

1 Sources of (co)variation in alternative siring routes available to male great tits (*Parus major*)

2 Yimen G. Araya-Ajoy^{1,2,3*}, Sylvia Kuhn², Kimberley J. Mathot^{1,4}, Alexia Mouchet¹, Ariane Mutzel^{1,5},
3 Marion Nicolaus^{1,6}, Jan J. Wilmenga¹, Bart Kempenaers², Niels J. Dingemanse^{1,7}

4
5 ¹Research Group Evolutionary Ecology of Variation, Max Planck Institute for Ornithology, Seewiesen,
6 Germany

7 ²Department of Behavioral Ecology and Evolutionary Genetics, Max Planck Institute for Ornithology,
8 Seewiesen, Germany

9 ³Current address: Center for Biodiversity Dynamics, Norwegian University of Science and
10 Technology, Trondheim, Norway

11 ⁴Current address: Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research (NIOZ), Department of Coastal Studies
12 (COS) and Utrecht University, Den Burg, Texel, the Netherlands

13 ⁵Current address: Department of Biology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, United States

14 ⁶Current address: Conservation Ecology Group, Groningen Institute for Evolutionary Life Sciences
15 (GELIFES), University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

16 ⁷Behavioural Ecology, Department of Biology, Ludwig-Maximilians University of Munich, Planegg-
17 Martinsried, Germany

18 **Keywords:** aggressiveness, extra-pair paternity, interacting phenotypes, life-history trade-offs,
19 fertilization success, plasticity, reproductive strategy

20 **Running title:** (Co)variation in siring routes.

21 Count: 6690 words, 1 figures and 5 tables

22 ***Corresponding author:** email: yimencr@gmail.com ; Tel: 4948506487

23 Males of socially monogamous species can increase their siring success via within-pair and extra-pair
24 fertilizations. In this study, we focused on the different sources of (co)variation between these siring
25 routes, and asked how each contributes to total siring success. We quantified the fertilization routes to
26 siring success, as well as behaviors that have been hypothesized to affect siring success, over a five-
27 year period for a wild population of great tits *Parus major*. We considered siring success and its
28 fertilization routes as “interactive phenotypes” arising from phenotypic contributions of both members
29 of the social pair. We show that siring success is strongly affected by the fecundity of the social
30 (female) partner. We also demonstrate that a strong positive correlation between extra-pair fertilization
31 success and paternity loss likely constrains the evolution of these two routes. Moreover, we show that
32 more explorative and aggressive males had less extra-pair fertilizations, whereas more explorative
33 females laid larger clutches. This study thus demonstrates that (co)variation in siring routes is caused
34 by multiple factors not necessarily related to characteristics of males. We thereby highlight the
35 importance of acknowledging the multi-level structure of male fertilization routes when studying the
36 evolution of male mating strategies.

37 **INTRODUCTION**

38 Most mating systems offer multiple ways by which males can maximize their siring success
39 (Gross 1996). In socially monogamous animals, extra-pair and within-pair fertilizations represent such
40 alternative pathways (Webster et al. 1995; Griffith et al. 2002). Therefore, a male's total siring success
41 will be determined by variation in, and covariation among, these different routes (Webster et al. 1995;
42 Lebigre et al. 2013). This (co)variation is in turn determined by the joint effects of the phenotypic
43 characteristics of the male and its social (female) mate, and the influence of environmental effects
44 (Petrie and Kempenaers 1998; Westneat and Stewart 2003). For example, if higher resource holding
45 potential increases a male's ability to gain within-pair fertilizations while simultaneously increasing its
46 chances to gain extra-pair paternity, differences between males in siring success will exist due to
47 among-male variation in ability to monopolize resources. In such cases, directional selection is
48 expected to deplete genetic variation in both resource-holding potential and any route to siring success,
49 unless trade-offs or other processes constrain their adaptive evolution (Merilä et al. 2001). For instance,
50 investment in avoidance of paternity loss might trade-off with investment in obtaining extra-pair
51 copulations in instances where males face limitations in the time or energy available for these activities
52 (Westneat and Stewart 2003; Kokko 2005). Such trade-offs between fertilization routes (whether
53 environmental or genetic in nature) may result in a situation where traits increasing fertilization success
54 through one route will decrease success through another. These trade-offs may be mediated by a male's
55 behavioral strategy and determine the relative contribution of the different fertilization routes in an
56 individual's annual siring success (Westneat and Stewart 2003; Kokko 2005). Hence, the sources of
57 variation in, and covariation between, siring routes will represent an important determinant of the
58 evolutionary trajectories of male reproductive strategies.

59 Several studies quantifying the covariance between the different routes to siring success find

60 that males that are successful in avoiding paternity loss are also more likely to gain extra-pair
61 fertilizations (Webster et al. 1995; Kempenaers et al. 1997; Schlicht and Kempenaers 2013; Reid et al.
62 2014b). As detailed above, such patterns can result from among-male variation in resource-holding
63 potential, but they can also emerge because of spatiotemporal variation in the availability of resources.
64 Such patterns are not mutually exclusive and, notably, do not imply the absence of trade-offs between
65 siring routes (van Noordwijk and Jong 1986). This is because covariances between life-history traits
66 are often simultaneously affected by multiple processes (Stearns 1989). For instance, in addition to the
67 (co)variation between fertilization routes generated by variation in resource availability, investment in
68 avoiding paternity loss might still trade-off with the amount of time and/or resources available for
69 investment in extra-pair fertilization behaviors. The overall pattern of correlation between fertilization
70 routes is therefore influenced simultaneously by variation in male attributes (e.g. resource-holding
71 potential), spatiotemporal variation in environmental conditions, and trade-offs between fertilization
72 routes. Importantly, in cases where associations between fertilization routes are opposite across
73 hierarchical levels, fertilization routes may seem completely unrelated if effects cancel each other out
74 in unpartitioned (i.e., ‘raw’) datasets. The potential existence of multiple processes contributing to the
75 overall patterns of covariance between traits and siring routes thus warrants the decomposition of the
76 sources of variation and covariation.

77 Quantifying (co)variation among siring routes in socially monogamous species is challenging
78 because each of the routes is difficult to define as the property of a single individual. For example,
79 paternity loss is often treated as a male trait, although it depends both on the male’s characteristics in
80 relation to the neighboring males, and the promiscuity level of its social mate (Petrie and Kempenaers
81 1998; Westneat and Stewart 2003; Reid et al. 2014a). Moreover, female fecundity can affect male
82 paternity loss because highly fecund females produce more eggs to be fertilized, resulting in an

83 increased probability for their social (male) partner to lose paternity. It follows that the evolutionary
84 dynamics of siring routes will not only depend on the sources of (co)variation within the sexes but also
85 across them (Reid et al. 2014a). Female phenotypic characteristics causing variation in, and covariation
86 among, siring routes can be viewed as environmental effects on siring routes, notably these
87 environmental components have genes and can thus evolve. In the quantitative genetics literature, traits
88 that are affected by the phenotype of other individuals are sometimes called ‘interactive phenotypes’
89 (Moore et al. 1997). This type of interaction may generate (co)variation in pathways to male
90 fertilization success and affect their response to selection (Wolf et al. 1998; Wolf 2003). Variance
91 partitioning approaches (detailed below) have proven insightful in the study of the sources of variation
92 and covariation of this type of interacting phenotype (McGlothlin and Brodie 2009; Dingemanse and
93 Araya-Ajoy 2015).

94 Using a variance partitioning approach, we quantified the sources of (co)variation between
95 behavioral traits and siring routes to determine their contribution to the annual siring success of great
96 tits (*Parus major*). Great tits are socially monogamous and commonly engage in extra-pair
97 reproduction (Brommer et al. 2007; van Oers et al. 2008; Patrick et al. 2012; Araya-Ajoy et al. 2016).
98 During five consecutive years (2010-2014), we monitored the breeding ecology of a Bavarian
99 population breeding in 12 nest box plots, and measured annual siring success (defined as the total
100 number of eggs sired by a male in a focal year). We had two main objectives: i) determine the
101 contribution of each of the fertilization routes to overall siring success and ii) estimate the extent to
102 which the (co)variation between fertilization routes is determined by characteristics of both members
103 of the social pair and by their response to spatiotemporal variation in environmental conditions. To
104 achieve these goals, we first decomposed male annual siring success into its underlying components:
105 extra-pair fertilization success (the number of eggs that a focal male sired that were laid by females

106 other than its social mate) and within-pair fertilization success (the number of eggs that a focal male
107 sired that were laid by its social mate), which is in turn determined by clutch size (the number of eggs
108 produced by the focal male's social mate) and paternity loss (number of eggs laid by the focal male's
109 social mate that were sired by extra-pair males) (Fig. 1). We then used a variance-partitioning approach
110 to quantify the relative contributions of male and female identity effects, spatiotemporal effects, and
111 within-male-cross-year (i.e., residual) effects on an individual's siring success (both for total annual
112 success and for each of the underlying siring routes). We refer to "identity" effects as the phenotypic
113 characteristics that vary among-individuals (due to genes and/or permanent environmental effects) and
114 cause variation in any of the fertilization routes. Residual variation captures within-male-cross-year
115 variation; this distinct level of variation reflects important biological processes (Westneat et al. 2015)
116 including patterns of within-individual plasticity in response to unmeasured environmental variables,
117 however, we acknowledge that variation at this level is also caused by stochastic events and/or
118 measurement error. We then extended this variance partitioning approach and estimated the
119 (co)variation between the alternative siring routes and annual siring success caused by the above-
120 mentioned sources.

121 This variance partitioning approach does not provide information about the specific individual-
122 level phenotypes of males or females affecting an individual's annual siring success, but can be used to
123 quantify the overall importance of phenotypic traits specific to females and males that are not
124 attributable to (within-individual) short-term responses to the environment (Griffing 1967). We
125 therefore proceeded to determine whether specific male behavioral traits were associated with a male's
126 fertilization strategy and whether behavioral traits of both sexes explained variation captured by the
127 male and female identity effects described above. We focused on the effects of male and female
128 exploration behavior and male aggressiveness. Exploration behavior has previously been shown to

129 affect various aspects of extra-pair reproduction in great tits. Studies conducted in a British population
130 found that a male's exploration behavior was positively associated with its extra-pair fertilization
131 success, but negatively associated to its ability to avoid paternity loss (Patrick et al. 2012). Studies
132 conducted in a Dutch population, furthermore, found that males paired to females of similar
133 exploration type lost more paternity (van Oers et al. 2008). Moreover, in our German population there
134 is evidence suggesting that exploratory behavior is related to female reproductive investment (Nicolaus
135 et al. 2015). With respect to aggressiveness, we hypothesized that increased aggressiveness towards
136 male intruders reduces paternity loss (Araya-Ajoy and Dingemanse 2014; Duckworth 2006). If
137 investment in securing within-pair fertilizations would trade-off with the expression of behaviors that
138 enables males to gain extra-pair copulations, we also expected that aggressive males would gain less
139 extra-pair paternity.

140 As a final step we synthesized the above-mentioned analyses using a path diagram (Fig. 1). We
141 aimed to model the contribution of each fertilization route to annual siring success, as well as the
142 relationships between the alternative fertilization routes. We also quantified the variance in each
143 fertilization route attributable to aggression and exploration behavior. First, we estimated how much
144 variation in male annual siring success was caused by within-pair fertilization success and how much
145 by extra-pair fertilization success. By definition, these two routes account for all variation in male
146 annual siring success. In a similar fashion, we then quantified the variance in within-pair fertilization
147 success caused by clutch size and paternity loss. Importantly, these two routes can only affect annual
148 siring success through their effect on within-pair fertilization success. We then proceeded to determine
149 the effects of the two behavioral traits on each fertilization route, appreciating that these behaviors can
150 only influence annual siring success by affecting clutch size, paternity loss, and/or extra-pair
151 fertilization success. By combining the information concerning the relationships within and among

152 fertilization routes, we were able to quantify how much of the variance in annual siring success at each
153 hierarchical level (i.e., among-males, among-females, among-plot-years or within-male-cross-years)
154 was attributable to each fertilization route and their correlations, while determining the mediating roles
155 of aggressive and explorative behavior.

156 **METHODS**

157 *Study site*

158 We studied a population of great tits breeding in nest boxes in Southern Germany (Bavarian Landkreis
159 Starnberg; 47° 58' N, 11° 14' E). The nest boxes were located in 12 plots established in 2009; each plot
160 was approximately 9 hectares in size and consisted of a regular grid of 50 nest boxes with 50 meters
161 between adjacent boxes. From April onwards, nest boxes were checked twice per week to determine
162 lay date (back-calculated assuming that one egg was laid per day), onset of incubation and clutch size.
163 Nestlings were blood sampled and marked with an aluminum ring when they were 6 days old; any
164 unhatched eggs or deceased nestlings were collected. Parents were caught with a spring trap in the nest
165 box the next day, measured, bled, and marked with a unique combination of rings if not ringed
166 previously.

167 *Male variation in siring success*

168 We recorded a total of 8182 eggs in our population distributed over 990 first clutches (defined as nests
169 starting within 30 days after the first egg of the focal year in a focal plot was found) between 2010 and
170 2014. Because we were interested in siring success and aimed to avoid bias in our measure due to
171 variation in hatching success or early survival of within- or extra-pair offspring (García-González
172 2008), we attempted to genotype all successfully fertilized eggs (i.e., hatched nestlings, unhatched eggs

173 and nestlings deceased prior to blood sampling). We were able to genotype 7109 (81%) of the 8182
174 recorded eggs. We performed genetic parentage assignments for these 7109 fertilized eggs using
175 genetic and spatial information incorporated in Bayesian full probability models (R package
176 MasterBayes; Hadfield et al. 2006). We excluded all breeding attempts where maternity was uncertain
177 (i.e., where the genetic mother was not sampled) and used a 90% confidence cut-off to take a paternity
178 assignment forward to further analyses (for further details see Araya-Ajoy et al 2016). This resulted in
179 6441 offspring (90% of the 7109 genotyped offspring) with assigned paternity from 558 males and 567
180 female parents over 862 breeding attempts. We detected 621 extra-pair offspring and managed to
181 determine the identity of the genetic father for 438 (71%) of them. The unassigned extra-pair offspring
182 may have been sired by males in our plots that were not blood sampled or by males breeding in natural
183 cavities within or adjacent to our study plots. Given current debates on the pros and cons of alternative
184 paternity assignment methods (Walling et al. 2010), we also performed the paternity assignment in
185 another commonly used package (Cervus 3.0.6); this produced very similar findings (Araya-Ajoy et al.
186 2016). We estimated male paternity loss as the number of eggs produced by the social female of a focal
187 clutch that were not sired by the social male, and male extra-pair paternity gain as the number of eggs
188 that a focal male sired with females other than its social mate. Within-pair fertilization success was
189 calculated as the clutch size minus the number of extra-pair offspring in the focal male's brood, and
190 male annual siring success was approximated as the sum of within- and extra-pair fertilization success.

191 *Male aggressiveness assay*

192 We measured male aggressive responses to standardized simulated territorial intrusions for each first
193 brood. Each male was subjected to two aggression tests during the laying phase of its social mate (one
194 and three days after the first egg was found) and two during her incubation phase (one and three days

195 after the onset of incubation). The behavioral test started when a taxidermic mount of a male great tit
196 with a playback song was presented one meter away from the subject's nest box on a 1.2 meter wooden
197 pole. We subsequently recorded the behavior of the focal male for a period of three minutes after it had
198 entered a 15-meter radius around the nest box. Details of the experimental setup, and assayed
199 behaviors, are given in Araya-Ajoy and Dingemanse (2014). As a measure of the intensity of the
200 aggressive response of a male during a focal breeding attempt (i.e., unique combination of male and
201 year identity), we mean-centered the minimum approach distance for each breeding stage and averaged
202 the breeding attempt measures during the four assays. We obtained measures of male aggressiveness
203 for 811 (94% of the 862) breeding attempts of 541 (96% of the 558) males. In 30 % of the tests males
204 did not respond to a simulated territorial intrusion (i.e. the male was not observed within 15 min of the
205 start of the simulated territorial intrusion; for details see Araya and Dingemanse 2014), therefore not all
206 the values for each breeding attempt were calculated using the same number of observations.
207 Importantly, the probability that a male responded to an aggression test was positively related to the
208 intensity of its response when responding (mean $r = 0.75$, 95% CI=0.08, 1.00). This suggests that the
209 response towards a simulated territorial intrusion is a measure of how much a male invests in territory
210 defense.

211 *Exploratory behavior assay*

212 We assayed exploration behavior of males and females when their nestlings were 7 days old. We
213 recorded exploration behavior using a cage test adapted from the "novel environment test" used to
214 score exploration behavior in winter (for more details see Stuber et al. 2013). Exploration behavior was
215 filmed during a 2-min recording period. Individual movements between perches, walls, and floor were
216 scored from the video recordings. Locations included 3 sections of the floor and 6 sections of the cage

217 area (see Figure 1 in Stuber et al. 2013). The total number of movements between sections was used as
218 a proxy of exploration behavior, similar to how it is scored in laboratory-based assays conducted in
219 winter (e.g., Dingemanse et al. 2002). We obtained data on exploration behavior for 511 (90% of 558)
220 males and 738 (85% of 862) breeding attempts, and for 521 (91% of 567) females and 747 (86% of
221 862) breeding attempts.

222 *Statistical analyses*

223 *Variance partitioning of routes to siring success*

224 We first quantified the sources of variation in male annual siring success and its underlying
225 components, clutch size, paternity loss, within-pair fertilization success, and extra-pair fertilization
226 success. We used mixed-effects models to determine variance attributable to male identity (n=558
227 individual males), female identity (n=567 individual females), spatiotemporal environmental effects
228 (by fitting n=60 unique combinations of plot and year identities; elsewhere in the manuscript referred
229 to as “plot-year”) and unidentified exogenous variables and measurement error causing residual
230 variation (i.e., residual variance; 862 observations). Our ability to disentangle male versus female-
231 identity effects hinged on the availability of repeated measures collected across years, which we had
232 for (i) 201 out of 558 (36%) males (no. of individuals (no. of years): 357 (1), 125 (2), 53 (3), 19 (4),
233 4(5)), (ii) 189 out of 567 (33%) females (378 (1), 114 (2), 53 (3), 13 (4), 9 (5)), and, importantly, (iii)
234 201 out of 558 (24%) males breeding with different females across years (424 (1), 103 (2), 27 (3), 3
235 (4), 1 (5)).

236 To achieve the partitioning of variance, we used mixed-effects models with random intercepts
237 for male and female identity (see Appendix S1 for model equations). We also included random

238 intercepts for each combination of plot and year (plot-year; 60 levels) to quantify any (interacting)
239 spatial and/or temporal effect on male fertilization routes and siring success. For these and all
240 subsequent models, annual siring success, within-pair fertilization success, and clutch size were
241 modeled with a Gaussian error distribution. Paternity loss and extra-pair fertilization success were
242 modeled assuming an over-dispersed Poisson distribution. We acknowledge that zero inflation may be
243 a concern not fully dealt with by modeling over-dispersion in this way and we therefore also fitted
244 models with these variables coded as a binary trait and assuming a binomial error distribution (Table
245 S2, Appendix S2).

246 *Covariation between fertilization routes and siring success*

247 We used a series of bivariate mixed-effects models to quantify the relationships between the
248 fertilization routes and annual siring success at the different levels (i.e., among-males, among-social
249 females, among-plot-years, and within-individuals). These models always consisted of two response
250 variables with a random effect structure analogous to the univariate models (see Appendix S1 for a
251 detailed description). We used these models to quantify i) the effect of each fertilization route on
252 annual siring success, and ii) the relationships between alternative fertilization routes. First, we
253 quantified the covariation between annual siring success and within-pair fertilizations (bivariate model
254 1), and between annual siring success and extra-pair fertilizations (bivariate model 2). We then studied
255 the paths contributing to within-pair fertilization success: we quantified the covariation between
256 within-pair fertilizations and clutch size (bivariate model 3), and between within-pair fertilizations with
257 paternity loss (bivariate model 4). As a next step, we quantified the relationships between the
258 alternative fertilization routes: we assessed the correlation between within- and extra-pair fertilizations
259 (bivariate model 5), paternity loss and clutch size (bivariate model 6), extra-pair fertilizations and

260 clutch size (bivariate model 7), and extra-pair fertilizations with paternity loss (bivariate model 8).
261 Annual siring success, clutch size and within-pair fertilizations were modeled on the data scale (i.e.,
262 using a Gaussian error distribution) and paternity loss and extra-pair fertilizations on a log scale (using
263 a Poisson error distribution). We also constructed these multivariate models with paternity loss and
264 extra-pair fertilizations fitted as Gaussian and binomial responses to ensure that the interpretation of the
265 results were robust to the chosen error distributions (see Appendix S2, Table S3 and S4).

266 *Correlations between behavioral traits and fertilization routes.*

267 We also quantified relationships between behaviors and fertilization routes. As above, we used a series
268 of bivariate mixed-effects models to quantify hypothesized relationships between behaviors and the
269 fertilization routes at each specified level (i.e., among-males, among-social females, among-plot-years
270 and within-individuals-cross-years). Specifically, we quantified the covariation at the different levels
271 between a male's aggressive or exploration behavior and its extra-pair fertilization success (bivariate
272 models 9 & 10). We also performed bivariate models to quantify the relationship between paternity
273 loss and male aggression (bivariate model 11), male exploration (bivariate model 12) and female
274 exploration (bivariate model 13). Finally we studied the effects of female exploration on clutch size
275 (bivariate model 14). We also constructed these multivariate models with paternity loss and extra-pair
276 fertilizations fitted as Gaussian and binomial responses, to ensure that the interpretation of the results
277 were robust to the chosen error distributions (see Appendix S2, Table S5).

278 *Pathways to annual siring success*

279 We summarized the results from the above-mentioned bivariate models to study the relationships
280 between behavior, siring routes and siring success using the path diagram depicted in Figure 1 (see
281 table S1 for a summary of these models). We aimed to model the hypothesized causal relationships of
282 behavior affecting each fertilization route, and the fertilization routes affecting overall siring success.

283 From the bivariate mixed-effects models (1-2), we estimated the causal effect of within- and extra-pair
284 fertilizations on male annual siring success. These relationships are causal because annual siring
285 success is by definition fully determined by within- and extra-pair fertilizations. Therefore, we used the
286 covariances between each fertilization route and annual siring success estimated with the bivariate
287 models to calculate a slope (β) that represents the effect of each siring route on annual siring success at
288 each of the studied levels. A focal slope (β) was calculated as the covariance between the two variables
289 divided by the variance of the focal route. Using the estimated covariances, we also calculated the
290 amount of variance explained (R^2) in annual siring success by each of the fertilization routes. Variance
291 explained was calculated simply as the squared correlation, but note that when the effects size (β) was
292 not significant, the proportion of variance explained is not readily interpretable. Similarly, we estimated
293 the effects of, and variance explained by, paternity loss and clutch size in within-pair fertilizations
294 (bivariate models 3 & 4). We then proceeded to estimate bivariate correlations between within- and
295 extra-pair fertilizations, clutch size and paternity loss, extra-pair fertilizations and clutch size, and
296 extra-pair fertilizations and paternity loss (bivariate models 5-8). We estimated these relationships as
297 correlations, as both variables could arguably be viewed both as a predictor (i.e., causal effect) and as a
298 response. For instance, the relationship between extra-pair fertilization success and within-pair
299 fertilization success could be caused by a factor affecting both of these traits simultaneously, like
300 resource abundance. When focusing on the behaviors and their relationships with the fertilization
301 routes, we present their associations as slopes, because we hypothesized that behaviors causally
302 affected the fertilization routes (bivariate models 9-14). As a final step, we estimated the total effects of
303 clutch size, paternity loss, and the behavioral traits on annual siring success (β), as well as the
304 respective proportion of variance explained (R^2) by each trait in annual siring success. The total effects
305 and variance explained were calculated using Wright path rules (Wright 1934), multiplying the effect

306 sizes of the different steps in the path of each trait to annual siring success (see table 5).

307 *General modeling procedures*

308 We fitted mixed-effects models (detailed above) using a Bayesian framework implemented in the R-
309 package (R Core Team 2015) MCMCglmm (Hadfield 2010). Uni- and multi-variate models were run
310 for 3,050,000 iterations per model, from which we discarded the initial 50000 (burn-in period). Each
311 chain was sampled at an interval of 3000 iterations, which resulted in a low autocorrelation among
312 thinned samples (<0.05). Posterior means and 95% credible intervals were estimated across the thinned
313 samples for the mean effects (fixed effects) and (co)variances. Fixed effect priors were normally
314 distributed and diffuse with a mean of zero and a large variance (100). Different priors were used for
315 the variance-covariance matrices; the results presented in the paper correspond to parameter-expanded
316 priors for univariate models and inverse-gamma priors for bivariate models. Posterior distributions
317 were robust to reasonable prior variation and were used to estimate derived quantities (e.g. proportion
318 of variance explained, correlations and slopes). We considered covariance, correlation and slope
319 estimates statistically significant in the frequentist's sense, when it's estimated 95% credible intervals
320 did not overlap zero.

321 **RESULTS**

322 *Male paternity: descriptive statistics*

323 Clutch size ranged from 2-17 eggs with a mean of 8.3. Mean paternity loss was 0.7 offspring (range 0-
324 8), with 40% of males losing at least one offspring and ~10% of all the offspring being extra-pair.

325 When a clutch contained extra-pair offspring, on average there were 1.8 offspring sired by an extra-pair
326 male. Mean extra-pair fertilization success was 0.5 offspring (range: 0-11), with 24% of males siring at

327 least one extra-pair offspring. Mean siring success was 8.1 offspring (range: 2-17). In a closed
328 population the average amount of extra-pair paternity gain and paternity loss should be the same, but
329 our population was not closed and we could not assign extra-pair fathers to all offspring (because some
330 extra-pair sires were not breeding in our nest boxes or were not sampled). Thus, the population-average
331 estimates of extra-pair gain and within-pair loss were somewhat different.

332 *Variance components of annual siring success and its routes*

333 Analysis of the sources of variation in siring success demonstrated that (unidentified) individual-
334 specific traits of females contributed more strongly to siring success than individual-specific traits of
335 males (as the variance attributable to female versus male identity was 22% versus 8%). While 3% of
336 the variation was explained by spatiotemporal environmental variation across unique combinations of
337 plot and year (plot-year effects; Table 1), most of the variation was unexplained (67%, Table 1). The
338 relative contribution of different variance components differed between siring routes (Table 1; Fig. 1):
339 individual-specific traits of females explained significantly more variation than individual-specific
340 traits of males in within-pair reproduction (35% versus 6%) and clutch size (49% versus 4%).
341 However, both male and female identity explained similar amounts of variance (6-8%) in paternity loss
342 and extra-pair fertilization success.

343 *Relative contribution of each siring route on overall siring success*

344 We found that variation in siring success mostly derived from within-pair fertilizations (72%) rather
345 than from extra-pair fertilizations (27%) (R^2_{Total} ; Model 1 vs. 2 in Table 2). Variation in within-pair
346 siring success was in turn largely attributable to the social mate's clutch size rather than to paternity
347 loss (R^2_{Total} Model 3 vs. 4). We further found that extra-pair fertilizations only explained variation in

348 annual siring success associated to residual variation, representing the combined effects of unmeasured
349 environmental variables, stochasticity, and measurement error ($R^2_{\text{Observations}}$; Model 2). The same was
350 true for paternity loss explaining variation in within-pair fertilization success ($R^2_{\text{Observations}}$; Model 4),
351 implying that the variance in annual siring success caused by paternity loss and gain was mostly of
352 environmental nature (or attributable to measurement error). In agreement with our finding that male
353 identity effects on clutch size and paternity loss were very relatively small, we found that within-pair
354 fertilizations did not explain significant variation in annual siring success at the male identity level.

355 *Correlations between alternative siring routes*

356 We found a positive relationship between clutch size and paternity loss (Model 6; Table 3). This
357 correlation was largely determined by a significant residual (i.e., within-male-cross-year) correlation
358 ($Cor_{\text{among-observations}}$, Model 6; Table 3): breeding attempts with larger clutches contained more extra-pair
359 offspring. We also found a tight positive correlation at the plot-year level between paternity loss and
360 gain ($Cor_{\text{among-plot-years}}$, Model 8; Table 3): as expected, plot-years with more extra-pair fertilizations
361 also had more paternity loss.

362 *Behavioral traits and siring routes*

363 More aggressive (Model 9) and more explorative (Model 10) behavior in males were associated with
364 lower numbers of extra-pair fertilizations (Table 4). The link between male exploration behavior and
365 extra-pair paternity gain was, notably, at the among-male level. In other words, males that were on
366 average highly explorative across years were also on average gaining less extra-pair paternity. The
367 overall effect of male aggression on extra-pair paternity gain was “significant”, although none of the
368 level-specific effects were “significant” (Table 4). The overall effect of aggression on extra-pair

369 fertilization success, however, should mostly be influenced by the residual (i.e., within-male-cross-
370 year) level because of the low values of male repeatability in extra-pair fertilization success. This
371 implies that in a year where a focal male was relatively aggressive it also had a lower extra-pair
372 fertilization success compared to years where it was less aggressive. Finally, exploration behavior in
373 females was positively associated with clutch size (Model 13), although none of the level-specific
374 effects was significant. Nevertheless, both the among-female and the within-individual-cross-year
375 effects were positive, suggesting that these two levels drive the overall effect. Overall, behavioral traits
376 explained a small percentage (1.2%) of the variance in annual siring success (Table 5).

377 **DISCUSSION**

378 In this study, we quantified the sources of variation in siring success in a wild population of great tits
379 during five consecutive years. We found that most of the variation in siring success was determined by
380 within-pair fertilization success. Within-pair fertilization success was in turn substantially influenced
381 by female identity effects (Fig. 1, Table 1), mostly due to repeatable variation in female fecundity (i.e.,
382 clutch size; Table 1, 5). Male and female identity effects on male paternity loss and extra-pair paternity
383 gain were very small (Table 1), and had a negligible influence on annual siring success (Table 2, 5).
384 Instead, the effects of extra-pair fertilizations and paternity loss on male annual siring success were
385 mostly linked to within-individual-cross-year (i.e., residual) variation (Table 2, 5). In general, a high
386 proportion of variation in, and covariation between, the alternative fertilization routes was associated
387 with such residual variation, suggesting that within-individual plasticity in response to environmental
388 variation and/or stochastic processes largely determined variation in siring success. Finally, our results

389 suggest that more exploratory and aggressive male behavior was associated with lower extra-pair
390 fertilization success, whereas more exploratory female behavior was associated with a larger clutch
391 size. While all of these behaviors were associated with male siring success, their net effects on annual
392 siring success were small (Table 5).

393 *Female phenotype strongly affected siring success*

394 Female identity explained two times more variance in siring success compared to male identity (Table
395 1). Our analyses suggest that female effects acted particularly through within-pair fertilization success
396 mediated by clutch size, which implies that a male's siring success was largely mediated by its social
397 mate's average level of fecundity. In contrast, male identity explained only a minor portion of the
398 variation in within-pair fertilization success and clutch size. This suggests that differential female
399 investment in response to repeatable among-male variation in phenotypic attributes plays a minor role,
400 which is consistent with another study on great tits (Browne and McCleery 2007). Our results do not
401 support the "differential allocation hypothesis", which predicts that females should invest more in
402 reproduction when mated with attractive males (Burley 1986; Sheldon 2010), because 'attractiveness'
403 is viewed as an individual-level character (e.g., mediated by 'genetic quality'). The results from our
404 study and Browne and McCleery (2007) imply that either female great tits do not strategically modify
405 investment in reproduction as a function of characteristics of their mate, or that the differential
406 investment occurs at a different stage of the reproductive season (e.g. nestling provisioning phase).

407 Male and female identity effects explained a similar amount of variation (~7%) in male
408 paternity loss. Repeatable among-female variation in promiscuity will inherently lead to such female
409 identity effects. A male's paternity loss is the same trait as its social mate's extra-pair paternity

410 reproduction. Extra-pair paternity has also been referred to as a “meta-trait” (Westneat & Stewart 2003)
411 given that it is determined by at least three players: the cuckolded male, the extra-pair father and the
412 female (Petrie and Kempenaers 1998). Female effects on siring routes can thus be viewed as a social
413 environment effect on siring success (Forstmeier et al. 2011; Reid et al. 2014a). Indirect genetic effects
414 theory developed in the field of quantitative genetics suggests that such social environment effects may
415 impose major evolutionary constraints (Wolf et al. 1998; McGlothlin et al. 2010; see also Brommer &
416 Rattiste (2008) for an empirical example). From the female’s perspective, benefits of extra-pair
417 reproduction remain unclear (Arnqvist and Kirkpatrick 2005; Forstmeier et al. 2014). If females engage
418 in extra-pair reproduction to reap genetic benefits (Jennions and Petrie 2000), this would cause an
419 inter-sexual conflict between the male’s efforts to reduce paternity loss and the female’s benefits
420 arising from extra-pair reproduction. Although researchers have been aware that female phenotype
421 affects siring success, our study empirically quantified the multiple routes by which females may affect
422 the evolution of male within- and extra-pair reproductive tactics.

423 *Patterns of (co)variance in male fertilization routes*

424 Males showed low among-year repeatability in annual siring success and in any of the fertilization
425 routes (Table 1). This implies that there is little consistency in a male’s “preferred” fertilization route
426 and that most of the observed variation is environmental in nature (i.e., varying within-male-cross-
427 years) or caused by stochastic processes and measurement error. The low variance attributed to plot-
428 year effects suggests that the environmental factors causing variation in male fertilization routes vary at
429 a local scale, as the plot-year effects should capture variation across years at a larger spatial scale. For
430 instance, the immediate social environment of an individual (i.e., mediated by traits of neighboring
431 males and females; e.g. Schlicht et al. 2015) might impact paternity loss and probability to gain extra-

432 pair paternity, provided that this social environment varies within males across-years, thereby causing
433 the observed variation in fertilization routes. Another factor that could cause residual variation in the
434 fertilization routes is male age. Older males typically sire more extra-pair offspring (e.g. Schlicht et al.
435 2015), and this is also the case in our population (see Appendix S2, Table S6). As documented in other
436 studies (Cleasby and Nakagawa 2012) age did not affect paternity loss in our population.

437 We did not find significant among-male correlations between any of the fertilization routes.
438 Thus, males that consistently had a higher number of extra-pair fertilizations did not necessarily have a
439 higher number of within-pair fertilizations (Table 3), implying that there were no “super” males that
440 were able to consistently monopolize both within- and extra-pair fertilizations. Furthermore, males that
441 gained more extra-pair fertilizations did not necessarily suffer more paternity loss (Table 3). Thus,
442 there is no evidence for a trade-off between investing in behaviors that increase extra-pair fertilizations
443 and investing in securing within-pair fertilizations. Note, however, that the estimates of these
444 correlations had broad confidence intervals, despite relatively high sample sizes. Our interpretations
445 about the significance and biological meaning therefore need to be considered with care.

446 We found that within-pair paternity loss was highly positively correlated at the plot-year level.
447 This means that in areas and years where more extra-pair fertilizations occur there is on average more
448 paternity loss. This is an expected result that comes with interesting evolutionary implications.
449 Specifically, it implies that, at the population level, within-pair paternity loss and extra-pair paternity
450 gain cannot evolve independently, because they are essentially auto-correlated. In other words, this is a
451 zero-sum game: when someone gains, somebody else has to lose. Therefore, an increase in the
452 frequency of individuals that are successful in gaining extra-pair fertilizations has to be linked to an
453 increase of individuals that lose within-paternity. This is a clear example where competition must result

454 in an evolutionary constraint (Wilson 2014). We also found that more eggs were fertilized by an extra-
455 pair male in larger clutches. Inspecting the level-specificity of this relation, we assume that it is caused
456 by a simple probabilistic process. This could occur (a) when there is a fixed probability that an egg is
457 sired by an extra-pair male, or (b) when more promiscuous females are more fecund. The latter is not
458 supported by our study, because the association between clutch size and paternity loss at the female
459 identity level was weak and non-significant.

460 Correlations between alternative fertilization routes will affect their contribution to annual
461 siring success. Variation in annual siring success can be calculated as the sum of the variance in within-
462 pair fertilizations and extra-pair fertilizations plus two times their covariance (Webster et al. 2005).
463 Similarly, the variance in within-pair fertilizations is determined by the (co)variation between within-
464 pair paternity loss and clutch size. Therefore, the correlation between clutch size and paternity loss
465 causes that variation in within-pair fertilizations is lower compared to expectations based on a separate
466 contribution of clutch size and paternity loss. The covariation between paternity loss and extra-pair
467 paternity gain at the plot-year level represents an extreme example of this issue, because the tight
468 correlation (0.93) between these routes cancels out any contribution of each of these traits to the
469 variation in annual siring success at the plot-year level. Our study shows how correlations between
470 siring routes determine the relative contribution of each of the fertilization routes to annual siring
471 success (see Table 2 for the correlations and Table S6 for the variance explained by the correlations
472 between routes). Note that the amount of variance associated with the correlation between the
473 fertilization routes, if underpinned by genetic variation, will determine the degree to which these
474 correlations accelerate or slow down the evolutionary responses to selection on each fertilization route
475 and on its associated traits.

477 We expected that male and female identity effects on siring routes would be explained to some extent
478 by behavioral attributes of the members of the social pair. We hypothesized that a male's investment in
479 aggressive behavior would reduce his paternity loss and simultaneously constrain his ability to gain
480 extra-pair paternity (due to time and/or energy allocation trade-offs). However, we found no support
481 for such dual effects. Although there was an overall negative association between male aggression and
482 extra-pair gain, it remains unclear at which level this effect occurs (Table 4). The overall effect seems
483 to be driven by a within-male-cross-year effect, i.e. in years where males were more aggressive, they
484 also gained less extra-pair paternity, which suggests that investment in aggressive behavior may indeed
485 constrain a male's ability to gain paternity. However, investment in aggressive behavior was not
486 associated with paternity loss (Table 3). This does not necessarily imply that aggressiveness does not
487 prevent paternity loss: the observed correlation could be the result of a "best-of-a-bad-job"
488 (Kempnaers et al. 1995), such that paternity loss would have been even higher if males would not
489 have been aggressive. For example, an increased threat of cuckoldry by neighboring males could make
490 individuals behave more aggressively, but they might still lose more paternity because their increased
491 aggressiveness did not fully secure against paternity loss in such social environments. Moreover, the
492 effect of male aggressive behavior on male extra-pair fertilization success may not be causal, but could
493 result from an unknown environmental factor affecting both traits simultaneously.

494 Our results further suggest that more exploratory males had a lower extra-pair fertilization
495 success. Because this effect was at the among-male level, it should lead to negative directional
496 selection favoring slow-exploring males. However, given that repeatable differences in paternity loss
497 were small and did not translate into repeatable differences in annual siring success (Table 2), there

498 may be no selection on exploration behavior in our population. Our results contradict a study that
499 found that male exploration behavior is positively linked to extra-pair fertilization success (Patrick et
500 al. 2012). The different outcomes of these studies may be explained by the use of different measures of
501 exploration behavior, or because Patrick et al. (2012) did not partition the association between behavior
502 and paternity in among- versus within-individual levels. Assuming the latter, it would be difficult to
503 distinguish between a causal relationship where behavior affects siring success or a situation where
504 environmental factors simultaneously affect siring success and behavior (Dingemanse et al. 2012). We
505 also studied the effect of female exploration behavior on male fertilization routes. Females with higher
506 exploratory tendencies laid larger clutches, which seemed mostly due to within-female-cross-year
507 effects (although the confidence interval slightly overlapped zero, Table 4). Previous work also
508 suggested that the probability of paternity loss depends on the interaction between exploration behavior
509 of the two pair members (van Oers et al. 2008). We explored this in our population by testing whether
510 the interaction between male and female exploratory behavior explained variation in paternity loss, but
511 did not find any evidence in support of this idea (results not shown).

512 *Multi-level (co)variation and evolutionary responses*

513 Partitioning the sources of covariation between behavior and traits closely related to fitness is key to
514 understanding responses to selection (Roff 1992). Such covariation between behaviors and e.g. within-
515 and extra-pair fertilization success may be caused by environmental pleiotropy, i.e., by a correlated
516 plastic response of multiple traits to the same environmental gradient. Importantly, this type of
517 covariation would not result in phenotypic evolution due to selection (Kruuk et al. 2003). Responses to
518 selection are only expected if the covariance between behaviors and fitness are at the among-individual
519 level and underpinned by an additive genetic covariance (Lynch and Walsh 1998). Given that

520 behaviors have an average repeatability of ~ 0.4 (Bell et al. 2009) and on average only 50% of this
521 variation is due to additive genetic effects (Dochtermann et al. 2015), phenotypic correlations between
522 behaviors are only partly expected to result in an adaptive evolutionary response to selection.
523 Moreover, given the modest repeatabilities of paternity loss and extra-pair paternity gain, the reported
524 (non-partitioned) correlations between these traits and behaviors (Duckworth 2006; Patrick et al. 2012;
525 van Oers et al. 2008), must largely represent within-individual effects (Dingemanse et al. 2012).
526 Indeed, in our study, the significant correlation between aggressiveness and extra-pair paternity gain
527 seems to be driven by environmental effects. Had we not partitioned this correlation into among-
528 versus within-individual effects, we could have erroneously concluded that aggressive “personalities”
529 were selected against in our population.

530 *Concluding remarks*

531 This study shows that multiple sources of variation affected male routes to siring success in a species
532 with a socially monogamous mating system. Our study highlights that different biological mechanisms
533 act at different hierarchical levels and that the social environment is an important source of variation in
534 siring success. We show that, at the among-individual level, male exploration behavior is negatively
535 associated with paternity gain and that female exploration behavior is positively associated with clutch
536 size. Our study also highlights that observed relationships between behavioral traits and siring routes
537 do not automatically imply that the behavior causally affects overall siring success, and therefore that
538 these relationships do not necessarily imply that the behavioral traits are under selection. In conclusion,
539 acknowledging the notion that siring routes can vary and covary at multiple levels, and considering the
540 particularities of the social environment as a source of phenotypic variation, can further our
541 understanding of the evolution of the reproductive strategies of socially monogamous but genetically

542 promiscuous species.

543 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

544 We thank Anne-Lise Olsen, Erica Stuber, Maria Moiron, Robin Abbey-Lee and all field assistants and
545 students for help in data collection and insightful discussion. Members of the Department of
546 Behavioral Ecology and Evolutionary Genetics, and the Research Group Evolutionary Ecology of
547 Variation are thanked for stimulating feedback. Lars Penke, Dave Westneat, Francesca Santostefano
548 and Jon Wright are gratefully acknowledged for feedback. The study was supported by the German
549 Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the Max Planck Society. Y.G.A.-A. was a member of the
550 International Max Planck Research School for Organismal Biology.

551 **REFERENCES**

- 552 Araya-Ajoy, Y. G., and N. J. Dingemanse. 2014. Characterizing behavioural “characters”: an
553 evolutionary framework. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 281:20132645.
- 554 Araya-Ajoy, Y. G., N. J. Dingemanse, and B. Kempenaers. 2016. Timing of extrapair fertilizations:
555 within-pair fertilization trade-offs or pair synchrony spillovers? *Behav. Ecol.* 27: 377-384.
- 556 Arnqvist, G., and M. Kirkpatrick. 2005. The evolution of infidelity in socially monogamous passerines:
557 the strength of direct and indirect selection on extrapair copulation behavior in females. *Am. Nat.* 165
558 Suppl :S26–S37.
- 559 Bell, A. M., S. J. Hankison, and K. L. Laskowski. 2009. The repeatability of behaviour: a meta-
560 analysis. *Anim. Behav.* 77:771–783. Elsevier Ltd.
- 561 Brommer, J. E. 2013. On between-individual and residual (co)variances in the study of animal
562 personality: are you willing to take the “individual gambit”? *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 67:1027–1032.
- 563 Brommer, J. E., P. Korsten, K. M. Bouwman, M. L. Berg, and J. Komdeur. 2007. Is extra-pair mating
564 random? On the probability distribution of extra-pair young in avian broods. *Behav. Ecol.* 18:895–904.
- 565 Brommer, J. E., and K. Rattiste. 2008. “Hidden” reproductive conflict between mates in a wild bird
566 population. *Evolution* 62:2326–2333.

567 Browne, W., and R. McCleery. 2007. Using cross-classified multivariate mixed response models with
568 application to life history traits in great tits (*Parus major*). *Stat. Modelling* 7:217–238.

569 Burley, N. 1986. Sexual Selection for Aesthetic Traits in Species with Biparental Care. *Am. Nat.*
570 127:415–445.

571 Cleasby, I. & Nakagawa, S. (2012) The influence of male age on within-pair and extra-pair paternity
572 in passerines. *Ibis*, 154: 318–324.

573

574 Dingemanse, N. J., and Y. G. Araya-Ajoy. 2015. Interacting personalities: behavioural ecology meets
575 quantitative genetics. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 30:88–97.

576 Dingemanse, N. J., N. A. Dochtermann, and S. Nakagawa. 2012. Defining behavioural syndromes and
577 the role of “syndrome deviation” in understanding their evolution. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 66:1543–
578 1548.

579 Dingemanse, N. J., C. Both, P. Drent, K. Van Oers, and A. Van Noordwijk. 2002. Repeatability and
580 heritability of exploratory behaviour in great tits from the wild. *Anim. Behav.* 64:929–938.

581 Dochtermann, N. A., T. Schwab, and A. Sih. 2015. The contribution of additive genetic variation to
582 personality variation: heritability of personality. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 282:20142201.

583 Duckworth, R. A. 2006. Behavioral correlations across breeding contexts provide a mechanism for a
584 cost of aggression. *Behav. Ecol.* 17:1011–1019.

585 Forstmeier, W., S. Nakagawa, S. C. Griffith, and B. Kempenaers. 2014. Female extra-pair mating:
586 adaptation or genetic constraint? *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 29:456–464.

587 Forstmeier, W., K. Martin, E. Bolund, H. Schielzeth, and B. Kempenaers. 2011. Female extrapair
588 mating behavior can evolve via indirect selection on males. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 108:10608–
589 13.

590 García-González, F. 2008. Male genetic quality and the inequality between paternity success and
591 fertilization success: consequences for studies of sperm competition and the evolution of. *Evolution*
592 62:1653–1665.

593 Griffing, B. 1967. Selection in reference to biological groups I. Individual and group selection applied
594 to populations of unordered groups. *Aust. J. Biol. Sci.* 127–139.

595 Griffith, S., I. Owens, and K. Thuman. 2002. Extra pair paternity in birds: a review of interspecific
596 variation and adaptive function. *Mol. Ecol.* 11:2195–2212.

597 Gross, M. 1996. Alternative reproductive strategies and tactics: diversity within sexes. *Trends Ecol.*
598 *Evol.* 11:92–97.

- 599 Hadfield, J. D. 2010. MCMC Methods for Multi-Response Generalized Linear Mixed Models: The
600 MCMCglmm R Package. *J. Stat. Softw.* 33:1–36.
- 601 Hadfield, J. D., D. S. Richardson, and T. Burke. 2006. Towards unbiased parentage assignment:
602 combining genetic, behavioural and spatial data in a Bayesian framework. *Mol. Ecol.* 15:3715–3730.
- 603 Hinde, J., and C. G. B. Demétrio. 1998. Overdispersion: Models and estimation. *Comput. Stat. Data*
604 *Anal.* 27:151–170.
- 605 Horvathova, T., S. Nakagawa, and T. Uller. 2012. Strategic female reproductive investment in response
606 to male attractiveness in birds. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 279:163–170.
- 607 Jennions, M. D., and M. Petrie. 2000. Why do females mate multiply? A review of the genetic benefits.
608 *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.* 75:21–64.
- 609 Kempnaers, B., G. R. Verheyen, and A. A. Dhondt. 1997. Extrapair paternity in the blue tit (*Parus*
610 *caeruleus*): female choice, male characteristics, and offspring quality. *Behav. Ecol.* 8:481–492.
- 611 Kempnaers, B., G. R. Verheyen, and A. A. Dhondt. 1995. Mate guarding and copulation behaviour in
612 monogamous and polygynous blue tits: do males follow a best-of-a-bad-job strategy? *Behav. Ecol.*
613 *Sociobiol.* 36:33–42.
- 614 Kokko, H. 2005. Mate guarding, male attractiveness, and paternity under social monogamy. *Behav.*
615 *Ecol.* 16:724–731.
- 616 Kruuk, L., J. Merilä, and B. Sheldon. 2003. When environmental variation short-circuits natural
617 selection. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 18:207–209.
- 618 Lebigre, C., P. Arcese, and J. M. Reid. 2013. Decomposing variation in male reproductive success:
619 age-specific variances and covariances through extra-pair and within-pair reproduction. *J. Anim. Ecol.*
620 82:872–883.
- 621 Lynch, M., and B. Walsh. 1998. Genetics and analysis of quantitative traits. Sinauer, Sunderland,
622 Mass.
- 623 McGlothlin, J. W., and E. D. Brodie. 2009. How to measure indirect genetic effects: the congruence of
624 trait-based and variance-partitioning approaches. *Evolution* 63:1785–1795.
- 625 McGlothlin, J. W., A. J. Moore, J. B. Wolf, and E. D. Brodie. 2010. Interacting phenotypes and the
626 evolutionary process. III. Social evolution. *Evolution* 64:2558–2574.
- 627 Merilä, J., B. Sheldon, and L. Kruuk. 2001. Explaining stasis: microevolutionary studies in natural
628 populations. *Genetica* 112-113:199–222.
- 629 Moore, A., E. D. Brodie, and J. Wolf. 1997. Interacting phenotypes and the evolutionary process: I.

630 Direct and indirect genetic effects of social interactions. *Evolution* 51:1352–1362.

631 Nakagawa, S. & Schielzeth, H. (2013) A general and simple method for obtaining R² from generalized
632 linear mixed-effects models. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 4:133–142.

633 Nakagawa, S., and H. Schielzeth. 2010. Repeatability for Gaussian and non-Gaussian data: a practical
634 guide for biologists. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.* 85:935–56.

635 Nicolaus, M., K. J. Mathot, Y. G. Araya-Ajoy, A. Mutzel, J. J. Wijmenga, B. Kempenaers, and N. J.
636 Dingemans. 2015. Does coping style predict optimization? An experimental test in a wild passerine
637 bird. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 282:20142405.

638 Noordwijk, A. Van, and G. De Jong. 1986. Acquisition and allocation of resources: their influence on
639 variation in life history tactics. *Am. Nat.* 128:137–142.

640 Patrick, S. C., J. R. Chapman, H. L. Dugdale, J. L. Quinn, and B. C. Sheldon. 2012. Promiscuity,
641 paternity and personality in the great tit. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 279:1724–1730.

642 Petrie, M., and B. Kempenaers. 1998. Extra-pair paternity in birds: explaining variation between
643 species and populations. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 13:52–58.

644 R Core Team. 2015. R: A language and environment for statistical computing.

645 Réale, D., D. Garant, M. M. Humphries, P. Bergeron, V. Careau, and P.-O. Montiglio. 2010.
646 Personality and the emergence of the pace-of-life syndrome concept at the population level. *Philos.*
647 *Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.* 365:4051–4063.

648 Reid, J. M., P. Arcese, L. F. Keller, and S. Losdat. 2014a. Female and Male Genetic Effects on
649 Offspring Paternity: Additive Genetic (Co)Variances in Female Extra-Pair Reproduction and Male
650 Paternity Success in Song Sparrows (*Melospiza Melodia*). *Evolution* 1–14.

651 Reid, J. M., P. Arcese, and S. Losdat. 2014b. Genetic covariance between components of male
652 reproductive success: within-pair vs. extra-pair paternity in song sparrows. *J. Evol. Biol.* 27:2046–
653 2056.

654 Roff, D. A. 1992. *Evolution Of Life Histories: Theory and Analysis*. Springer.

655 Schlicht, E., and B. Kempenaers. 2013. Effects of social and extra-pair mating on sexual selection in
656 blue tits (*Cyanistes caeruleus*). *Evolution* 67:1420–1434.

657 Schlicht, L., M. Valcu, and B. Kempenaers. 2015. Spatial patterns of extra-pair paternity: beyond
658 paternity gains and losses. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 84:518–531.

659 Sheldon, B. C. 2016. Differential allocation: tests, mechanisms and implications. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*
660 15:397–402.


- 661 Stuber, E. F., Y. G. Araya-Ajoy, K. J. Mathot, A. Mutzel, M. Nicolaus, J. J. Wijmenga, J. C. Mueller,
662 and N. J. Dingemanse. 2013. Slow explorers take less risk: a problem of sampling bias in ecological
663 studies. *Behav. Ecol.* 24:1092–1098.
- 664 Stearns, S. 1989. Trade-offs in life-history evolution. *Funct. Ecol.* 3:259–268.
- 665 Noordwijk, A. Van, and G. De Jong. 1986. Acquisition and allocation of resources: their influence on
666 variation in life history tactics. *Am. Nat.* 128:137–142.
- 667 Van Oers, K., P. J. Drent, N. J. Dingemanse, and B. Kempenaers. 2008. Personality is associated with
668 extrapair paternity in great tits, *Parus major*. *Anim. Behav.* 76:555–563.
- 669 van de Pol, M., and J. Wright. 2009. A simple method for distinguishing within- versus between-
670 subject effects using mixed models. *Anim. Behav.* 77:753–758.
- 671 Walling, C. a, J. M. Pemberton, J. D. Hadfield, and L. E. B. Kruuk. 2010. Comparing parentage
672 inference software: reanalysis of a red deer pedigree. *Mol. Ecol.* 19:1914–1928.
- 673 Webster, M., S. Pruett-Jones, D. Westneat, and S. Arnold. 1995. Measuring the effects of pairing
674 success, extra-pair copulations and mate quality on the opportunity for sexual selection. *Evolution*
675 49:1147–1157.
- 676 Westneat, D. F., and I. R. K. Stewart. 2003. Extra-pair Paternity in Birds: Causes, Correlates, and
677 Conflict. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 34:365–396.
- 678 Westneat, D. F., J. Wright, and N. J. Dingemanse. 2015. The biology hidden inside residual within-
679 individual phenotypic variation. *Biol. Rev.* 90:729–743.
- 680 Wilson, A. J. 2014. Competition as a source of constraint on life history evolution in natural
681 populations. *Heredity.* 112:70–78.
- 682 Wolf, J. B. 2003. Genetic architecture and evolutionary constraint when the environment contains
683 genes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 100:4655–4660.
- 684 Wolf, J. B., E. D. Brodie, J. M. Cheverud, A. J. Moore, and M. J. Wade. 1998. Evolutionary
685 consequences of indirect genetic effects. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 13:64–69.
- 686 Wright, S. (1934) The Method of Path Coefficients. *Ann. Math. Stat.* 5:161–215.

687

688

689

690 **Figure 1.** Path diagram depicting the relative contributions of different routes to annual siring success.
 691 Pie charts represent the proportion of variation in each of the fertilization routes and annual siring
 692 success that is attributable to male and social female identity effects, spatiotemporal variation (plot-
 693 year effects) and unexplained environmental effects (residual variation). In brackets we present the
 694 path and model used to estimate the hypothesized relationship. Single-headed arrows represent causal
 695 effects of the fertilization routes in annual siring success (1-4) and the observed not-necessarily causal
 696 effects of behavior in the fertilization routes (9, 10, 13). Double-headed arrows represent hypothesized
 697 non-causal relationships between alternative fertilization routes that may affect annual siring success



698 (5, 6).

700 **Table 1.** Population mean and proportion of variance explained at the among-male, among-social-
 701 female, among-plot-year and residual level for annual siring success and its different components.
 702 Estimates presented are the mean of the posterior distribution and in parentheses the lower and upper
 703 credible interval limits (95% CI). Extra-pair fertilizations and paternity loss were modeled assuming a
 704 Poisson error distribution (see table S2 for results assuming other error distributions). Proportion of
 705 variance explained was calculated following Nakagawa and Schielzeth (2009).

	Annual Siring success	Extra-pair fertilizations	Within-pair fertilizations	Clutch size	Paternity loss
Fixed effects	β (95% CI)	β (95% CI)	β (95% CI)	β (95% CI)	β (95% CI)
Intercept	8.061 (7.875, 8.238)	0.180 (0.133, 0.227)	7.571 (7.377, 7.748)	8.288 (8.112, 8.482)	0.461 (0.375, 0.541)
Proportion of variance	R (95% CI)	R (95% CI)	R (95% CI)	R (95% CI)	R (95% CI)
$R_{\text{among-males}}$	0.079 (0.001, 0.183)	0.080 (0.004, 0.190)	0.050 (0.000, 0.143)	0.044 (0.000, 0.128)	0.068 (0.001, 0.174)
$R_{\text{among-females}}$	0.227 (0.123, 0.331)	0.074 (0.005, 0.194)	0.354 (0.263, 0.444)	0.471 (0.385, 0.549)	0.063 (0.000, 0.174)
$R_{\text{among-plot-years}}$	0.027 (0.001, 0.068)	0.058 (0.008, 0.122)	0.061 (0.026, 0.107)	0.091 (0.050, 0.144)	0.069 (0.012, 0.134)
R_{residual}	0.667 (0.546, 0.786)	0.788 (0.640, 0.911)	0.535 (0.431, 0.636)	0.394 (0.311, 0.485)	0.800 (0.656, 0.920)

706 **Table 2.** Multi-level pathways to annual siring success. Shown are total effects of the fertilization routes on annual siring
707 success (β) and proportion of variance explained (R^2). Effect sizes and proportion of variance explained were also
708 calculated at the among-male, among-female, among-plot-year and residual levels. Within-and extra-pair fertilizations
709 directly affect annual siring success (paths and models 1 and 2), whereas paternity loss and clutch size can only affect
710 annual siring success through their effects on within-pair fertilizations (paths and models 3 and 4). Effect sizes and
711 proportion of variance explained were calculated from the multi-level covariance estimates extracted from bivariate-mixed
712 effects models. The slopes (β) were calculated as the covariance between the variables divided by the variance of the focal
713 route and the variance explained as the squared correlation (R^2). When the effect size (β) is not significant, the proportion of
714 variance explained (R^2) is not interpretable and is printed in italics. We present the estimates of the models in the data scale
715 for all variables so the effect sizes and variance explained can be interpreted in terms of number of fertilized eggs (see Table
716 S3 for results assuming other error distributions). Estimates presented are the mean of the posterior distribution and in
717 parentheses the lower and upper credible interval limits (95% CI).

Fertilization paths to annual siring success	Male	Female	Plot-year	Residual	Total
(1) Within-pair fertilizations → annual siring success					
β	1.457	0.922	0.651	1.038	0.996
(95% CI)	(-0.872, 3.053)	(0.792, 1.048)	(0.308, 0.933)	(0.947, 1.113)	(0.956, 1.037)
R^2	<i>0.856</i>	0.986	0.905	0.627	0.720
(95% CI)	(<i>0.087, 0.997</i>)	(0.922, 1.048)	(0.566, 0.995)	(0.553, 0.693)	(0.687, 0.750)
(2) Extra-pair fertilizations → annual siring success					
β	2.119	-4.745	-1.55	1.064	0.987
(95% CI)	(-1.54, 5.387)	(-15.25, 10.22)	(-4.655, 0.172)	(0.912, 1.21)	(0.875, 1.095)
R^2	<i>0.801</i>	<i>0.536</i>	<i>0.656</i>	0.427	0.273
(95% CI)	(<i>0.056, 0.994</i>)	(<i>0.002, 0.984</i>)	(<i>0.006, 0.980</i>)	(0.377, 0.502)	(0.220, 0.324)
(3) Clutch Size → within-pair fertilizations					
β	0.399	1.001	0.798	0.867	0.918
(95% CI)	(-2.586, 3.768)	(0.892, 1.106)	(0.540, 1.041)	(0.749, 0.988)	(0.871, 0.962)
R^2	<i>0.577</i>	0.989	0.801	0.449	0.658
(95% CI)	(<i>0.004, 0.987</i>)	(0.941, 0.999)	(0.516, 0.988)	(0.360, 0.529)	(0.619, 0.695)
(4) Paternity loss → within-pair fertilizations					
β	-0.534	-0.196,	0.352	-0.861	-0.814
(95% CI)	(-3.398, 2.527)	(-19.38, 19.841)	(-1.11, 3.572)	(-0.989, -0.733)	(-0.921, -0.712)
R^2	<i>0.62</i>	<i>0.36</i>	<i>0.182</i>	0.422	0.231

(95% CI) (0.004, 0.989) (0.001, 0.980) (0.000, 0.931) (0.319, 0.514) (0.179, 0.288)

718 **Table 3.** Correlations between the alternative fertilization routes to annual siring success. Estimates are
 719 extracted from bivariate mixed-effects models. Extra-pair fertilizations and paternity loss were
 720 modeled assuming a Poisson error distribution (see table S4 for results assuming other distributions).
 721 Estimates presented are the mean of the posterior distribution and in parentheses the lower and higher
 722 credible interval (95% CI).

Correlations between alternative fertilization paths	<i>r</i> among-males	<i>r</i> among-females	<i>r</i> among-plot-years	<i>r</i> residual	<i>r</i> total
(5) Extra-pair fertilizations ↔ within-pair fertilizations	0.179 (-0.755, 0.893)	-0.183 (-0.866, 0.693)	-0.410 (-0.887, 0.192)	0.084 (-0.117, 0.280)	0.006 (-0.104, 0.111)
(6) Paternity loss ↔ clutch size	0.038 (-0.820, 0.865)	0.034 (-0.758, 0.758)	0.339 (-0.155, 0.747)	0.295 (0.081, 0.508)	0.196 (0.073, 0.306)
(7) Extra-pair fertilizations ↔ clutch size	0.405 (-0.639, 0.993)	-0.334 (-0.896, 0.354)	0.420 (-0.118, 0.886)	0.093 (-0.146, 0.308)	0.046 (-0.058, 0.152)
(8) Extra pair fertilizations ↔ paternity loss	0.303 (-0.750, 0.926)	-0.141 (-0.897, 0.901)	0.935 (0.795, 0.995)	-0.097 (-0.429, 0.250)	0.161 (-0.017, 0.340)

723 **Table 4.** Effects of male and female behavioral traits on the alternative fertilization routes: clutch size,
724 paternity loss and extra-pair fertilizations. Effects were calculated at the among-male, among-female,
725 among-plot-year and residual levels. The behavioral traits can only affect annual siring success through
726 their effects on paternity loss, clutch size and extra-pair paternity gain. The pathways presented are
727 hypothesized relations between behavior and the fertilization routes based on previous studies (see
728 Introduction; paths and models 9-13). We present these relationships as slopes, which may represent
729 causal effects depending on the specified level. Estimates presented are the mean of the posterior
730 distribution and in parentheses the lower and upper credible interval limits (95% CI). Extra-pair
731 fertilizations and paternity loss were modeled assuming a Poisson error distribution (see table S5 for
732 results assuming other distributions)

Behavioral paths	Male	Female	Plot-year	Residual	Total
(9) Male aggression → extra-pair fertilizations					
β	-0.151	-0.089	0.458	0.247	0.204
(95% CI)	(-1.911, 1.508)	(-6.111, 5.778)	(-0.715, 1.843)	(-0.060, 0.551)	(0.026, 0.376)
(10) Male exploration → extra-pair fertilizations					
β	-0.899	0.251	-0.191	-0.069	-0.181
(95% CI)	(-0.998, -0.334)	(-0.975, 0.917)	(-0.964, 0.917)	(-0.286, 0.015)	(-0.290, -0.064)
(11) Male aggression → paternity loss					
β	0.783	-1.329	0.903	-0.118	0.044
(95% CI)	(-0.255, 2.241)	(-9.270, 7.909)	(-0.128, 2.201)	(-0.289, 0.088)	(-0.064, 0.161)
(12) Male exploration → paternity loss					
β	0.177	0.064	2.373	-0.104	0.030
(95% CI)	(-0.221, 0.563)	(-7.607, 7.703)	(-6.239, 8.278)	(-0.413, 0.176)	(-0.088, 0.154)
(13) Female exploration → paternity loss					
β	-1.384	0.488	1.373	-1.173	0.022
(95% CI)	(-8.850, 8.048)	(-0.062, 1.059)	(-4.361, 6.371)	(-0.414, 0.098)	(-0.098, 0.142)
(14) Female exploration → clutch size					
β	-0.897	0.457	-1.853	0.052	0.135
(95% CI)	(-8.002, 6.974)	(-0.046, 1.053)	(-8.943, 6.99)	(-0.134, 0.224)	(0.011, 0.262)

733

734

735 **Table 5.** Total effects (β) of clutch size, paternity loss and behavioral traits through either the within-
736 or the extra-pair fertilization route. We also give the proportion of variance explained (R^2) by each of
737 these traits on annual siring success. Total effects and variance explained were calculated by
738 multiplying the effect sizes of the different steps in the path of each trait to annual siring success. When
739 the effect size (β) is not significant, the proportion of variance explained (R^2) is not interpretable and is
740 printed in italics. We present the estimates of the models in the data scale for all variables so the effect
741 sizes and variance explained can be interpreted in terms of number of fertilized eggs. Estimates
742 presented are the mean of the posterior distribution and in parentheses the lower and upper credible
743 interval limits (95% CI).

Fertilization paths to annual siring success	Male	Female	Plot-year	Residual	Total
Clutch size → within-pair reproduction → annual siring success					
β	0.485	0.928	0.52	0.989	0.914
(95% CI)	(-4.185, 5.785)	(0.757, 1.107)	(0.200, 0.852)	(0.751, 1.057)	(0.852, 0.979)
R^2	<i>0.502</i>	0.975	0.727	0.279	0.473
(95% CI)	<i>(0.001, 0.962)</i>	(0.899, 0.998)	(0.375, 0.953)	(0.259, 0.298)	(0.438, 0.508)
Paternity loss → within-pair reproduction → annual siring success					
β	-1.33	-4.327	0.226	-1.896	-1.598
(95% CI)	(-6.313, 3.679)	(-17.418, 12.935)	(-1.07, 2.427)	(-2.314, -1.559)	(-1.950, -1.267)
R^2	<i>0.608</i>	<i>0.517</i>	<i>0.194</i>	0.617	0.398
(95% CI)	<i>(0.006, 0.976)</i>	<i>(0.003, 0.971)</i>	<i>(0.000, 0.893)</i>	(0.535, 0.681)	(0.309, 0.493)
Male aggression → extra-pair fertilizations → annual siring success					
β	-0.143	1.033	-0.688	0.25	0.197
(95% CI)	(-4.513, 3.99)	(-4.96, 4.578)	(-4.277, 1.279)	(-0.061, 0.577)	(0.022, 0.347)
R^2	<i>0.482</i>	<i>0.273</i>	<i>0.320</i>	<i>0.012</i>	0.005
(95% CI)	<i>(0.002, 0.963)</i>	<i>(0.00, 0.789)</i>	<i>(0.000, 0.891)</i>	<i>(0.000, 0.041)</i>	(0.000, 0.016)
Male exploration → extra-pair fertilizations → annual siring success					
β	-0.578	-1.702	-0.576	-0.046	-0.109
(95% CI)	(-1.85, 0.229)	(-25.42, 21.98)	(-9.580, 6.963)	(-0.232, 0.116)	(-0.191, -0.032)
R^2	<i>0.558</i>	<i>0.287</i>	<i>0.256</i>	<i>0.002</i>	0.003
(95% CI)	<i>(0.009, 0.956)</i>	<i>(0.000, 0.812)</i>	<i>(0.000, 0.821)</i>	<i>(0.000, 0.010)</i>	(0.000, 0.008)
Female exploration → clutch size → within-pair reproduction → annual siring success					
β	-0.311	0.422	-0.946	0.047	0.123
(95% CI)	(-18.54, 20.15)	(-0.043, 1.003)	(-4.798, 3.501)	(-0.122, 0.215)	(0.010, 0.236)
R^2	<i>0.283</i>	<i>0.052</i>	<i>0.233</i>	<i>0.003</i>	0.004
(95% CI)	<i>(0.00, 0.848)</i>	<i>(0.000, 0.184)</i>	<i>(0.001, 0.755)</i>	<i>(0.003, 0.012)</i>	(0.000, 0.012)

Appendix S1. Model equations for the variance decomposition using univariate mixed effect models.

$$siring_{success_{ij}} = mu + male_j + female_k + plot - year_l + e_{ij} \quad \text{Eq. 1}$$

$$with \in -pair_{fertilizations_{ij}} = mu + male_j + female_k + plot - year_l + e_{ij} \quad \text{Eq. 2}$$

$$clutch_{ij} = mu + male_j + female_k + plot - year_l + e_{ij} \quad \text{Eq. 3}$$

$$\log(with \in -pair_{paternity_{loss}_{ij}}) = mu + male_j + female_k + plot - year_l + obs_{ij} \quad \text{Eq. 4}$$

$$\log(extra - pair_{fertilizations_{ij}}) = mu + male_j + female_k + plot - year_l + obs_{ij} \quad \text{Eq. 5}$$

Here, the siring route or siring success of male j in the breeding attempt i is modeled as a function of the population mean siring success across years (mu), the male's (average) deviation from the population mean value ($male_j$), the effect of the female in her social mate siring route or success ($female_k$), spatio-temporal environmental effects associated to the plot and year where the breeding attempt took place ($plot - year_l$). Male ($male_j$), female ($female_k$) and plot-year ($plot - year_l$) deviations from the population-mean value (mu) are assumed to follow a normal distribution (N) with a mean of zero and variance ($V_{male}, V_{female}, V_{plot-year}$) to be estimated from the data. Siring success, within-pair fertilization success and clutch size were modeled in the data scale and the deviations from the predicted value (e_{ij}) are also assumed to be realizations of a Gaussian distribution with a mean of zero and an estimated residual variance (V_e). Within-pair paternity loss and extra-pair fertilization success were modeled with a poisson error distribution (log scale) and a observation level random effect was used to model over-dispersion (V_{obs}), which was also assumed to follow a normal distribution.

$$[male_j] \sim N(0, \Omega_{male}) \quad : \Omega_{male} = [V_{male}] \quad \text{Eq. 6a}$$

$$[female_k] \sim N(0, \Omega_{female}) \quad : \Omega_{female} = [V_{female}] \quad \text{Eq. 6b}$$

$$[plot - year_l] \sim N(0, \Omega_{plot-year}) \quad : \Omega_{plot-year} = [V_{plot-year}] \quad \text{Eq. 6c}$$

$$[e_{ij}] \sim N(0, \Omega_e) \quad : \Omega_e = [V_e] \quad \text{Eq. 7a}$$

$$[ob_{ij}] \sim N(0, \Omega_{ob}) \quad : \Omega_{ob} = [V_{ob}] \quad \text{Eq. 7b}$$

Table S1. Bivariate models used to study the multi-level relations between annual siring routes, annual siring success and the behavioral traits. Bivariate models were an extension of the univariate models to calculate the covariances between variables at the different studied levels.

Bivariate model	y_1	y_2
1	Annual siring success	Within-pair fertilizations
2	Annual siring success	Extra-pair fertilizations
3	Within-pair fertilizations	Clutch size
4	Within-pair fertilizations	Within-pair paternity loss
5	Extra-pair fertilizations	Within-pair fertilizations
6	Within-pair paternity loss	Clutch size
7	Extra-pair fertilizations	Clutch size
8	Extra-pair fertilizations	Within-pair paternity loss
9	Extra-pair fertilizations	Male aggression
10	Extra-pair fertilizations	Male exploration
11	Within-pair paternity loss	Male aggression
12	Within-pair paternity loss	Male exploration
13	Within-pair paternity loss	Female exploration
14	Clutch size	Female exploration

Appendix S2. Additional models for the analysis of within-pair and extra-pair paternity

Table S2. Population mean and proportion of variance explained at the among-male, -female, -plot-year for paternity loss and extra-pair fertilization. Estimates presented are the mode of the posterior distribution and in parentheses the lower and upper credible interval limits (95%CI). Within-pair paternity loss and extra-pair paternity gain were considered as Gaussian and also binary variables, coded as zero (if there was no within-pair paternity loss or extra-pair fertilization success respectively) and 1 (if a male had “lost at least one within-pair chick or “gain” at least one extra-pair chick) .

Response variable	Extra-pair fert. (Gaussian)	Extra-pair fert. (binomial)	Paternity loss (Gaussian)	Paternity loss (binomial)
Fixed effects	β (95% CI)	β (95% CI)	β (95% CI)	β (95% CI)
Intercept	0.46 (0.376, 0.544)	0.361* (0.305, 0.420)	0.715 (0.609, 0.815)	0.173* (0.125, 0.221)
Proportion of variance	R (95% CI)	R (95% CI)	R (95% CI)	R (95% CI)
R_{males}	0.025 (0.001, 0.310)	0.122 (0.001, 0.310)	0.077 (0.008, 0.165)	0.060 (0.000, 0.132)
R_{females}	0.021 (0.000, 0.161)	0.056 (0.000, 0.161)	0.045 (0.002, 0.119)	0.162 (0.008, 0.329)
$R_{\text{plot-year}}$	0.12 (0.537, 0.931)	0.748 (0.537, 0.931)	0.056 (0.017, 0.103)	0.036 (0.000, 0.095)
R_{residual}	0.942 (0.899, 0.78)	1	0.822 (0.712, 0.971)	1

*Back transformed estimates from a generalized mixed effect models with binomial error distribution, should be interpreted as a probability.

10 **Table S3.** Multi-level pathways to annual siring success. Shown are total effects of the fertilization
 11 routes on annual siring success (β) and proportion of variance explained (R^2). Effect sizes and
 12 proportion of variance explained were calculated at the among-male, among-female, among-plot-year
 13 and residual levels. Within-and extra-pair fertilizations directly affect annual siring success (paths and
 14 models 1 and 2), whereas paternity loss and clutch size can only affect annual siring success through
 15 their effects on within-pair fertilizations (paths and models 3 and 4). Effect sizes and proportion of
 16 variance explained were calculated from the multi-level covariance estimates extracted from bivariate-
 17 mixed effects models. The slopes (β) were calculated as the covariance between the variables divided
 18 by the variance of the focal route and the variance explained as the squared correlation (R^2). When the
 19 effect size (β) is not significant, the proportion of variance explained (R^2) is not interpretable and is
 20 printed in italics. We present the estimates of the models for extra-pair fertilizations and paternity loss
 21 in the log scale as they were estimated using a Poisson error distribution. Estimates presented are the
 22 mean of the posterior distribution and in parentheses the lower and upper credible interval limits (95%
 23 CI).

Fertilization paths to annual siring success	Male	Female	Plot-year	Within-male-cross-year	Total
(1) Within-pair fertilizations → annual siring success					
β	1.457	0.922	0.651	1.038	0.996
(95% CI)	(-0.872, 3.053)	(0.792, 1.048)	(0.308, 0.933)	(0.947, 1.113)	(0.956, 1.037)
R^2	<i>0.856</i>	0.986	0.905	0.627	0.720
(95% CI)	(<i>0.087, 0.997</i>)	(0.922, 1.048)	(0.566, 0.995)	(0.553, 0.693)	(0.687, 0.750)
(2) Extra-pair fertilizations → annual siring success					
β	1.165	-1.551	-0.931	1.545	1.381
(95% CI)	(-5.764, 7.326)	(-16.32, 15.123)	(-4.175, 2.131)	(1.341, 1.809)	(1.313, 1.648)
R^2	<i>0.66</i>	<i>0.549</i>	<i>0.579</i>	0.988	0.603
(95% CI)	(<i>0.004, 0.993</i>)	(<i>0.002, 0.984</i>)	(<i>0.003, 0.983</i>)	(0.9341, 1.00)	(0.490, 0.718)
(3) Clutch Size → within-pair fertilizations					
β	0.399	1.001	0.798	0.867	0.918
(95% CI)	(-2.586, 3.768)	(0.892, 1.106)	(0.540, 1.041)	(0.749, 0.988)	(0.871, 0.962)
R^2	<i>0.577</i>	0.989	0.801	0.449	0.658
(95% CI)	(<i>0.004, 0.987</i>)	(0.941, 0.999)	(0.516, 0.988)	(0.360, 0.529)	(0.619, 0.695)
(4) Paternity loss → within-pair fertilizations					
β	-0.948	-4.854,	0.345	-1.891	-1.605
(95% CI)	(-4.107, 2.266)	(-18.902, 13.189)	(-1.150, 3.675)	(-2.159, -1.522)	(-1.945, -1.311)
R^2	<i>0.78</i>	<i>0.510</i>	<i>0.226</i>	0.987	0.556
(95% CI)	(<i>0.009, 0.992</i>)	(<i>0.002, 0.975</i>)	(<i>0.000, 0.956</i>)	(0.921, 0.999)	(0.424, 0.691)

24 **Table S4.** Correlations between the different fertilization routes. Estimates are extracted from bivariate
 25 mixed-effects models. Estimates presented are the mean of the posterior distribution and in parentheses
 26 the lower and higher credible interval (95% CI). Within-pair paternity loss and extra-pair paternity gain
 27 are model with binomial error distributions in A and assuming a Gaussian error distribution in B.

28 A)

Correlations between alternative fertilization paths	r among-males	r among-females	r among-plot-years
(5) Extra-pair fertilizations ↔ within-pair fertilizations	0.202 (-0.473, 0.709)	-0.148 (-0.617, 0.362)	-0.206 (-0.639, 0.291)
6) Paternity loss ↔ clutch size	0.377 (-0.315, 0.824)	0.186 (-0.116, 0.459)	0.351 (-0.168, 0.731)
(7) Extra-pair fertilizations ↔ clutch size	0.380 (-0.295, 0.790)	-0.297 (-0.691, 0.185)	0.330 (-0.120, 0.713)
8) Extra pair fertilizations ↔ paternity loss	0.144 (-0.515, 0.719)	-0.141 (-0.710, 0.492)	0.781 (0.544, 0.917)

B)

Correlations between alternative fertilization paths	r among-males	r among-females	r among-plot-years	r within-male-cross-year	r total
(5) Extra-pair fertilizations ↔ within-pair fertilizations	0.733 (-0.910, 0.996)	-0.592 (-0.989, 0.623)	-0.844 (-0.993, -0.323)	0.041 (-0.073, 0.155)	-0.007 (-0.077, 0.059)
(6) Paternity loss ↔ clutch size	0.090 (-0.984, 0.991)	-0.005 (-0.966, 0.951)	0.466 (-0.093, 0.961)	0.148 (0.031, 0.262)	0.122 (0.053, 0.123)
(7) Extra-pair fertilizations ↔ clutch size	0.833 (0.017, 0.997)	-0.787 (-0.992, -0.041)	0.053 (-0.158, 0.1986)	0.053 (-0.068, 0.175)	0.034 (-0.058, 0.152)
(8) Extra pair fertilizations ↔ paternity loss	0.642 (-0.842, 0.993)	-0.322 (-0.987, 0.951)	-0.976 (-0.905, 0.997)	-0.022 (-0.121, 0.073)	0.065 (-0.006, 0.141)

Table S5. Effects of male and female behavioral traits on the alternative fertilization routes: clutch size, paternity loss and extra-pair fertilizations. Effects were calculated at the among-male, among-female, among-plot-year and residual levels. The behavioral traits can only affect annual siring success through their effects on paternity loss, clutch size and extra-pair paternity gain. The pathways presented are hypothesized relations between behavior and the fertilization routes based on previous studies (see Introduction; paths and models 9-13). We present these relationships as slopes, which may represent causal effects depending on the specified level. Estimates presented are the mean of the posterior distribution and in parentheses the lower and upper credible interval limits (95% CI). Extra-pair fertilizations and paternity loss were modeled assuming a Gaussian error distribution.

Behavioral paths	Male	Female	Plot-year	Within-male-cross-year	Total
(9) Male aggression → extra-pair fertilizations					
β	-0.015	-0.099	0.395	0.089	0.094
(95% CI)	(-0.887, 0.691)	(-2.821, 3.224)	(-0.099, 1.043)	(-0.041, 0.213)	(0.014, 0.173)
(10) Male exploration → extra-pair fertilizations					
β	-0.267	0.494	-0.195	-0.042	-0.112
(95% CI)	(-0.528, -0.038)	(-3.198, 3.772)	(-3.22, 3.681)	(-0.221, 0.119)	(-0.190, -0.035)
(11) Male aggression → paternity loss					
β	0.586	-0.415	0.579	-0.073	0.043
(95% CI)	(-0.094, 1.563)	(-3.764, 3.318)	(-0.067, 1.390)	(-0.200, 0.068)	(-0.032, 0.130)
(12) Male exploration → paternity loss					
β	0.099	-0.161	1.760	-0.057	0.018
(95% CI)	(-0.309, 0.958)	(-3.266, 3.487)	(-3.873, 6.053)	(-0.220, 0.120)	(-0.067, 0.100)
(13) Female exploration → paternity loss					
β	1.071	-0.184	0.229	-0.025	0.017
(95% CI)	(-5.860, 8.003)	(-1.779, 1.388)	(-0.227, 0.689)	(-0.122, 0.074)	(-0.054, 0.084)
(13) Female exploration → clutch size					
β	-0.897	0.457	-1.853	0.052	0.135
(95% CI)	(-8.002, 6.974)	(-0.046, 1.053)	(-8.943, 6.99)	(-0.134, 0.224)	(0.011, 0.262)

29 **Table S6.** Proportion of variance explained in annual siring success by each fertilization route and their
 30 correlation based on the point estimates of the bivariate models' results.
 31

Fertilization paths to annual siring success	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Plot-year</i>	<i>Within-male -cross-year</i>	<i>Total</i>
Variance in Annual siring success (ANS)	0.396	1.136	0.138	3.330	4.999
Proportion of variance in ANS associated with within-pair fertilizations p(V)	0.464	1.13	1.61	0.582	0.726
Proportion of variance in ANS associated with Extra-pair fertilizations p(V)	0.211	0.063	0.31	0.363	0.282
Proportion of variance in ANS associated to covariation between extra- and within fertilizations p(V)	0.403	-0.171	-0.954	0.039	-0.07
Sum of the estimated proportions p(V)	1.079	1.025	0.968	0.984	1.001
Variance in within-pair fertilizations (WPF)	0.184	1.286	0.222	1.937	3.629
Proportion of variance in WPF associated with clutch size p(V)	0.689	1.047	1.176	0.580	0.788
Proportion of variance in WPR associated with within-pair paternity loss p(V)	0.537	0.045	0.321	0.541	0.352
Proportion of variance in WPR associated to covariation between clutch size and within pair loss p(V)	-0.074	-0.002	-0.456	-0.178	-0.128
Sum of the estimated proportions p(V)	1.152	1.09	1.041	0.943	1.012

32 **Table S7.** Age effects on within-pair paternity loss and extra-pair paternity gain derived from mixed-
 33 effect models. Parental age is based on birth year for locally born birds or plumage characteristics at
 34 first catching for immigrants (Svensson 1992). Immigrants first caught with adult plumage are assigned
 35 a minimal age of 2 years (following Bouwhuis et al. 2009). Estimates presented are the mode of the
 36 posterior distribution and in parentheses the credible interval (95%CI). Paternity loss and extra-pair
 37 paternity gain are modeled assuming over-dispersed Poisson error distributions.

Response variable	Within-pair paternity loss	Extra-pair paternity gain
Fixed effects	β (95% CI)	β (95% CI)
Intercept	-0.83 (-1.01, -0.61)	-2.12 (-2.46, -1.79)
Age	0.07 (-0.02, 0.18)	0.37 (0.23, 0.52)
Random effects	σ^2 (95% CI)	σ^2 (95% CI)
$V_{\text{among-males}}$	0.150 (0.001, 0.398)	0.321 (0.002, 0.926)
$V_{\text{among-females}}$	0.129 (0.001, 0.398)	0.280 (0.001, 0.914)
$V_{\text{among-plot-years}}$	0.133 (0.035, 0.275)	0.143 (0.001, 0.422)
$V_{\text{within-male-cross-year}}$	1.714 (1.372, 2.110)	3.847 (3.010, 4.903)

38

39 **REFERENCES**

40

41 Bouwhuis, S., B. C. Sheldon, S. Verhulst, and A Charmantier. 2009. Great tits growing old: selective
 42 disappearance and the partitioning of senescence to stages within the breeding cycle. *Proc. Biol. Sci.*
 43 276:2769–77.

44 Svensson, L. 1992. Identification guide to European passerines. L. Svensson.

