WILEY

Once you have Acrobat Reader open on your computer, click on the Comment tab at the right of the toolbar:

| 🗐 💾 🖨 ✉ | ⬆ ⬇ | 1 / 27 | ⊖ ⊕ 70.4% ▾ | 💾 | ⤢ ▾ | Tools | Comment | Share |

This will open up a panel down the right side of the document. The majority of tools you will use for annotating your proof will be in the Annotations section, pictured opposite. We've picked out some of these tools below:

▾ **Annotations**

💬 📝 📎 🔊 👤▾

T̪ ᴛ̥ ╤ I̲ ᴛ̥

**1. Replace (Ins) Tool** – for replacing text.

Strikes a line through text and opens up a text box where replacement text can be entered.

How to use it

- Highlight a word or sentence.
- Click on the Replace (Ins) icon in the Annotations section.
- Type the replacement text into the blue box that appears.

ndard framework for the analysis of m
icy. Nevertheless, it also led to exoge
ole of strategic intertation between fi
nber of comp
is that the st
nain compo
level, are exc
important works on enty by Childe
M henceforth)[1] we open the 'black h

> dthreshe
> 08/06/2011 15:58:17
> , which led

---

2. Strikethrough (Del) Tool – for deleting text.

Strikes a red line through text that is to be deleted.

How to use it

- Highlight a word or sentence.
- Click on the Strikethrough (Del) icon in the Annotations section.

there is no room for extra profits ar
ups are zero and the number of
cet) values are not determined by
Blanchard and Kiyotaki (1987),
rfect competition in general equilil
ts of aggregate demand and supply
lassical framework assuming monop
een an exogenous number of firms

---

3. Add note to text Tool – for highlighting a section to be changed to bold or italic.

Highlights text in yellow and opens up a text box where comments can be entered.

How to use it

- Highlight the relevant section of text.
- Click on the Add note to text icon in the Annotations section.
- Type instruction on what should be changed regarding the text into the yellow box that appears.

namic responses of mark ups
ent with the VAR evidence

sation
y Ma
and
on n
to a
stent also with the demand-

> dthreshe
> 08/06/2011 15:31:38

---

4. Add sticky note Tool – for making notes at specific points in the text.

Marks a point in the proof where a comment needs to be highlighted.

How to use it

- Click on the Add sticky note icon in the Annotations section.
- Click at the point in the proof where the comment should be inserted.
- Type the comment into the yellow box that appears.

land and supply snocks. Most of
amir
numbe
dard fra
icy. Nev
ole of st
ber of competitors and the imp
is that the structure of the secto

> dthreshe
> 08/06/2011 15:18:08

WILEY

5. Attach File Tool – for inserting large amounts of text or replacement figures.

Inserts an icon linking to the attached file in the appropriate place in the text.

How to use it

- Click on the Attach File icon in the Annotations section.
- Click on the proof to where you'd like the attached file to be linked.
- Select the file to be attached from your computer or network.
- Select the colour and type of icon that will appear in the proof. Click OK.

E N D

---

6. Drawing Markups Tools – for drawing shapes, lines and freeform annotations on proofs and commenting on these marks.
Allows shapes, lines and freeform annotations to be drawn on proofs and for comment to be made on these marks.

How to use it

- Click on one of the shapes in the Drawing Markups section.
- Click on the proof at the relevant point and draw the selected shape with the cursor.
- To add a comment to the drawn shape, move the cursor over the shape until an arrowhead appears.
- Double click on the shape and type any text in the red box that appears.

Disappearance of eggs from nonparasitized nests of brood parasite hosts: the evolutionary equilibrium hypothesis revisited

BÅRD G. STOKKE[1]*, EIVIN RØSKAFT[1], ARNE MOKSNES[1], ANDERS PAPE MØLLER[2], ANTON ANTONOV[1†], FRODE FOSSØY[1], WEI LIANG[3], GERMÁN LÓPEZ-IBORRA[4], CSABA MOSKÁT[5], JACQUI SHYKOFF[2], MANUEL SOLER[6], JOHAN R. VIKAN[1], CANCHAO YANG[3] and FUGO TAKASU[7]

[1]*Department of Biology, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Faculty of Natural Sciences and Technology, NO-7491, Trondheim, Norway*
[2]*Laboratoire Ecologie, Systematique et Evolution, UMR 8079, CNRS, Université Paris-Sud XI, AgroParisTech, F-91405, Orsay, Cedex, France*
[3]*Ministry of Education Key Laboratory for Tropical Animal and Plant Ecology, College of Life Sciences, Hainan Normal University, Haikou, 571158, China*
[4]*Departamento de Ecología/IMEM Ramon Margalef, Universidad de Alicante, Apartado 99, E-03080, Alicante, Spain*
[5]*MTA-ELTE-MTM Ecology Research Group of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, c/o Biological Institute, Eötvös Lóránd University, Pázmány Péter sétány 1/c, , H-1117, Budapest Hungary and Hungarian Natural History Museum, Baross u. 13, Budapest, H-1088, Hungary*
[6]*Grupo Coevolución, Departamento de Biología Animal, Unidad Asociada al CSIC, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Granada, Granada, E-18071, Spain*
[7]*Department of Information and Computer Sciences, Nara Women's University, Kita-Uoya Nishimachi, Nara, 630-8506, Japan*

The evolutionary equilibrium hypothesis was proposed to explain variation in egg rejection rates among individual hosts (intra- and interspecific) of avian brood parasites. Hosts may sometimes mistakenly reject own eggs when they are not parasitized (i.e. make recognition errors). Such errors would incur fitness costs and could counter the evolution of host defences driven by costs of parasitism (i.e. creating equilibrium between acceptors and rejecters within particular host populations). In the present study, we report the disappearance of host eggs from nonparasitized nests in populations of seven actual and potential hosts of the common cuckoo *Cuculus canorus*. Based on these data, we calculate the magnitude of the balancing parasitism rate provided that all eggs lost are a result of recognition errors. Importantly, because eggs are known to disappear from nests for reasons other than erroneous host rejection, our data represent the maximum estimates of such costs. Nonetheless, the disappearance of eggs was a rare event and therefore incurred low costs compared to the high costs of parasitism. Hence, costs as a result of recognition errors are probably of minor importance with respect to opposing selective pressure for the evolution of egg rejection in these hosts. We cannot exclude the possibility that low or intermediate egg rejection rates in some host populations may be caused by spatiotemporal variation in the occurrence of parasitism and gene flow, creating a variable influence of opposing costs as a result of recognition errors and the costs of parasitism. © 2015 The Linnean Society of London, *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 2015, **00**, 000–000.

ADDITIONAL KEYWORDS: co-evolution – cuckoo – fitness cost – host defence – host–parasite interactions.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: bard.g.stokke@ntnu.no
†In memory of A. Antonov, who died much too young, 20 May 2012.

INTRODUCTION

In hosts of avian brood parasites, the costs of parasitism impose strong selection for the evolution of defensive traits because successful parasitism in many cases leads to a total loss of host reproductive output. Therefore, many hosts have evolved fine-tuned egg rejection abilities, which, in several cases, have been countered by parasites evolving mimetic eggs (Payne, 1967; Brooke & Davies, 1988; Davies & de Brooke, 1989a; Moksnes *et al.*, 1991; Antonov *et al.*, 2006a; Starling *et al.*, 2006; Spottiswoode & Stevens, 2010; Stoddard & Stevens, 2010, 2011; Begum *et al.*, 2011). In some species, there is apparently no variation in rejection abilities either within or between populations, and rejection rates are more or less fixed at 100% (i.e. all individuals are capable of rejection) as long as the appearance of the parasitic egg is cognitively recognizable for the individuals in question (Stokke, Moksnes & Røskaft, 2005). However, even rejection rates of non-mimetic eggs are only moderate in several other host species, often showing prominent temporal and/or spatial variation (Brooke, Davies & Noble, 1998; Soler *et al.*, 1999; Stokke *et al.*, 2008), relying on additional cues other than egg appearance when deciding to reject parasitic eggs (i.e. conditional responses; Brooke *et al.*, 1998; Davies, 2000). Such co-occurrence of acceptors and rejecters (either as fixed or flexible strategies) within a single host population is often explained by the costs of making errors in the recognition and rejection of foreign eggs, which could outweigh the benefits of egg rejection under specific circumstances (Rothstein, 1982a; Marchetti, 1992; Lotem, Nakamura & Zahavi, 1995; Davies, Brooke & Kacelnik, 1996; Takasu, 1998). Specifically, host individuals attuned to reject foreign eggs may mistakenly reject one of their own eggs in nests that are not parasitized (Stokke *et al.*, 2005; Røskaft *et al.*, 2002a) or own eggs instead of parasitic eggs in parasitized nests. These costs obviously have fitness consequences because the resulting clutch size will be smaller than the original one. In theory, such errors are most likely to occur in hosts that have high variation in egg appearance within clutches (Davies & de Brooke, 1989b; Lotem *et al.*, 1995; Stokke *et al.*, 2007), making it difficult for hosts to recognize and hence reject parasitic eggs. Thus, if parasitism rates are low or variable, the costs of making recognition errors could potentially be higher than the costs of parasitism. Such a scenario could result in equilibrium between acceptors and rejecters within particular host populations or, if costs as a result of recognition errors and rejection costs are high, could even lead to acceptance being the optimal strategy (the evolutionary equilibrium hypothesis; Lotem & Nakamura, 1998).

However, the importance of recognition errors as an opposing selective force to egg rejection, at least in hosts of evicting parasites, has been questioned (Røskaft *et al.*, 2002a; Stokke *et al.*, 2002). In brood parasites such as honeyguides (Indicatoridae) and cuckoos (Cuculidae), the parasitic chick gets rid of all host eggs or young from the nest soon after hatching (Davies, 2000; Anderson *et al.*, 2009; Grim *et al.*, 2009; Spottiswoode & Koorevaar, 2012), enforcing high costs on host reproduction and hence strong selection for the evolution of defences against parasitism (Medina & Langmore, 2015), depending on the level of parasitism (Davies *et al.*, 1996). Furthermore, estimating the occurrence of recognition errors is not straightforward. It is well known that partial egg losses may be a result of jostling or partial predation (Rothstein, 1982b; Lerkelund *et al.*, 1993). Hence, only the constant monitoring of nests throughout the egg-laying and incubation period can provide us with evidence for the occurrence of recognition errors. Without such monitoring, we cannot rule out the possibility that eggs may disappear for other reasons than erroneous host rejection and estimates of such costs are therefore in many cases probably higher than what is actually the case.

The present study aims to report the disappearance of own eggs in actual and potential host species of common cuckoo *Cuculus canorus*. Based on these data, we estimate the maximum costs of recognition errors and the parasitism rate that should balance these costs. We discuss our results in relation to current knowledge of co-evolutionary adaptations in common cuckoos and their hosts.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Empirical data on the disappearance of eggs and other relevant factors

Data on the disappearance of own eggs in nonparasitized nests were retrieved from our own field studies in which nests were monitored throughout the egg-laying and incubation periods. We retrieved (1) number of host eggs lost from unparasitized host nests in the specific population; (2) mean clutch size in the specific population (F); and (3) rejection rate of experimentally added, non-mimetic eggs within the study populations. In addition, we also retrieved (4) the observed parasitism rate within each population (Table 1). The number of eggs lost in each population, termed the 'number of disappeared eggs', was calculated as the number of eggs lost from nonparasitized nests divided by total number of

Table 1. Data used to calculate the balancing parasitism rate (%) required for opposing maximum estimates of costs as a result of recognition errors

Species	Locality	Number of disappeared eggs	RE1 (%)	RE2 (%)	RE3 (%)	RE4 (%)	Parasitism rate (%)	Rejection rate, RE4 (%)	Clutch size	Balancing parasitism, RE1	Balancing parasitism, non-mimetic eggs, Balancing parasitism, non-mimetic eggs Balancing parasitism, RE2	Balancing parasitism, RE3	Balancing parasitism, RE4
Acrocephalus arundinaceus	Hungary	4 (54)	1.53 (54)	3.07 (54)	6.13 (54)	1.61 (54)	59.4 (546)	95.2 (58)	4.83 (137)	1.9	3.9	7.7	2.0
Acrocephalus arundinaceus	Spain	6 (86)	1.50 (86)	3.01 (86)	6.01 (86)	1.58(86)**	12.1 (116)	NA	4.64 (59)	1.9	3.8	7.7	2.0**
Acrocephalus scirpaceus	Spain	17 (229)	2.09 (229)	4.18 (229)	8.36 (229)	16.73 (229)	2.0 (402)	12.5 (16)	3.55 (273)	2.9	5.8	11.6	23.3
Acrocephalus palustris	Bulgaria	1 (157)	0.14 (157)	0.27 (157)	0.54 (157)	0.15 (157)	28.3 (532)	88.2 (17)	4.68 (159)	0.2	0.3	0.7	0.2
Hippolais pallida	Bulgaria	1 (113)	0.23 (113)	0.46 (113)	0.92 (113)	0.25 (113)	26.6 (128)	91.3 (23)*	3.85 (113)	0.3	0.6	1.2	0.3
Fringilla coelebs	Norway	0 (38)	0.00 (38)	0.00 (38)	0.00 (38)	0.00 (38)	0.0 (220)	87.0 (152)	4.75 (92)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fringilla montifringilla	Norway	0 (57)	0.00 (57)	0.00 (57)	0.00 (57)	0.00 (57)	0.0 (250)	78.4 (37)	6.02 (189)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Miliaria calandra	Bulgaria	1 (118)	0.17 (118)	0.34 (118)	0.69 (118)	0.30 (118)	14.6 (356)	56.5 (108)	4.93 (119)	0.2	0.4	0.9	0.4

The frequency of recognition errors is estimated as the proportion of own eggs lost out of all eggs laid [($\Delta F/F$) × 100)] in nonparasitized nests assuming that (1) all (RE1), (2) 50% (RE2) and (3) 25% (RE3) of the individuals are capable of rejecting eggs (where RE is the recognition error). As a fourth estimate (RE4), we also consider the proportion of individuals in the population that are able to reject experimental non-mimetic eggs (for calculation, see Eqn 1). *Individuals that recognized and pecked foreign eggs. **Rejection rate of non-mimetic eggs in the Hungarian population used. Numbers in brackets refer to the number of nests. For more details, see Material and methods.

nonparasitized nests (excluding nests that were naturally or experimentally parasitized). We only included nests with single host eggs lost because the disappearance of more than one egg could indicate partial predation rather than actual errors in recognition. Hence, in our marsh warbler *Acrocephalus palustris* population, we omitted cases where three out of four eggs ($N = 1$) and four out of five eggs ($N = 2$) disappeared. In our corn bunting *Miliaria calandra* population, we omitted cases where two out of three eggs ($N = 1$), three out of five eggs ($N = 1$), and four out of five eggs ($N = 1$) disappeared. We also omitted clutches where egg-laying did not follow the 'one egg per day' criterion. More specifically, this refers to two extraordinary cases in the chaffinch *Fringilla coelebs* population, with an irregular egg laying sequence (Stokke *et al.*, 2002). Furthermore, the loss of all eggs in the clutch was considered to be caused by predation, and such nests were omitted from the calculations.

Nests were monitored daily from nest building until 6 days of incubation to allow estimates of disappearance of own eggs from nonparasitized nests. Eggs were marked with permanent ink in the sequence they were laid. Clutch size was estimated from completed, nonparasitized clutches. Nests used to calculate recognition errors and clutch size were different from those used to calculate rejection rate of experimentally added, non-mimetic eggs.

The disappearance of eggs from nonparasitized nests was estimated in eight study populations (Table 1): (1) great reed warblers *Acrocephalus arundinaceus* in Apaj, Hungary (1998–2007); (2) great reed warblers in Embalse del Hondo, Alicante, Spain (1995–2006); (3) reed warblers *Acrocephalus scirpaceus* in Embalse del Hondo, Alicante, Spain (1995–2006); (4) marsh warblers in Zlatia, Bulgaria (2002–2009); (5) olivaceous warblers *Hippolais pallida* in Zlatia, Bulgaria (2001–2009); (6) chaffinches in Stjørdal, Norway (1999–2001); (7) bramblings *Fringilla montifringilla* in Tana, Norway (2003–2004); and (8) corn buntings in Zlatia, Bulgaria (2002–2009). All these species are known to be parasitized by common cuckoos to various extents (Moksnes & Røskaft, 1995). Data on clutch sizes, parasitism rates, and rejection rates of experimentally added, non-mimetic eggs were retrieved from the literature for the same populations from which we obtained data on the disappearance of eggs (Moksnes *et al.*, 1991; Moksnes, Røskaft & Solli, 1994; Bártol *et al.*, 2002; Moskát & Honza, 2002; Stokke *et al.*, 2002, 2004; Antonov *et al.*, 2006a,b, 2007a,b; Antonov *et al.* 2009; Hauber, Moskát & Bán, 2006; Moskát *et al.*, 2008a,b,c, 2009; Avilés *et al.*, 2009; Vikan *et al.*, 2009, 2010, 2011). A few data from unpublished studies were also included; in the Spanish reed warbler population (number 3 in the list above), rejection data of non-mimetic eggs refer to experimentally added eggs painted pale blue (i.e. resembling eggs laid by cuckoos utilizing redstarts *Phoenicurus phoenicurus*; Brooke & Davies, 1988).

ESTIMATE OF PARASITISM RATE BALANCING MAXIMUM RECOGNITION ERRORS ESTIMATES

We acknowledge that the response to a parasitic egg may be conditional/plastic (Brooke *et al.*, 1998; Lindholm & Thomas, 2000; Soler, Martín-Vivaldi & Fernández-Morante, 2012). Furthermore, we realistically assume that host egg rejection behaviour has a genetic basis (Martín-Gálvez *et al.*, 2006). In the absence of parasitism, the frequency of rejecters in the population may decline as a result not only of recognition errors, but also other costs related to maintaining specific traits or because of stochasticity (Lahti, 2005, 2006). In populations experiencing parasitism above a certain threshold level, selection will likely lead to rejecters producing more offspring than acceptors because rejecters escape the costs of parasitism. We use the model presented by Davies & de Brooke (1989b) to derive the mean reproductive success of acceptor and rejecter pairs ($RS_{acceptor}$ and $RS_{rejecter}$) and the corresponding balancing parasitism rate, p^*. Let p be the parasitism rate (probability of a host nest being parasitized). The mean reproductive success of acceptor pairs (both sexes are acceptors) is:

$$RS_{acceptor} = F(1-p) + c(F-1)p \qquad (1)$$

where F is the mean host clutch size and c is the proportion of host young reared together with a parasitic chick ($0 \leq c \leq 1$). Typically, for evicting brood parasites such as *Cuculus* cuckoos, $c = 0$ (but see also Rutila, Latja & Koskela, 2002), whereas, for non-evicting parasites, c can be larger. We assume that cuckoo females remove one host egg from the nest when parasitizing the nest (Davies, 2000), even though the removal of more than one egg is not uncommon (Øien *et al.*, 1998). The mean reproductive success of rejecter pairs (at least one breeding individual is rejecter), where all parasite eggs are rejected is:

$$RS_{rejecter} = (F - \Delta F)(1-p) + (F - \Delta F - 1)p \qquad (2)$$

where ΔF denotes recognition errors expressed as the number of host eggs lost by rejecters. Because only rejecters are likely to commit recognition errors, we need to take egg rejection rates within the population into account when calculating ΔF as:

$\Delta F =$ [Proportion of host eggs lost from unparasitized nests in population] [Mean clutch size in population]/

[Egg rejection rate in population]   (3)

At equilibrium ($RS_{\text{acceptor}} = RS_{\text{rejecter}}$), we obtain the parasitism rate, p^*, that balances the benefit of rejecting parasite eggs with the cost of rejecting own eggs in nonparasitized nests (recognition errors) as:

$$p* = \Delta F/((F - 1)/(1 - c)) \quad (4)$$

In some species, host individuals show phenotypic plasticity in their responses against parasites [based on social cues: Campobello & Sealy (2011); personality: Avilés & Parejo (2011; and perception of risk of parasitism: Welbergen & Davies (2009)] and parasitic eggs, and hosts will more likely reject eggs if they experience additional cues other than the egg itself, such as observing a cuckoo in the vicinity of the nest (Moksnes *et al.*, 2000). Furthermore, the ability of individuals to reject parasitic eggs usually depends on the contrast between own and foreign eggs (i.e. egg mimicry) (Davies, 2000; Spottiswoode & Stevens, 2010). Hence, from Eqn 3, we obtain four estimates of ΔF; assuming that (1) all (RE1), (2) 50% (RE2), (3) 25% (RE3), and (4) observed % (RE4) of individuals in the population are able to reject foreign eggs (where RE is the recognition error). The estimate RE4 is based on the rejection of experimental non-mimetic eggs in the specific study population (Table 1). We acknowledge that these four estimates only represent crude attempts to take phenotypic plasticity into account in our calculations but, first, we aim to keep our calculations as simple as possible, and, second, we lacked reliable quantitative estimates of phenotypic plasticity. By calculating four estimates, at least some of the phenotypic plasticity present at the individual level in specific populations is taken into account.

RESULTS

Disappearance of eggs from nonparasitized nests was most pronounced in great reed and reed warblers (7–7.4%). In the remaining species, eggs disappeared in only 0–0.9% of the nests (Table 1). Individuals in the populations included in our analyses experienced 0–16.7% loss of own eggs in nonparasitized nests depending on how rejection abilities were considered (RE1–RE4) (Table 1). Calculations of parasitism rates that would balance the costs of recognition errors (provided that all eggs lost were a result of

erroneous egg rejection) show considerable variation among species (range 0–23.3%) (Table 1). Because only rejecters are assumed to erroneously reject own eggs, and our estimate of recognition errors is one fixed value per population, the cost of recognition errors and the corresponding balancing parasitism rate will be higher when fewer individuals are classified as rejecters (Eqn 3). Hence, within particular populations, estimates of recognition errors and balancing parasitism rates will generally be higher when considering the rejection of mimetic eggs than non-mimetic eggs because the rejection rate for mimetic eggs in the population is generally lower than for non-mimetic eggs. If we assume that all individuals have the ability to reject eggs (100% rejection rate), estimates of both recognition errors and balancing parasitism rate can be regarded as minimum estimates.

The balancing parasitism rates are generally in the magnitude of 0–1.2%, except in great reed and reed warblers, where it may reach 7.7% and 23.3% respectively, depending on calculation of the proportion of individuals that are able to reject parasitic eggs. In seven of the eight study populations, observed parasitism rates are equal to or higher than those required to balance the costs of making recognition errors, indicating that egg rejection abilities should evolve and be maintained, which is in accordance with the high rejection rates of non-mimetic eggs generally found in the present study. Hence, recognition errors should not be important as opposing selection pressure in these populations. The only exception among these seven populations is the corn bunting population, which experiences a rather high parasitism rate but still only rejects non-mimetic eggs at an intermediate level. The remaining population, Spanish reed warblers, experiences a parasitism rate that is lower than the ones required maintaining rejection behaviour with all four estimates of recognition errors (Table 1).

DISCUSSION

Perceptual errors may cause costs that could oppose the evolution or maintenance of apparently optimal adaptations such as those involved in co-evolutionary arms races. Such costs may act as opposing selective pressures against the evolution of host defences against brood parasitism, as outlined in the evolutionary equilibrium hypothesis (Rothstein, 1982a; Lotem *et al.*, 1995; Davies *et al.*, 1996). In the present study, we have shown that the magnitudes of such errors are generally low across eight different host populations of the common cuckoo, even with our overestimated rates of recognition errors.

Furthermore, our estimates of recognition errors are comparable to those obtained from other species (Marchetti, 1992, 2000; Lotem *et al.*, 1995).

Several European passerines regarded as suitable common cuckoo hosts show strong rejection of experimentally added eggs (Davies & de Brooke, 1989a; Moksnes *et al.*, 1991; Moskát, Szentpéteri & Barta, 2002; Honza *et al.*, 2004; Lovászi & Moskát, 2004; Procházka & Honza, 2004; Rutila *et al.*, 2006; Samaš *et al.*, 2011) (Table 1). Such species are often characterized by having a low intraclutch variation in egg appearance (Øien, Moksnes & Røskaft, 1995; Soler & Møller, 1996; Stokke, Moksnes & Røskaft, 2002b), reducing the risk of making recognition errors and enhancing the rejection of even moderately mimetic parasitic eggs (Stokke *et al.*, 2007; Moskát *et al.*, 2008a). Furthermore, several species may retain rejection behaviour in the absence of parasitism (Underwood, Sealy & McLaren, 2004; Lahti, 2006; Medina & Langmore, 2015), and even after speciation events (Bolen, Rothstein & Trost, 2000; Rothstein, 2001; Peer & Sealy, 2004), indicating that opposing selective pressures for egg rejection, such as recognition errors, are negligible in these species. Even with the existence of recognition errors, rejection behaviour may be retained without apparent interspecific parasitism for several reasons. First, there may be unaccounted benefits to egg rejection behaviour, such as resistance to intraspecific brood parasitism, that maintain rejection behaviour and even cause it to increase in frequency (Grim *et al.*, 2011; Samaš *et al.*, 2011). Second, interspecific parasitism may still occur at a low rate without researchers being able to detect it. Hence, parasitism by cuckoos laying non-mimetic eggs (i.e. from a gens with another main host) may happen from time to time but, because such eggs would be ejected quickly, the host population appears to be nonparasitized. Such 'accidental' layings are not uncommon (Capek, 1896; Chance, 1940), and the rate at which such events occur may be sufficient to retain rejection rates, as is apparent from the balancing parasitism rates reported in the present study. For example, Moksnes & Røskaft (1995) found 76 cuckoo eggs in chaffinches stored in European museums and, out of 58 000 cases of cuckoo parasitism from Europe collected by B. G. Stokke, 325 cases were recorded in chaffinch nests scattered all over Europe (unpubl. data). The balancing parasitism rates estimated for chaffinches and bramblings in the present study are equal to zero, indicating that occasional parasitism by cuckoos is sufficient to retain high rates of egg rejection. Third, the retention of egg rejection in these species may be caused by immigration of rejecters from other populations that suffer high parasitism rates (Soler *et al.*, 2001). Hence, there are reports of chaffinches being utilized regularly by common cuckoos in the European parts of Russia (Malchevsky, 1960), and bramblings are favoured hosts in parts of Fennoscandia (Vikan *et al.*, 2011).

On the other hand, our results also indicate that perceptual errors may be influential for the evolution of egg rejection in some cases. Hence, one of our study populations experiences parasitism rates lower than the balancing parasitism rates. Reed warblers in Spain experience a parasitism rate of 2.0%, which is slightly lower than the calculated balancing parasitism rate (2.9–23.3%). In this population, egg rejection abilities should therefore deteriorate with time, based on our current estimates of recognition errors, provided that there is no immigration of rejecters from other populations, or as long as there are no large fluctuations in parasitism rate among years. Several studies have focused on the influence of recognition errors in reed warblers, although support for the importance of errors has been ambiguous (Davies & de Brooke, 1988; Davies *et al.*, 1996; Røskaft *et al.*, 2002a; Čapek *et al.*, 2010). This species shows marked spatial variation in egg rejection related to parasitism pressure in the specific population (Lindholm & Thomas, 2000; Stokke *et al.*, 2008), indicating that there could be opposing selective pressures working against egg rejection in populations experiencing no or low parasitism. Alternatively, temporal variation in parasitism (Brooke *et al.*, 1998) may also lead to the same pattern, with fluctuations in selective pressures depending on the current costs of parasitism. Furthermore, reed warblers have substantial intraclutch variation in egg appearance (Stokke *et al.*, 1999; 2002b) and are parasitized by cuckoos laying mimetic eggs (Davies & de Brooke, 1988), making the recognition of parasitic eggs error prone. In such cases, hosts may rely on conditional stimuli in perceiving the risk of parasitism (Rothstein, 1982a; Davies & de Brooke, 1988, 1998; Stokke *et al.*, 2005, 2007). Hence, reed warblers are more likely to reject parasitic eggs when they observe a cuckoo close to the nest, indicating an increased risk of parasitism (Davies & de Brooke, 1988; Moksnes, Røskaft & Korsnes, 1993; Moksnes *et al.*, 2000). However, a recent study disclosed that the presence of a cuckoo does not necessarily lead to an increased risk of making recognition errors (Čapek *et al.*, 2010). Careful investigations of reed warbler nests by utilizing video recordings should be undertaken to determine unambiguously if disappearance of eggs is a result of the erroneous rejection of own eggs.

Gene flow, not considered directly in the present study, may potentially slow down the process of evolving optimally expressed traits in particular populations or lead to local mal-adaptation (Nuismer,

Thompson & Gomulkiewicz, 1999). Influx of rejecter or acceptor alleles may therefore influence the expression of egg rejection in local populations. However, this critically depends on spatiotemporal variation in selection regimes (Duffy & Forde, 2009), such as cuckoo parasitism and costs as a result of recognition errors, although, at present, such data are unavailable. Gene flow could also increase the frequency of rejecter alleles in nonparasitized or weakly parasitized populations (Røskaft *et al.*, 2002b, 2006; Moskát *et al.*, 2008b), thus causing errors to increase. Interestingly, there is low genetic differentiation among reed warbler populations in Europe, showing evidence of extensive gene flow among populations (Procházka *et al.*, 2011). The intermediate rejection of non-mimetic eggs in reed warblers and possibly in corn buntings may therefore be caused by a combined effect of the costs of making recognition errors, gene flow, and spatiotemporal variation in the occurrence of parasitism, creating a mosaic of situations in which the opposing costs vary in relative magnitude. Interestingly, the few studies available on corn buntings indicate similar spatial variation in parasitism as in reed warblers. Hence, in Italy, only 1.4% (*N* = 208) corn bunting nests were parasitized (Campobello & Sealy, 2009), which is profoundly different from the relatively high parasitism rate at our Bulgarian study site.

It is important to acknowledge that recognition errors are probably rarer events than estimated in the present study because eggs may disappear from nests for several other reasons (Rothstein, 1982b; Lerkelund *et al.*, 1993; Moksnes *et al.*, 2000; Røskaft *et al.*, 2002a). For example, Moksnes *et al.* (2000) and Røskaft *et al.* (2002a) reported that cuckoos visited and partially depredated 12% of reed warbler nests without actually parasitizing them; see also Wyllie (1975). Furthermore, cuckoos often remove one or two host eggs just prior to laying their own egg (Wyllie, 1975, 1981). If the host then rapidly ejects the parasitic egg, the loss of its own egg(s) will appear to be self-inflicted to the observer even when this was not actually the case. Even with daily monitoring of nests, such mistakes may take place, leading to overinflated estimates of recognition errors.

By using empirical data on disappearance of own eggs from nonparasitized nests, we have shown that costs opposing evolution of egg rejection in host species of the common cuckoo with intermediate–high rejection rates are generally small. Importantly, our estimates are most probably overestimates of true recognition errors, indicating that such costs in general are minute compared to the high costs of parasitism. Recognition errors appear to be most likely in species with specific characteristics such as a high intraclutch variation in egg appearance, an interme-diate and variable rejection rate, spatiotemporal variation in occurrence of parasitism, and parasitism by brood parasites laying eggs mimicking host eggs at least to some extent, such as in reed warblers and perhaps corn buntings. Future studies on the importance of recognition errors should focus on long-term studies of 'low' and 'intermediate' rejecters at a spatiotemporal scale including several populations, thus taking gene flow into account, at the same time as also considering phenotypic plasticity in host anti-parasite behaviour. By this approach, we should be able to obtain reliable estimates of variation in recognition errors, rejection rates, and parasitism rates and address the importance of the various costs for the evolution of egg rejection. Finally, the use of video cameras (Weidinger, 2010) would disclose the proportion of eggs that are actually lost by erroneous ejection of own eggs and not to other factors such as jostling or partial predation.

Feeney, Welbergen & Langmore (2014) called for a focus on the integration of co-evolved traits found at various stages in the breeding cycle to better understand interactions between brood parasites and their hosts. Our findings related to the egg-stage should be of importance for evaluating hypotheses proposing to explain variation in the expression of defences in hosts. Further research should focus on clarifying how recognition errors promote selection for low intraclutch variation, an important antiparasite defence in hosts of brood parasites, because host eggs with an extreme appearance are expected to be identified as parasitic eggs. We also suggest that future research should investigate how the frequency of recognition errors might be characteristic for specific stages of the arms race between hosts and brood parasites.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Anderson MG, Moskát C, Bán M, Grim T, Cassey P, Hauber ME. 2009. Egg eviction imposes a recoverable cost of virulence in chicks of a brood parasite. *PLoS ONE* **4:** e7725.

Antonov A, Stokke BG, Moksnes A, Røskaft E. 2006a. Egg rejection in marsh warblers (*Acrocephalus palustris*) heavily parasitized by common cuckoos (*Cuculus canorus*). *Auk* **123:** 419–430.

Antonov A, Stokke BG, Moksnes A, Røskaft E. 2006b. Coevolutionary interactions between common cuckoos and corn buntings. *Condor* **108:** 414–422.

Antonov A, Stokke BG, Moksnes A, Røskaft E. 2007a. First evidence of regular common cuckoo, *Cuculus canorus*, parasitism on eastern olivaceous warblers, *Hippolais pallida elaeica*. *Naturwissenschaften* **94:** 307–312.

Antonov A, Stokke BG, Moksnes A, Røskaft E. 2007b. Aspects of breeding ecology of the eastern olivaceous warbler (*Hippolais pallida*). *Journal of Ornithology* **148:** 443–451.

Avilés JM, Parejo D. 2011. Host personalities and the evolution of behavioural adaptations in brood parasitic-host systems. *Animal Behaviour* **82:** 613–618.

Avilés JM, Moskát C, Bán M, Hargitai R, Parejo D. 2009. Common cuckoos (*Cuculus canorus*) do not rely on indicators of parental abilities when searching for host nests: the importance of host defenses. *Auk* **126:** 431–438.

Bártol I, Karcza Z, Moskát C, Røskaft E, Kisbenedek T. 2002. Responses of great reed warblers *Acrocephalus arundinaceus* to experimental brood parasitism: the effects of a cuckoo *Cuculus canorus* dummy and egg mimicry. *Journal of Avian Biology* **33:** 420–425.

Begum S, Moksnes A, Røskaft E, Stokke BG. 2011. Interactions between the Asian koel (*Eudynamys scolopacea*) and its hosts. *Behaviour* **148:** 325–340.

Bolen GM, Rothstein SI, Trost CH. 2000. Egg recognition in yellow-billed and black-billed magpies in the absence of interspecific parasitism: implications for parasite–host coevolution. *Condor* **102:** 432–438.

de Brooke ML, Davies NB 1988. Egg mimicry by cuckoos *Cuculus canorus* in relation to discrimination by hosts. *Nature* **335:** 630–632.

de Brooke ML, Davies NB, Noble DG 1998. Rapid decline of host defences in response to reduced cuckoo parasitism: behavioural flexibility of reed warblers in a changing world. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B, Biological Sciences* **265:** 1277–1282.

Campobello D, Sealy SG. 2009. Avian brood parasitism in a Mediterranean region: hosts and habitat preferences of common cuckoos *Cuculus canorus*. *Bird Study* **56:** 389–400.

Campobello D, Sealy SG. 2011. Use of social over personal information enhances nest defense against avian brood parasitism. *Behavioral Ecology* **22:** 422–428.

Capek V 1896. Beiträge zur Fortpflanzungsgeschichte des Kuckucks. *Ornithologisches Jahrbuch* **7:** 41–72, 102–117, 146–157, 165–183.

Čapek M, Požgayová M, Procházka P, Honza M. 2010. Repeated presentations of the common cuckoo increase nest defense by the Eurasian reed warbler but do not induce it to make recognition errors. *Condor* **112:** 763–769.

Chance EP. 1940. *The truth about the cuckoo*. London: Country Life.

Davies NB. 2000. *Cuckoos, cowbirds and other cheats*. London: T & AD Poyser.

Davies NB, de Brooke ML 1988. Cuckoos versus reed warblers: adaptations and counteradaptations. *Animal Behaviour* **36:** 262–284.

Davies NB, de Brooke ML 1989a. An experimental study of co-evolution between the cuckoo, *Cuculus canorus*, and its hosts. I. Host egg discrimination. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **58:** 207–224.

Davies NB, de Brooke ML 1989b. An experimental study of co-evolution between the cuckoo, *Cuculus canorus*, and its hosts. II. Host egg markings, chick discrimination and general discussion. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **58:** 225–236.

Davies NB, de Brooke ML 1998. Studies in coevolution. In: Rothstein SI, Robinson SK, eds. *Parasitic birds and their hosts; studies in coevolution*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 59–79.

Davies NB, de Brooke ML, Kacelnik A 1996. Recognition errors and probability of parasitism determine whether reed warblers should accept or reject mimetic cuckoo eggs. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B, Biological Sciences* **263:** 925–931.

Duffy MA, Forde SE. 2009. Ecological feedbacks and the evolution of resistance. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **78:** 1106–1112.

Feeney WE, Welbergen JA, Langmore NE. 2014. Advances in the study of coevolution between avian brood parasites and their hosts. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* **45:** 227–246.

Grim T, Rutila J, Cassey P, Hauber ME. 2009. The cost of virulence: an experimental study of egg eviction by brood parasitic chicks. *Behavioral Ecology* **20:** 1138–1146.

Grim T, Samaš P, Moskát C, Kleven O, Honza M, Moksnes A, Røskaft E, Stokke BG. 2011. Constraints on host choice: why do parasitic birds rarely exploit some common potential hosts? *Journal of Animal Ecology* **80:** 508–518.

Hauber ME, Moskát C, Bán M. 2006. Experimental shift in hosts' acceptance threshold of inaccurate-mimic brood parasite eggs. *Biology Letters* **2:** 177–180.

Honza M, Procházka P, Stokke BG, Moksnes A, Røskaft E, Čapek M Jr, Mrlík V. 2004. Are blackcaps current winners in the evolutionary struggle against the common cuckoo? *Journal of Ethology* **22:** 175–180.

Lahti DC. 2005. Evolution of bird eggs in the absence of cuckoo parasitism. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **102:** 18057–18062.

Lahti DC. 2006. Persistence of egg recognition in the absence of cuckoo brood parasitism: pattern and mechanism. *Evolution* **60:** 157–168.

Lerkelund HE, Moksnes A, Røskaft E, Ringsby TH. 1993. An experimental test of optimal clutch size of the fieldfare; with a discussion on why brood parasites remove eggs when they parasitize a host species. *Ornis Scandinavica* **24:** 95–102.

Lindholm AK, Thomas RJ. 2000. Differences between populations of reed warblers in defences against brood parasitism. *Behaviour* **137:** 25–42.

Lotem A, Nakamura H. 1998. Evolutionary equilibria in avian brood parasitism. In: Rothstein SI, Robinson SK, eds. *Parasitic birds and their hosts; studies in coevolution*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 223–235.

Lotem A, Nakamura H, Zahavi A. 1995. Constraints on egg discrimination and cuckoo–host co-evolution. *Animal Behaviour* **49:** 1185–1209.

Lovászi P, Moskát C. 2004. Break-down of arms race between the red-backed shrike (*Lanius collurio*) and common cuckoo (*Cuculus canorus*). *Behaviour* **141:** 245–262.

Malchevsky AS. 1960. On the biological races of the common cuckoo, *Cuculus canorus* L in the territory of the European part of the USSR. *Proceedings of the International Ornithological Congress* **12:** 464–470.

Marchetti K. 1992. Costs to host defence and the persistence of parasitic cuckoos. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B, Biological Sciences* **248:** 41–45.

Marchetti K. 2000. Egg rejection in a passerine bird: size does matter. *Animal Behaviour* **59:** 877–883.

Martín-Gálvez D, Soler JJ, Martínez JG, Krupa AP, Richard M, Soler M, Møller AP, Burke T. 2006. A quantitative trait locus for recognition of foreign eggs in the host of a brood parasite. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **19:** 543–550.

Medina I, Langmore NE. 2015. The costs of avian brood parasitism explain variation in egg rejection behaviour in hosts. *Biology Letters* **11:** 20150296.

Moksnes A, Røskaft E. 1995. Egg-morphs and host preference in the common cuckoo (*Cuculus canorus*): an analysis of cuckoo and host eggs from European museum collections. *Journal of Zoology* **236:** 625–648.

Moksnes A, Røskaft E, Braa AT, Korsnes L, Lampe HM, Pedersen HC. 1991. Behavioural responses of potential hosts towards artificial cuckoo eggs and dummies. *Behaviour* **116:** 64–89.

Moksnes A, Røskaft E, Korsnes L. 1993. Rejection of cuckoo (*Cuculus canorus*) eggs by meadow pipits (*Anthus pratensis*). *Behavioral Ecology* **4:** 120–127.

Moksnes A, Røskaft E, Solli MM. 1994. Documenting puncture ejection of parasitic eggs by chaffinches *Fringilla coelebs* and blackcaps *Sylvia atricapilla*. *Fauna Norvegica, Series C* **17:** 115–118.

Moksnes A, Røskaft E, Greger Hagen L, Honza M, Mørk C, Olsen PH. 2000. Common cuckoo *Cuculus canorus* and host behaviour at reed warbler *Acrocephalus scirpaceus* nests. *Ibis* **142:** 247–258.

Moskát C, Honza M. 2002. European cuckoo *Cuculus canorus* parasitism and host's rejection behaviour in a heavily parasitized great reed warbler *Acrocephalus arundinaceus* population. *Ibis* **144:** 614–622.

Moskát C, Szentpéteri J, Barta Z. 2002. Adaptations by great reed warblers to brood parasitism: a comparison of populations in sympatry and allopatry with the common cuckoo. *Behaviour* **139:** 1313–1329.

Moskát C, Avilés JM, Bán M, Hargitai R, Zölei A. 2008a. Experimental support for the use of egg uniformity in parasite egg discrimination by cuckoo hosts. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **62:** 1885–1890.

Moskát C, Hansson B, Barabás L, Bártol I, Karcza Z. 2008b. Common cuckoo *Cuculus canorus* parasitism, antiparasite defence and gene flow in closely located populations of great reed warblers *Acrocephalus arundinaceus*. *Journal of Avian Biology* **39:** 663–671.

Moskát C, Székely T, Cuthill IC, Kisbenedek T. 2008c. Hosts' responses to parasitic eggs: which cues elicit hosts' egg discrimination? *Ethology* **114:** 186–194.

Moskát C, Hauber ME, Avilés JM, Bán M, Hargitai R, Honza M. 2009. Increased host tolerance of multiple cuckoo eggs leads to higher fledging success of the brood parasite. *Animal Behaviour* **77:** 1281–1290.

Nuismer SL, Thompson JN, Gomulkiewicz R. 1999. Gene flow and geographically structured coevolution. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B, Biological Sciences* **266:** 605–609.

Øien IJ, Moksnes A, Røskaft E. 1995. Evolution of variation in egg color and marking pattern in European passerines: adaptations in a coevolutionary arms race with the cuckoo, *Cuculus canorus*. *Behavioral Ecology* **6:** 166–174.

Øien IJ, Moksnes A, Røskaft E, Honza M. 1998. Costs of cuckoo *Cuculus canorus* parasitism to reed warblers *Acrocephalus scirpaceus*. *Journal of Avian Biology* **29:** 209–215.

Payne RB. 1967. Interspecific communication signals in parasitic birds. *American Naturalist* **101:** 363–375.

Peer BD, Sealy SG. 2004. Fate of grackle (*Quiscalus* spp) defenses in the absence of brood parasitism: implications for long-term parasite–host coevolution. *Auk* **121:** 1172–1186.

Procházka P, Honza M. 2004. Egg discrimination in the yellowhammer. *Condor* **106:** 405–410.

Procházka P, Stokke BG, Jensen H, Fainová D, Bellinvia E, Fossøy F, Vikan JR, Bryja J, Soler M. 2011. Low genetic differentiation among reed warbler *Acrocephalus scirpaceus* populations across Europe. *Journal of Avian Biology* **42:** 103–113.

Røskaft E, Moksnes A, Meilvang D, Bicík V, Jemelíková J, Honza M. 2002a. No evidence for recognition errors in *Acrocephalus* warblers. *Journal of Avian Biology* **33:** 31–38.

Røskaft E, Moksnes A, Stokke BG, Moskát C, Honza M. 2002b. The spatial habitat structure of host populations explains the pattern of rejection behavior in hosts and parasitic adaptations in cuckoos. *Behavioral Ecology* **13:** 163–168.

Røskaft E, Takasu F, Moksnes A, Stokke BG. 2006. Importance of spatial habitat structure on establishment of host defenses against brood parasitism. *Behavioral Ecology* **17:** 700–708.

Rothstein SI. 1982a. Mechanisms of avian egg recognition: which egg parameters elicit responses by rejecter species? *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **11:** 229–239.

Rothstein SI. 1982b. Successes and failures in avian egg and nestling recognition with comments on the utility of optimality reasoning. *American Zoologist* **22:** 547–560.

Rothstein SI. 2001. Relic behaviours, coevolution and the retention versus loss of host defences after episodes of avian brood parasitism. *Animal Behaviour* **61:** 95–107.

Rutila J, Latja R, Koskela K. 2002. The common cuckoo *Cuculus canorus* and its cavity nesting host, the redstart *Phoenicurus phoenicurus*: a peculiar cuckoo–host system? *Journal of Avian Biology* **33:** 414–419.

Rutila J, Jokimäki J, Avilés JM, Kaisanlahti-Jokimäki M-L. 2006. Responses of parasitized and unparasitized common redstart (*Phoenicurus phoenicurus*) populations against artificial cuckoo parasitism. *Auk* **123:** 259–265.

Samaš P, Hauber ME, Cassey P, Grim T. 2011. Repeatability of foreign egg rejection: testing the assumptions of co-evolutionary theory. *Ethology* **117:** 606–619.

Soler JJ, Møller AP. 1996. A comparative analysis of the evolution of variation in appearance of eggs of European passerines in relation to brood parasitism. *Behavioral Ecology* **7:** 89–94.

Soler JJ, Martínez JG, Soler M, Møller AP. 1999. Genetic and geographic variation in rejection behavior of cuckoo eggs by European magpie populations: an experimental test of rejecter-gene flow. *Evolution* **53:** 947–956.

Soler JJ, Martínez JG, Soler M, Møller AP. 2001. Coevolutionary interactions in a host–parasite system. *Ecology Letters* **4:** 470–476.

Soler M, Martín-Vivaldi M, Fernández-Morante J. 2012. Conditional response by hosts to parasitic eggs: the extreme case of the rufous-tailed scrub robin. *Animal Behaviour* **84:** 421–426.

Spottiswoode CN, Koorevaar J. 2012. A stab in the dark: chick killing by brood parasitic honeyguides. *Biology Letters* **8:** 241–244.

Spottiswoode CN, Stevens M. 2010. Visual modeling shows that avian host parents use multiple visual cues in rejecting parasitic eggs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **107:** 8672–8676.

Starling M, Heinsohn R, Cockburn A, Langmore NE. 2006. Cryptic gentes revealed in pallid cuckoos *Cuculus pallidus* using reflectance spectrophotometry. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B, Biological Sciences* **273:** 1929–1934.

Stoddard MC, Stevens M. 2010. Pattern mimicry of host eggs by the common cuckoo, as seen through a bird's eye. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B, Biological Sciences* **277:** 1387–1393.

Stoddard MC, Stevens M. 2011. Avian vision and the evolution of egg color mimicry in the common cuckoo. *Evolution* **65:** 2004–2013.

Stokke BG, Moksnes A, Røskaft E, Rudolfsen G, Honza M. 1999. Rejection of artificial cuckoo (*Cuculus canorus*) eggs in relation to variation in egg appearance among reed warblers (*Acrocephalus scirpaceus*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B, Biological Sciences* **266:** 1483–1488.

Stokke BG, Honza M, Moksnes A, Røskaft E, Rudolfsen G. 2002. Costs associated with recognition and rejection of parasitic eggs in two European passerines. *Behaviour* **139:** 629–644.

Stokke BG, Rudolfsen G, Moksnes A, Røskaft E. 2004. Rejection of conspecific eggs in chaffinches: the effect of age and clutch characteristics. *Ethology* **110:** 459–470.

Stokke BG, Moksnes A, Røskaft E. 2005. The enigma of imperfect adaptations in hosts of avian brood parasites. *Ornithological Science* **4:** 17–29.

Stokke BG, Takasu F, Moksnes A, Røskaft E. 2007. The importance of clutch characteristics and learning for antiparasite adaptations in hosts of avian brood parasites. *Evolution* **61:** 2212–2228.

Stokke BG, Hafstad I, Rudolfsen G, Moksnes A, Møller AP, Røskaft E, Soler M. 2008. Predictors of resistance to brood parasitism within and among reed warbler populations. *Behavioral Ecology* **19:** 612–620.

Takasu F. 1998. Why do all host species not show defense against avian brood parasitism: evolutionary lag or equilibrium? *American Naturalist* **151:** 193–205.

Underwood TJ, Sealy SG, McLaren CM. 2004. Experiments on egg discrimination in two North American corvids: further evidence for retention of egg ejection. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **82:** 1399–1407.

Vikan JR, Stokke BG, Fossøy F, Jackson C, Huhta E, Rutila J, Moksnes A, Røskaft E. 2009. Fixed rejection responses to single and multiple experimental parasitism in two *Fringilla* hosts of the common cuckoo. *Ethology* **115:** 840–850.

Vikan JR, Stokke BG, Rutila J, Huhta E, Moksnes A, Røskaft E. 2010. Evolution of defences against cuckoo (*Cuculus canorus*) parasitism in bramblings (*Fringilla montifringilla*): a comparison of four populations in Fennoscandia. *Evolutionary Ecology* **24:** 1141–1157.

Vikan JR, Fossøy F, Huhta E, Moksnes A, Røskaft E, Stokke BG. 2011. Outcomes of brood parasite–host interactions meadiated by egg matching: common cuckoos *Cuculus canorus* versus *Fringilla* finches. *PLoS ONE* **6:** e19288.

Weidinger K. 2010. Foraging behaviour of nest predators at open-cup nests of woodland passerines. *Journal of Ornithology* **151:** 729–735.

Welbergen JA, Davies NB. 2009. Strategic variation in mobbing as a front line of defense against brood parasitism. *Current Biology* **19:** 235–240.

Wyllie I. 1975. Study of cuckoos and reed warblers. *British Birds* **68:** 369–378.

Wyllie I. 1981. *The cuckoo*. London: Batsford.

Author Query Form

Dear Author,
During the copy-editing of your paper, the following queries arose. Please respond to these by marking up your proofs with the necessary changes/additions. Please write your answers on the query sheet if there is insufficient space on the page proofs. Please write clearly and follow the conventions shown on the attached corrections sheet. If returning the proof by fax do not write too close to the paper's edge. Please remember that illegible mark-ups may delay publication.
Many thanks for your assistance.

Query reference	Query	Remarks
1	AUTHOR: Please confirm that given names (red) and surnames/family names (green) have been identified correctly.	
2	AUTHOR: Please note that the Additional keywords may only comprise terms not already included in the article title itself. You may wish to replace the deleted items.	
3	AUTHOR: 'where RE is the recognition error'. OK here?.	
4	AUTHOR: Antonov et al. 2009 has not been included in the Reference List, please supply full publication details.	
5	AUTHOR: 'where RE is the recognition error'. OK here?.	
6	AUTHOR: Stokke, Moksnes & Røskaft, 2002b has not been included in the Reference List, please supply full publication details.	
7	AUTHOR: 'unpubl. data'. Please list the name(s) and initial(s) of all individuals who contributed to the unpublished data.	

MARKED PROOF

Please correct and return this set

Please use the proof correction marks shown below for all alterations and corrections. If you wish to return your proof by fax you should ensure that all amendments are written clearly in dark ink and are made well within the page margins.

Instruction to printer	Textual mark	Marginal mark
Leave unchanged	• • • under matter to remain	Ⓙ
Insert in text the matter indicated in the margin	⋀	New matter followed by ⋀ or ⋀⊘
Delete	/ through single character, rule or underline or ⊢——⊣ through all characters to be deleted	⌀ or ⌀⊘
Substitute character or substitute part of one or more word(s)	/ through letter or ⊢——⊣ through characters	new character / or new characters /
Change to italics	— under matter to be changed	‿
Change to capitals	≡ under matter to be changed	≡
Change to small capitals	= under matter to be changed	=
Change to bold type	∿ under matter to be changed	∿
Change to bold italic	≈ under matter to be changed	≈
Change to lower case	Encircle matter to be changed	≢
Change italic to upright type	(As above)	⊥
Change bold to non-bold type	(As above)	⊥
Insert 'superior' character	/ through character or ⋀ where required	⋎ or ⋏ under character e.g. ⋎² or ⋏²
Insert 'inferior' character	(As above)	⋀ over character e.g. ⋀₂
Insert full stop	(As above)	⊙
Insert comma	(As above)	،
Insert single quotation marks	(As above)	⋎ or ⋏ and/or ⋎ or ⋏
Insert double quotation marks	(As above)	⋎ or ⋏ and/or ⋎ or ⋏
Insert hyphen	(As above)	⊢⊣
Start new paragraph	⌐	⌐
No new paragraph	↶	↶
Transpose	⊔⊓	⊔⊓
Close up	linking ⌒ characters	⌒
Insert or substitute space between characters or words	/ through character or ⋀ where required	Y
Reduce space between characters or words	| between characters or words affected	↑