

1 **Combined measures of mimetic fidelity explain imperfect mimicry in a brood parasite-host system.**

2 **Electronic supplementary information**

3 Tanmay Dixit¹, *Gary P. T. Choi^{2,3}, *Salem al-Mosleh³, Jess Lund^{1,8}, Jolyon Troscianko⁴, Collins Moya⁵,
4 †L. Mahadevan^{3,6,7}, †Claire N. Spottiswoode^{1,8}

5 * and † represent pairs of equal contributions

6 ¹ Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom

7 ² Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts,
8 USA

9 ³ School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA

10 ⁴ Centre for Ecology and Conservation, University of Exeter, Penryn, UK

11 ⁵ Musumanene Farm, Choma, Zambia

12 ⁶ Department of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA

13 ⁷ Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge,
14 Massachusetts, USA

15 ⁸ DST-NRF Centre of Excellence at the FitzPatrick Institute of African Ornithology, University of Cape
16 Town, Rondebosch, Cape Town, South Africa

17

18

19 **Calculating areas of scribbles and blotches**

20 To confirm that cuckoo finch eggs painted with scribbles and blotches had approximately the same
21 area of markings added to them, we used ImageJ to estimate the areas of these added markings on
22 scaled egg images (scaled to 29 px/mm, as described in main text). The mean \pm SD scribble treatment
23 area per egg ($n = 7$) was $6.12 \pm 0.37 \text{ mm}^2$, and the mean \pm SD blotches treatment area per egg ($n = 7$)
24 was $5.98 \pm 0.20 \text{ mm}^2$. These areas were not significantly different from each other ($t_{9,1} = 0.92$, $P =$
25 0.38). Therefore, the added area for the scribble and the blotch treatment was approximately the
26 same.

27

28 **Testing whether painted scribbles and blotches have a similar colour to prinia egg markings**

29 We tested whether the artificial markings that we added to cuckoo finch eggs were similar in colour
30 to prinia markings, according to avian visual models. We used almost identical methods to [1]. We
31 took photographs, each with a prinia egg and an artificially-marked cuckoo finch egg, along with a
32 40% Spectralon grey standard (Labsphere, Congleton, UK), using a Nikon D7000 camera with a
33 quartz conversion (Advanced Camera Series, Norfolk, UK) with a Micro-Nikkor 105 mm lens. Images

34 were taken from about 50 cm, in a dark room. For each pair of eggs, a human-visible image was
 35 taken using a Baader UV-IR blocking filter (Baader Planetarium, Mammendorf, Germany;
 36 transmitting 420–680nm), and a UV image was taken using a Baader UV pass filter (transmitting
 37 320–380nm). The ISO was set at 400 and aperture at f13. Shutter speed was varied to control
 38 exposure.

39 We selected regions of interest (ROIs) as small dark regions of scribble and blotch markings
 40 on prinia eggs, and small regions of painted scribbles or blotches on cuckoo finch eggs. We extracted
 41 raw pixel values from the visible and UV images using the MICA toolbox in ImageJ [2], and converted
 42 these to cone-catch values based on the blue tit (*Cyanistes caeruleus*) visual system. These cone-
 43 catch values were used to calculate just noticeable differences (JNDs) between true prinia markings
 44 and artificial cuckoo finch markings, again based on the blue tit visual system, using the R package
 45 *Pavo* [3].

46 The mean \pm SD JND between prinia markings and painted cuckoo finch markings (n=4 pairs of
 47 eggs) was 1.37 ± 0.58 . JNDs of less than 1 are predicted to be indiscriminable, with JNDs greater than
 48 3 predicted to be discriminable [4,5]. Thus, the colour of added scribbles and blotches to cuckoo
 49 finch eggs was almost indistinguishable from that of naturally occurring scribbles and blotches in
 50 prinias.

51

52 **Coefficients of traits included in the FDA**

Trait	Coefficient
First principal component of colour traits	20%
Second principal component of colour traits	-18%
Marking Size	-3%
Variation in marking size	-19%
Pattern contrast	10%
Total pattern coverage	4%
Extent to which pattern is dispersed between blunt and narrow poles of egg	-22%
First principal component of traits extracted from NPM	-6%
Second principal component of traits extracted from NPM	18%
Σ Euler	-36%
$\Sigma(P^2/A)$	50%

53

54 **Table S1.** the coefficients of the traits included in the FDA. A higher absolute value of a coefficient
55 indicates that the corresponding trait is more informative for distinguishing prinia and cuckoo finch
56 eggs. Positive coefficients indicate that prinias have larger values for that trait than do cuckoo
57 finches; negative values indicate that cuckoo finches have larger values than prinias. See main text
58 for explanation of traits and how they were extracted.

59

60 **References**

- 61 1. Jamie GA, van Belleghem SM, Hogan BG, Hamama S, Moya C, Troscianko J, Stoddard MC,
62 Kilner RM, Spottiswoode CN. 2020 Multimodal mimicry of hosts in a radiation of parasitic
63 finches. *Evolution* **74**, 2526–2538. (doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.14057>)
- 64 2. Troscianko J, Stevens M. 2015 Image calibration and analysis toolbox – a free software suite
65 for objectively measuring reflectance, colour and pattern. *Methods Ecol Evol* **6**, 1320–1331.
66 (doi:10.1111/2041-210X.12439)
- 67 3. Maia R, Gruson H, Endler JA, White TE. 2019 PAVO 2: New tools for the spectral and spatial
68 analysis of colour in R. *Methods Ecol Evol* **10**. (doi:10.1111/2041-210X.13174)
- 69 4. Vorobyev M, Osorio D. 1998 Receptor noise as a determinant of colour thresholds. *Proc R Soc*
70 *B* **265**, 351–358. (doi:10.1098/rspb.1998.0302)
- 71 5. Siddiqi A, Cronin TW, Loew ER, Vorobyev M, Summers K. 2004 Interspecific and intraspecific
72 views of color signals in the strawberry poison frog *Dendrobates pumilio*. *J exp biol* **207**,
73 2471–2485. (doi:10.1242/jeb.01047)

74