Consequently, these results are consistent with the idea that females are  
manipulating the developmental rate and consequent hatching time of their offspring  
446 independently of their own state. The mechanism by which they achieve this could be  
through increasing the provision of resources to eggs laid later. Consistent with this idea  
448 is the fact that egg size increases over the laying sequence, and larger eggs hatch faster

(Rubolini *et al.* 2005; Hadfield *et al.* 2013b). This is a clear extension of previous work  
450 that suggested that larger size of late-laid eggs should benefit late-hatched chicks through  
the effect on the size at hatching of those chicks (Howe 1976; Clark & Wilson 1981), and  
452 thus reducing the effect of hatching asynchrony. Where size also affects hatching time,  
then size differences may affect the extent, as well as the effect, of hatching asynchrony. In  
454 addition, Ferrari *et al.* (2006) and Alquati *et al.* (2007) found that experimental removal  
of albumen delayed hatching, thus the relative amount of albumen and yolk within an egg  
456 may be important in influencing prenatal development. Maternally deposited hormones are  
a more commonly invoked candidate as a mediator of anticipatory maternal effects. More  
458 specifically, androgens generally act to accelerate pre- and post-hatching development (e.g.  
Lipar & Ketterson 2000; Eising *et al.* 2001), reviewed in von Engelhardt & Groothuis (2011),  
460 although contrary results have been found (Sockman & Schwabl 2000; Von Engelhardt  
*et al.* 2006). Previous work on blue tits, however, suggests there is little variation across  
462 the clutch in androgen concentration (Kingma *et al.* 2009); a pattern predicted from  
interspecific comparisons of initial size differences between first and last hatching chicks  
464 and yolk testosterone compensation (Muller & Groothuis 2013). Thus, it seems unlikely  
that androgens, are driving the differences in prenatal development in this particular  
466 case, although other hormones may be at play. Nonetheless, our experiment is unable to  
differentiate between a passive effect of changes in the females endocrine state and an active  
468 anticipatory role if hormones are mediating such effects. It is not known whether females  
are able to independently control blood plasma and egg hormone concentrations, but most  
470 hormones in egg yolks are derived from cells in the developing follicle (Huang *et al.* 1979;  
Hackl *et al.* 2003; Williams *et al.* 2004; Gil 2008), and so the possibility of independent  
472 control exists (Groothuis & Schwabl 2008).

It is also possible that laying order effects are a direct maternal response to changing  
474 nutritive conditions, but such an effect might not be seen if providing wax worms failed

to recapitulate such conditions. However, the wax worms provided to the birds should  
476 contain sufficient calorific and protein content to lift seasonal resource constraints; twenty  
wax worms constitute 12kcal and 0.67g protein (Sauter *et al.* 2006), whereas blue tits  
478 require 13.8kcal per day (Gibb 1957, winter conditions) and each egg contains about 0.12g  
of protein (Bourgault *et al.* 2007; Murphy 1994, given a mean egg weight of 1.18g) . Thus,  
480 although there is evidence that responses to feeding experiments depend upon the protein  
content of the food provided (Nager *et al.* 1997; Ramsay & Houston 1997, 1998), we  
482 believe our supplementary feeding would lift any constraints imposed by limited protein  
availability. Furthermore, if changing nutritive conditions were generating changes in  
484 hatching time, this would be detected in the models using climatic variables as predictors,  
which was not seen. In addition to macronutrients, it is possible that birds become less  
486 constrained by micronutrients as laying progresses. In particular, blue tits do not use  
skeletal calcium for egg production, so all calcium must be obtained in the diet (Woodburn  
488 & Perrins 1997) mainly through consumption of snail shells, bones and grit (Betts 1955;  
Graveland & Berends 1997; Reynolds & Perrins 2010). Twenty wax worms contains just  
490 0.230mg calcium, much less than the content of an eggshell (58mg; Graveland & Berends  
1997). However, although the wax worms may be limiting in certain resources, the energy  
492 they provide may still allow greater time and resources to be spent in obtaining those  
micronutrients.

494 Previous feeding experiments lend support to the idea that supplementary feeding can  
lift constraints associated with breeding, since supplemented birds often show advanced lay  
496 dates and increased clutch size (see Christians 2002; Robb *et al.* 2008a). However, these  
experiments usually commence feeding prior to laying, ranging from several months prior  
498 to breeding (e.g. Robb *et al.* 2008b) to a few days (e.g. Ramsay & Houston 1997), and  
the few that have looked at effects on prenatal development often attribute differences to  
500 behavioural changes in the female rather than changes in egg characteristics (e.g. Wiebe &

Bortolotti 1994). In the experiment shown here we failed to find any effect of supplementary  
502 food on female behaviour, either through clutch size or incubation. Nevertheless, there is  
limited evidence that supplementary feeding can alter egg characteristics. Effects on egg  
504 size in particular have been investigated, and some increases in response to supplementary  
food have been found (Wiebe & Bortolotti 1995; Horsfall 1984; Ramsay & Houston 1997),  
506 although the results are not always replicated (Nilsson & Svensson 1993; Nager *et al.* 1997),  
and the majority of studies have failed to find any significant effect of feeding (reviewed  
508 in Christians 2002). A recent paper from Ruuskanen *et al.* (2016) carried out a similar  
experiment to the one shown here, and found increased egg mass in fed nests. However,  
510 there appear to be differences between mass of eggs in control and fed treatments prior to  
feeding, and thus the conclusions from this may be questionable.

512 In this study we fail to see any major effect of the environment on the prenatal  
development of chicks, either through the provision of food or through correlations with  
514 the weather at the time of laying. Thus it seems that egg characteristics and prenatal  
development are insensitive to external conditions as experienced by the mother. Consistent  
516 with this insensitivity is the high repeatability of egg size (Christians 2002; Williams 2012),  
and other egg constituents (Postma *et al.* 2014), within females. This suggests that the  
518 observed laying-order effects are regulated by the female without regard to her external  
environment. If the laying-order effects are the result of differential resource provisioning  
520 by the female, then we suggest that this is in anticipation of the level of sibling competition  
the chicks will experience. However, if the laying-order effects are mediated by maternal  
522 androgens our results are silent as to whether they are passive by-products of the females  
endocrinological state or whether they constitute an anticipatory parental effect.

### *Author Contributions*

524 CET designed the experiment, carried out field work and statistical analysis, and wrote

the manuscript. JDH helped in experimental design, carried out field work, designed the statistical analysis, and contributed to writing the manuscript.

## *Acknowledgements*

Thanks to Mar Zurita Cassinello, Jorge Meltzer Gomez-Escalonilla, Nick Crouch, Sam Farrell, Simon Nockold for help in data collection. Thanks also to Albert Phillimore and Adrian Roberts for help with analyses, and to BADC-NERC for access to climate data. This work was funded by Royal Society Fellowship to JDH, and supported by Lord Rosebery and Dalmeny estate. CET is funded by EPSRC, Clarendon Fund and Magdalen College, Oxford.

## *Data Accessibility*

Data and scripts used for this paper are available on Data Dryad DOI: doi:10.5061/dryad.26h4q.



## REFERENCES

- 538 Agrawal, A.A., Laforsch, C. & Tollrian, R. (1999) Transgenerational induction of defences  
in animals and plants. *Nature* **401**, 60–63.
- 540 Alquati, A.B., Rubolini, D., Romano, M., Boncoraglio, G., Fasola, M. & Saino, N. (2007)  
Effects of egg albumen removal on yellow-legged gull chick phenotype. *Functional*  
542 *Ecology* **21**, 310–316.
- Badyaev, A.V. & Uller, T. (2009) Parental effects in ecology and evolution: mechanisms,  
544 processes and implications. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:*  
*Biological Sciences* **364**, 1169–1177.
- 546 Betts, M.M. (1955) The food of titmice in oak woodland. *The Journal of Animal Ecology*  
**24**, 282–323.
- 548 Blount, J.D., Surai, P.F., Houston, D.C. & Moller, A.P. (2002) Patterns of yolk enrichment  
with dietary carotenoids in gulls: the roles of pigment acquisition and utilization.  
550 *Functional Ecology* **16**, 445–453.
- Bourgault, P., Thomas, D.W., Blondel, J., Perret, P. & Lambrechts, M.M. (2007)  
552 Between-population differences in egg composition in blue tits (*Cyanistes caeruleus*).  
*Canadian Journal of Zoology* **85**, 71–80.
- 554 Burgess, S.C. & Marshall, D.J. (2014) Adaptive parental effects: the importance of  
estimating environmental predictability and offspring fitness appropriately. *Oikos*  
556 **123**, 769–776.
- Christians, J.K. (2002) Avian egg size: variation within species and inflexibility within  
558 individuals. *Biological Reviews* **77**, 1–26.

Clark, A.B. & Wilson, D.S. (1981) Avian breeding adaptations: hatching asynchrony, brood  
560 reduction, and nest failure. *Quarterly Review of Biology* **56**, 253–277.

Cramp, S. & Perrins, C.M. (1993) *Handbook of the birds of Europe, Middle East and North*  
562 *Africa. The birds of the Western Palearctic.*, vol. 7. Oxford University Press.

Dixon, A.F.G. (1976) Timing of egg hatch and viability of the sycamore aphid,  
564 *Drepanosiphum platanoidis* (Schr.), at bud burst of sycamore, *Acer pseudoplatanus*  
L. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **45**, 593–603.

Eising, C.M., Eikenaar, C., Schwabl, H. & Groothuis, T.G. (2001) Maternal androgens  
566 in black-headed gull (*Larus ridibundus*) eggs: consequences for chick development.  
568 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* **268**,  
839–846.

Ferrari, R.P., Martinelli, R. & Saino, N. (2006) Differential effects of egg albumen content  
570 on barn swallow nestlings in relation to hatch order. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*  
572 **19**, 981–993.

Galloway, L.F. (2005) Maternal effects provide phenotypic adaptation to local environmental  
574 conditions. *New Phytologist* **166**, 93–100.

Galloway, L.F. & Etterson, J.R. (2007) Transgenerational plasticity is adaptive in the wild.  
576 *Science* **318**, 1134–1136.

Gelman, A., Jakulin, A., Pittau, M.G. & Su, Y.S. (2008) A weakly informative default  
578 prior distribution for logistic and other regression models. *The Annals of Applied*  
*Statistics* **2**, 1360–1383.

Gibb, J. (1957) Food requirements and other observations on captive tits. *Bird Study* **4**,  
580 207–215.

- 582 Gil, D. (2008) Hormones in avian eggs: physiology, ecology and behavior. *Advances in the  
Study of Behaviour* **38**, 337–398.
- 584 Goldsmith, A. & Williams, D. (1980) Incubation in mallards (*Anas platyrhynchos*): changes  
in plasma levels of prolactin and luteinizing hormone. *Journal of Endocrinology* **86**,  
586 371–379.
- Gorman, K. & Williams, T. (2005) Correlated evolution of maternally derived yolk  
588 testosterone and early developmental traits in passerine birds. *Biology Letters* **1**,  
461–464.
- 590 Graveland, J. & Berends, A.E. (1997) Timing of the calcium intake and effect of  
calcium deficiency on behaviour and egg laying in captive great tits, *Parus major*.  
592 *Physiological zoology* **70**, 74–84.
- Groothuis, T.G., Müller, W., von Engelhardt, N., Carere, C. & Eising, C. (2005) Maternal  
594 hormones as a tool to adjust offspring phenotype in avian species. *Neuroscience &  
Biobehavioral Reviews* **29**, 329–352.
- 596 Groothuis, T.G. & Schwabl, H. (2008) Hormone-mediated maternal effects in birds:  
mechanisms matter but what do we know of them? *Philosophical Transactions of  
598 the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **363**, 1647–1661.
- Hackl, R., Bromundt, V., Daisley, J., Kotrschal, K. & Möstl, E. (2003) Distribution and  
600 origin of steroid hormones in the yolk of japanese quail eggs (*Coturnix coturnix  
japonica*). *Journal of Comparative Physiology B* **173**, 327–331.
- 602 Hadfield, J.D. (2010) MCMC methods for multi-response generalized linear mixed models:  
the MCMCglmm R package. *Journal of Statistical Software* **33**, 1–22.

- 604 Hadfield, J.D., Heap, E.A., Bayer, F., Mittell, E.A. & Crouch, N. (2013a) Disentangling  
genetic and prenatal sources of familial resemblance across ontogeny in a wild  
606 passerine. *Evolution* **67**, 2701–2713.
- Hadfield, J.D., Heap, E.A., Bayer, F., Mittell, E.A. & Crouch, N. (2013b) Intrac clutch  
608 differences in egg characteristics mitigate the consequences of age related hierarchies  
in a wild passerine. *Evolution* **67**, 2688–2700.
- 610 Hastie, T. & Tibshirani, R. (1993) Varying-coefficient models. *Journal of the Royal  
Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* **55**, 757–796.
- 612 Haywood, S. (1993) Role of extrinsic factors in the control of clutch-size in the blue tit  
*Parus caeruleus*. *Ibis* **135**, 79–84.
- 614 Horsfall, J.A. (1984) Food supply and egg mass variation in the european coot. *Ecology* **65**,  
89–95.
- 616 Howe, H.F. (1976) Egg size, hatching asynchrony, sex, and brood reduction in the common  
grackle. *Ecology* **57**, 1195–1207.
- 618 Huang, E.S.R., Kao, K. & Nalbandov, A. (1979) Synthesis of sex steroids by cellular  
components of chicken follicles. *Biology of Reproduction* **20**, 454–461.
- 620 Kingma, S.A., Komdeur, J., Vedder, O., von Engelhardt, N., Korsten, P. & Groothuis, T.G.  
(2009) Manipulation of male attractiveness induces rapid changes in avian maternal  
622 yolk androgen deposition. *Behavioral Ecology* **20**, 172–179.
- Krebs, J. (1970) The efficiency of courtship feeding in the blue tit *parus caeruleus*. *Ibis* **112**,  
624 108–110.
- Krist, M. (2011) Egg size and offspring quality: a meta-analysis in birds. *Biological Reviews*  
626 **86**, 692–716.

Lipar, J.L. & Ketterson, E.D. (2000) Maternally derived yolk testosterone enhances the  
628 development of the hatching muscle in the red-winged blackbird *Agelaius phoeniceus*.  
*Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* **267**,  
630 2005–2010.

Lipar, J.L., Ketterson, E.D. & Nolan, V. (1999) Intracatch variation in testosterone content  
632 of red-winged blackbird eggs. *The Auk* **116**, 231–235.

Marshall, D.J. & Uller, T. (2007) When is a maternal effect adaptive? *Oikos* **116**,  
634 1957–1963.

Mousseau, T.A. & Dingle, H. (1991) Maternal effects in insect life histories. *Annual review*  
636 *of Entomology* **36**, 511–534.

Mousseau, T.A. & Fox, C.W. (1998) The adaptive significance of maternal effects. *Trends*  
638 *in Ecology & Evolution* **13**, 403–407.

Muller, M. & Groothuis, T.G. (2013) Within-clutch variation in yolk testosterone as an  
640 adaptive maternal effect to modulate avian sibling competition: evidence from a  
comparative study. *The American Naturalist* **181**, 125–136.

642 Murphy, M.E. (1994) Amino acid compositions of avian eggs and tissues: nutritional  
implications. *Journal of Avian Biology* **25**, 27–38.

644 Nager, R.G., Ruegger, C. & Van Noordwijk, A.J. (1997) Nutrient or energy limitation on  
egg formation: a feeding experiment in great tits. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **66**,  
646 495–507.

Nilsson, J.k. & Svensson, E. (1993) Energy constraints and ultimate decisions during  
648 egg-laying in the blue tit. *Ecology* **74**, 244–251.

Perrins, C.M. (1979) *British Tits*. The New Naturalist, Collins, London.

- 650 Plaistow, S.J., Clair, J.J.S., Grant, J. & Benton, T.G. (2007) How to put all your eggs  
in one basket: empirical patterns of offspring provisioning throughout a mother's  
652 lifetime. *The American Naturalist* **170**, 520–529.
- Postma, E., Siitari, H., Schwabl, H., Richner, H. & Tschirren, B. (2014) The multivariate  
654 egg: quantifying within-and among-clutch correlations between maternally derived  
yolk immunoglobulins and yolk androgens using multivariate mixed models. *Oecologia*  
656 **174**, 631–638.
- Pullen, N. (1946) Further notes on the breeding of blue tits. *British Birds* **39**, 162–167.
- 658 R Development Core Team (2012) R: A language and environment for statistical computing.  
ISBN 3-900051-07-0.
- 660 Ramsay, S. & Houston, D. (1998) The effect of dietary amino acid composition on egg  
production in blue tits. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B:*  
662 *Biological Sciences* **265**, 1401–1405.
- Ramsay, S.L. & Houston, D.C. (1997) Nutritional constraints on egg production in the blue  
664 tit: a supplementary feeding study. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **66**, 649–657.
- Reynolds, S.J. & Perrins, C.M. (2010) Dietary calcium availability and reproduction in  
666 birds. *Current Ornithology* (ed. C.F. Thompson), vol. 17, pp. 31–74, Springer, New  
York.
- 668 Roach, D.A. & Wulff, R.D. (1987) Maternal effects in plants. *Annual Review of Ecology and*  
*Systematics* **18**, 209–235.
- 670 Robb, G.N., McDonald, R.A., Chamberlain, D.E. & Bearhop, S. (2008a) Food for thought:  
supplementary feeding as a driver of ecological change in avian populations. *Frontiers*  
672 *in Ecology and the Environment* **6**, 476–484.

- Robb, G.N., McDonald, R.A., Chamberlain, D.E., Reynolds, S.J., Harrison, T.J. &  
674 Bearhop, S. (2008b) Winter feeding of birds increases productivity in the subsequent  
breeding season. *Biology Letters* **4**, 220–223.
- 676 Roberts, A.M., Tansey, C., Smithers, R.J. & Phillimore, A.B. (2015) Predicting a change  
in the order of spring phenology in temperate forests. *Global Change Biology* **21**,  
678 2603–2611.
- Rossiter, M. (1996) Incidence and consequences of inherited environmental effects. *Annual*  
680 *Review of Ecology and Systematics* **27**, 451–476.
- Rossiter, M. (1998) The role of environmental variation in parental effects expression.  
682 *Maternal effects as adaptations* (eds. C. Fox & T. Mousseau), pp. 112–134, Oxford  
University Press, Oxford, UK.
- 684 Royama, T. (1966) A re-interpretation of courtship feeding. *Bird Study* **13**, 116–129.
- Royale, N.J., Surai, P. & Hartley, I.R. (2001) Maternally derived androgens and antioxidants  
686 in bird eggs: complementary but opposing effects? *Behavioral Ecology* **12**, 381–385.
- Rubolini, D., Romano, M., Boncoraglio, G., Ferrari, R.P., Martinelli, R., Galeotti, P.,  
688 Fasola, M. & Saino, N. (2005) Effects of elevated egg corticosterone levels on  
behavior, growth, and immunity of yellow-legged gull (*Larus Zichahellis*) chicks.  
690 *Hormones and Behavior* **47**, 592–605.
- Ruuskanen, S., Darras, V.M., Vries, B., Visser, M.E. & Groothuis, T.G. (2016) Experimental  
692 manipulation of food availability leads to short-term intra-clutch adjustment in egg  
mass but not in yolk androgen or thyroid hormones. *Journal of Avian Biology* **47**,  
694 36–46.

Saino, N., Bertacche, V., Ferrari, R.P., Martinelli, R., Møller, A.P. & Stradi, R. (2002)

696 Carotenoid concentration in barn swallow eggs is influenced by laying order, maternal  
infection and paternal ornamentation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London.  
698 Series B: Biological Sciences* **269**, 1729–1733.

Sauter, A., Bowman, R., Schoech, S.J. & Pasinelli, G. (2006) Does optimal foraging theory  
700 explain why suburban florida scrub-jays (*Aphelocoma coerulescens*) feed their young  
human-provided food? *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **60**, 465–474.

702 Schwabl, H. (1993) Yolk is a source of maternal testosterone for developing birds. *Proceedings  
of the National Academy of Sciences* **90**, 11446–11450.

704 Schwabl, H. (1996) Maternal testosterone in the avian egg enhances postnatal growth.  
*Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Physiology* **114**, 271–276.

706 Schwabl, H., Mock, D.W. & Gieg, J.A. (1997) A hormonal mechanism for parental  
favouritism. *Nature* **386**, 231.

708 Slagsvold, T., Sandvik, J., Rofstad, G., Lorentsen, O. & Husby, M. (1984) On the adaptive  
value of intraclutch egg-size variation in birds. *The Auk* **101**, 685–697.

710 Smiseth, P.T., Scott, M.P. & Andrews, C. (2011) Hormonal regulation of offspring begging  
and mediation of parent-offspring conflict. *Animal Behaviour* **81**, 507–517.

712 Sockman, K.W. & Schwabl, H. (1999) Daily estradiol and progesterone levels relative to  
laying and onset of incubation in canaries. *General and Comparative Endocrinology*  
714 **114**, 257–268.

Sockman, K.W. & Schwabl, H. (2000) Yolk androgens reduce offspring survival. *Proceedings  
716 of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* **267**, 1451–1456.



Stone, M. (1974) Cross-validators choice and assessment of statistical predictions. *Journal*  
718 *of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* **36**, 111–147.

Stone, M. (1977) Asymptotics for and against cross-validation. *Biometrika* **64**, 29–35.

720 Thomson, C.E. & Hadfield, J.D. (2017) Data for: Prenatal maternal effects ap-  
pear to be insensitive to experimental or natural environmental variation,  
722 doi:10.5061/dryad.26h4q.

Török, J., Hargitai, R., Hegyi, G., Matus, Z., Michl, G., Péczely, P., Rosivall, B. & Tóth,  
724 G. (2007) Carotenoids in the egg yolks of collared flycatchers (*Ficedula albicollis*)  
in relation to parental quality, environmental factors and laying order. *Behavioral*  
726 *Ecology and Sociobiology* **61**, 541–550.

UK Meteorological Office (1853-Current) Met office integrated data archive system (midas)  
728 land and marine surface stations data.

Uller, T., Nakagawa, S. & English, S. (2013) Weak evidence for anticipatory parental effects  
730 in plants and animals. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **26**, 2161–2170.

Von Engelhardt, N., Carere, C., Dijkstra, C. & Groothuis, T.G. (2006) Sex-specific effects  
732 of yolk testosterone on survival, begging and growth of zebra finches. *Proceedings of*  
*the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **273**, 65–70.

734 von Engelhardt, N. & Groothuis, T. (2011) Maternal hormones in avian eggs. *Hormones*  
*and Reproduction of Vertebrates* (eds. D. Norris & K. Lopez), vol. 4, pp. 91–127,  
736 Academic Press, London.

Wiebe, K. & Bortolotti, G. (1995) Egg size and clutch size in the reproductive investment  
738 of american kestrels. *Journal of Zoology* **237**, 285–301.

Wiebe, K.L. & Bortolotti, G.R. (1994) Food supply and hatching spans of birds: energy  
constraints or facultative manipulation. *Ecology* **75**, 813–823.

Williams, T., Kitaysky, A. & Vézina, F. (2004) Individual variation in plasma estradiol-17 $\beta$   
and androgen levels during egg formation in the european starling *Sturnus vulgaris*:  
implications for regulation of yolk steroids. *General and Comparative Endocrinology*  
**136**, 346–352.

Williams, T.D. (2012) *Physiological Adaptations for Breeding in Birds*. Princeton University  
Press, Princeton, NJ.

Wolf, J.B. & Wade, M.J. (2009) What are maternal effects (and what are they not)?  
*Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **364**,  
1107–1115.

Wood, S. (2006) *Generalized additive models: an introduction with R*. Chapman and  
Hall/CRC, Florida.

Woodburn, R. & Perrins, C. (1997) Weight change and the body reserves of female blue  
tits, *Parus caeruleus*, during the breeding season. *Journal of Zoology* **243**, 789–802.

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found in the online version of this article.

Figure 1: Egg Rank Splines from the Feeding Analyses

Figure 2: Feeding Splines from the Feeding Analyses

Figure 3: Splines of the effect of Wind from the Weather Analyses

Figure 4: Splines of the effect of Temperature from the Weather Analyses

760 Figure 5: Splines of the effect of Rain from the Weather Analyses

Tables 1-9: Results from the models of the effects of Weather on Egg- and Nest  
762 characteristics.

Please note: Wiley Blackwell are not responsible for the content or functionality of any  
764 supporting information supplied by the authors. Any queries (other than missing material)  
should be directed to the corresponding author for the article.




Fig. 1.— The cumulative effect of wax worms eaten on (a) hatching asynchrony within nest, (b) time from laying of the final egg in a nest to hatching, (c) probability of hatching, (d) weight of eggs, and (e) the probability that an egg is laid. Boxplots and barplots show the raw data, split by treatment, together with predictions (solid lines) and 95% credible intervals (dashed lines). Predictions were made holding all predictors at their mean value except rank and the number of wax worms eaten for which we use the mean for each egg-number/treatment combination.

Table 1: Sample sizes (n), the number of eggs that are excluded, and the number of nests that those eggs are found in, for each model

	<b>Feeding</b>				<b>Weather</b>			
	Included		Excluded		Included		Excluded	
	Eggs	Nests	Eggs	Nests	Eggs	Nests	Eggs	Nests
Ordinal Hatching	1649	214	67	3	3076	426	775	39
Censored Gaussian Hatching	1649	214	67	3	3076	426	775	39
Hatching Success	1825	215	49	2	3425	428	829	37
Weight	1979	235	51	12	2754	319	730	91
Pausing	1739	235	0	0	3259	431	794	93
Clutch Size		229		18		409		115
Onset of Incubation		210		24		391		104

Table 2: Mean predictive power from 20-fold cross validation of feeding experiment models, comparing the full model (all fixed and random effects included, along with splines of the effects of the feeding experiment) with those that drop the splines for each of the early and late treatments, and the null model in which both are dropped (but all other fixed and random effects are retained). Ordinal and Censored Gaussian are the two models of hatching time.. For weight, predictive power is measured as an  $R^2$  value, and for other models it is the rate of correct classification. In all cases the predictions are marginal with respect to  $\text{nest}_o$  and  $\text{nest}_r$  (where appropriate). The final column is the probability that the estimated predictive power of the best model (in bold) exceeds that of the null model more than would be expected from Monte Carlo error alone.

	Full	Early	Late	Both	$\text{Pr}(\hat{z}W)$
	Model	Spline	Spline	Dropped	
		Dropped	Dropped		
Ordinal	0.616	0.615	<b>0.616</b>	0.615	0.1240
Censored Gaussian	0.178	0.178	<b>0.178</b>	0.177	0.0830
Hatching Success	0.842	0.842	0.842	<b>0.843</b>	
Weight	0.094	0.095	0.096	<b>0.097</b>	
Laying Success	0.793	0.793	<b>0.794</b>	0.793	0.5090

Table 3: Summary of the fixed effects from an ordinal model of hatching asynchrony (day of hatching relative to the first day of hatching within the nest). These results are from a model without treatment splines since they did not significantly increase predictive ability (Table 2). P-values from wald tests on fixed effects are also presented. The mean is the posterior mean, l-95% and u-95% are the lower and upper 95% credible intervals.

	mean	l-95%	u-95%	pMCMC	Pr( $j W$ )
Intercept	-6.067	-8.539	-3.654	<b>0.001</b>	
Treatment <sub>r</sub> .None	0.288	-0.442	1.120	0.464	
Treatment <sub>r</sub> .Early	-0.200	-1.150	0.675	0.646	0.223
Treatment <sub>r</sub> .Late	0.731	-0.210	1.588	0.121	
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .Early	0.585	-0.057	1.285	0.101	0.232
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .Late	-0.082	-0.789	0.586	0.803	
Clutch size <sub>r</sub>	0.284	0.105	0.495	<b>0.002</b>	
Clutch size <sub>o</sub>	0.083	-0.048	0.212	0.221	
Year.2013	-0.389	-1.156	0.403	0.308	
Laydate <sub>r</sub>	0.052	0.014	0.091	<b>0.007</b>	
After pause	0.365	-0.131	0.867	0.163	

Table 4: Summary of the fixed effects from a censored Gaussian model on the time (in days) from laying to hatching of eggs. These results are from a model without treatment splines since they did not significantly increase predictive ability (Table 2). P-values from wald tests on fixed effects are also presented. The mean is the posterior mean, l-95% and u-95% are the lower and upper 95% credible intervals.

	mean	l-95%	u-95%	pMCMC	Pr( $\chi^2$ W)
Intercept	21.347	19.327	23.197	<b>0.001</b>	
Treatment <sub>r</sub> .None	-0.430	-1.106	0.189	0.193	
Treatment <sub>r</sub> .Early	0.079	-0.675	0.711	0.822	0.663
Treatment <sub>r</sub> .Late	-0.277	-0.978	0.377	0.438	
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .Early	0.101	-0.018	0.219	0.107	0.264
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .Late	0.015	-0.118	0.136	0.818	
Clutch size <sub>r</sub>	-0.287	-0.445	-0.127	<b>0.001</b>	
Clutch size <sub>o</sub>	0.018	-0.005	0.040	0.111	
Year.2013	-0.358	-0.972	0.337	0.295	
Laydate <sub>r</sub>	-0.106	-0.137	-0.074	<b>0.001</b>	
After pause	0.049	-0.038	0.146	0.322	



Table 5: Summary of the fixed effects from a model of hatching success of eggs. These results are from a model without treatment splines since they did not significantly increase predictive ability (Table 2). P-values from wald tests on fixed effects are also presented. The mean is the posterior mean, l-95% and u-95% are the lower and upper 95% credible intervals.

	mean	l-95%	u-95%	pMCMC	Pr( $j W$ )
Intercept	0.331	-2.086	3.032	0.809	
Treatment <sub>r</sub> .None	-0.863	-1.684	-0.100	<b>0.040</b>	
Treatment <sub>r</sub> .Early	-0.490	-1.557	0.499	0.349	0.56
Treatment <sub>r</sub> .Late	0.258	-0.794	1.319	0.627	
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .Early	0.149	-0.830	1.195	0.778	0.918
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .Late	-0.155	-1.162	0.899	0.784	
Clutch size <sub>r</sub>	0.150	-0.050	0.365	0.160	
Clutch size <sub>o</sub>	0.133	-0.024	0.318	0.116	
Year.2013	-0.630	-1.499	0.128	0.125	
Laydate <sub>r</sub>	0.034	-0.003	0.076	0.089	
After pause	-0.842	-1.520	-0.126	<b>0.028</b>	

Table 6: Summary of the fixed effects from a model of egg weight. These results are from a model without treatment splines since they did not significantly increase predictive ability (Table 2). P-values from wald tests on fixed effects are also presented. The mean is the posterior mean, l-95% and u-95% are the lower and upper 95% credible intervals.

	mean	l-95%	u-95%	pMCMC	Pr( $\beta \neq 0$ )
Intercept	1.160	1.059	1.251	<b>0.001</b>	
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .None	-0.005	-0.035	0.027	0.728	
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .Early	-0.012	-0.045	0.020	0.467	0.766
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .Late	-0.004	-0.037	0.031	0.771	
Clutch size <sub>o</sub>	-0.001	-0.009	0.007	0.896	
Year.2013	-0.080	-0.111	-0.049	<b>0.001</b>	
Laydate	0.002	0.000	0.003	<b>0.028</b>	
After pause	0.051	0.043	0.059	<b>0.001</b>	

Table 7: Summary of the fixed effects from a model of the probability that an egg is laid. These results are from a model without treatment splines since they did not significantly increase predictive ability (Table 2). P-values from wald tests on fixed effects are also presented. The mean is the posterior mean, l-95% and u-95% are the lower and upper 95% credible intervals.

	mean	l-95%	u-95%	pMCMC	Pr( $\mathcal{I} \subset W$ )
Intercept	4.469	3.466	5.530	<b>0.001</b>	
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .None	-0.530	-1.232	0.082	0.094	
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .Early	0.394	-0.330	1.116	0.286	0.504
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .Late	-0.091	-0.782	0.603	0.820	
Year.2013	-0.283	-0.987	0.379	0.399	
Laydate	-0.039	-0.069	-0.004	<b>0.024</b>	

Table 8: Summary of the fixed effects from a gaussian model of clutch size. P-values from wald tests on fixed effects are also presented. The mean is the posterior mean, l-95% and u-95% are the lower and upper 95% credible intervals.

	mean	l-95%	u-95%	pMCMC	Pr( $\chi^2$ W)
Intercept	10.828	10.092	11.564	<b>0.001</b>	
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .None	-0.112	-0.620	0.467	0.689	
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .Early	0.413	-0.130	0.964	0.136	0.205
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .Late	0.386	-0.197	0.947	0.170	
Laydate	-0.073	-0.095	-0.049	<b>0.001</b>	
Year.2013	0.232	-0.312	0.692	0.402	

Table 9: Summary of the fixed effects from a gaussian model of the onset of incubation relative to the date on which the last egg in a nest was laid. P-values from wald tests on fixed effects are also presented. The mean is the posterior mean, l-95% and u-95% are the lower and upper 95% credible intervals.

	mean	l-95%	u-95%	pMCMC	Pr( $\beta \neq 0$ )
Intercept	6.185	4.018	8.138	<b>0.001</b>	
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .None	-0.154	-0.820	0.519	0.687	
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .Early	0.639	-0.119	1.309	0.090	0.187
Treatment <sub>o</sub> .Late	-0.064	-0.731	0.715	0.838	
Laydate	-0.080	-0.114	-0.048	<b>0.001</b>	
Year.2013	-0.371	-1.002	0.311	0.298	
Clutch size <sub>o</sub>	-0.261	-0.417	-0.087	<b>0.003</b>	

Table 10: Mean predictive power from 20-fold cross validation of weather models, comparing the full model (all fixed and random effects included, and splines of the effects of temperature, rain and wind) with those with each of the individual weather splines dropped, and the null model in which all three weather splines are dropped (but all other fixed and random effects are retained). Ordinal and Censored Gaussian are the two models of hatching time. For weight, predictive power is measured as an  $R^2$  value, and for other models it is the rate of correct classification. All are run with  $\text{nest}_o$  and  $\text{nest}_r$  (where appropriate) marginalised. The final column is the probability that the predictive power of the best model (in bold) exceeds that of the null model more than would be expected from Monte Carlo error alone.

	Full	Wind	Temperature	Rain	All	$\text{Pr}(i W)$
	Model	Spline	Spline	Spline	Dropped	
		Dropped	Dropped	Dropped		
Ordinal	0.574	0.592	0.578	0.569	<b>0.593</b>	
Censored Gaussian	0.219	<b>0.219</b>	0.219	0.218	0.218	<b>0.0180</b>
Hatching Success	0.831	<b>0.831</b>	0.831	0.831	0.830	0.0730
Weight	<b>0.066</b>	0.062	0.063	0.064	0.063	0.4000
Pausing	0.868	<b>0.869</b>	0.868	0.868	0.868	0.1990
Clutch Size	0.303	0.305	0.271	<b>0.308</b>	0.259	<b>0.0020</b>
Incubation	0.243	0.247	0.248	0.249	<b>0.256</b>	