Relaxed selection diminishes social memory and expression of host defenses against cuckoos

Deryk Tolman[1,2,*], Katja Rönkä[1,2], Edward Kluen[1,2], Juho Jolkkonen[3], Pietro Di Bari[1], Renzo Ientile[4], Daniela Campobello[5], Rose Thorogood[1,2]

[1]HiLIFE Helsinki Institute of Life Science, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

[2]Research Programme in Organismal and Evolutionary Biology, Faculty of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

[3]Department of Biological and Environmental Science, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland

[4]Department of Biological, Geological and Environmental Sciences, Section of Animal Biology "M. La Greca", University of Catania, Catania, Italy

[5]Dipartimento STEBICEF, Università degli Studi di Palermo, Palermo, Italy

*Corresponding author. **Email:** deryk.tolman@helsinki.fi

Author Contributions: Deryk Tolman: conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, project administration, supervision, validation, visualization, writing - original draft, writing - review & editing; **Katja Rönkä:** conceptualization, data curation, investigation, methodology, project administration, resources, writing - review & editing; **Edward Kluen:** conceptualization, data curation, investigation, methodology, project administration, writing - review & editing; **Juho Jolkkonen:** investigation, methodology, writing - review & editing; **Pietro Di Bari:** investigation, methodology, writing - review & editing; **Renzo Ientile:** investigation, project administration, resources, writing - review & editing; **Daniela Campobello:** investigation, project administration, resources, supervision, writing - review & editing; **Rose Thorogood:** conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, funding acquisition, investigation, methodology, project administration, resources, supervision, validation, visualization, writing - review & editing.

Keywords: relaxed selection, geographic mosaic of coevolution, host-parasite coevolution, behavioural plasticity, social information

Funding: This research was supported by Academy of Finland Project grant 333803 and a start-up grant to RT from HiLIFE Helsinki Institute of Life Science. KR was further supported by Academy of Finland Postdoctoral grant 347478, and DT by the Ella and Georg Ehrnrooth Foundation.

Acknowledgements: We thank field assistants Julius Mäkinen, Anna Tuominen, Anna Välkki, Purabi Deshpande, Linnea Kivelä, and Nora Bergman for their essential help with nest searching and monitoring, Lukas Wolfram for confirming responses to model eggs from videos, Tuomas Pärnänen for designing and printing eggs, Steve Collett for painting model cuckoos, Merve Ünlü for bird illustrations, and Gloria Murari for figure aesthetics.

We are grateful to private landowners, Uusimaa municipalities, and Metsähallitus (permission no. MH1100/2018/06.06.02) for allowing access to reed beds in Finland, and Giuseppe Mammino and staff of the Fiume Ciane Nature Reserve (Libero Consorzio Comunale di Siracusa) for facilitating our work in Sicily. We also thank the editors and two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments which improved this manuscript.

Abstract

Behavioral defenses are a key adaptation across animals, but confirming decay under relaxed selection is challenging. If expression involves decision-making, then defenses may only be expressed when the right environmental cues are available (i.e. cryptic plasticity). Even if defenses wane, they could be quickly restored once selection resumes as animals can learn by observing others (i.e. social memory). Here we tested cryptic plasticity and social memory under relaxed selection in a cuckoo host, the Common Reed Warbler, by manipulating perceived parasitism risk with social information in geographically-distinct areas differing in allopatry (100 to 1000 years). Despite predicting social information of a cuckoo vs. a control would elicit otherwise cryptic behavioral defenses, only birds that mobbed model cuckoos prior to manipulation upregulated this defense, and only in the recently allopatric population. Social information also had no effect on low-to-absent rates of foreign egg rejection, a second line of defense common to cuckoo host species. These results contrast with parasitized locations where similar methods provoke mobbing and increase egg rejection ten-fold. Our study therefore suggests that, even when manipulating information to account for reaction norms, behavioral defenses may degrade rapidly under relaxed selection, demonstrating a process facilitating a geographic mosaic of coevolution.

Main Text

Introduction

As species' ranges expand or contract, their exposure to enemies and selection pressures can also change (Gilman et al., 2010). Where selection relaxes (i.e. with allopatry), traits that were previously adaptive are expected to reduce (e.g. due to drift), particularly if maintaining the trait is costly (Lahti et al., 2009). However, while behavioral defenses are common across the animal kingdom (Candolin & Wong, 2015), whether these respond to relaxed selection is rarely tested (Foster, 2013; Lahti et al., 2009). Behaviors are assumed unlikely to be lost due to complex genetic architectures (pleiotropy) and underlying trait variation that can be co-opted in response to other selective pressures (Lahti et al., 2009). However, another key issue is that loss of behavior can be challenging to measure. Behavioral responses depend on prior experience and availability of information about the relative costs or benefits of taking action (i.e. information ecology; Dall et al., 2005). Therefore, the absence of a response does not necessarily indicate a lack of enemy recognition but rather cryptic plasticity (Foster, 2013). Taking an informational approach (Gil et al., 2018; O'Connor et al., 2019) and manipulating cues in allopatry, however, makes it possible to approximate the retention of behavioral reaction norms in the wild.

Social 'memory' could play a key role in determining whether behaviors are lost or retained. For example, prey and hosts observe the behavior of others to learn about novel threats (Feeney & Langmore, 2013; Langmore et al., 2012; Rowell et al., 2020) and assess risk of predation or parasitism (Gil et al., 2018), while predators use social information to find suitable prey (Hämäläinen et al., 2022). Therefore, how individuals adjust their behavior in response to social information (i.e. social responsiveness; (de Groot et al., 2023) is likely to affect both their own fitness and the strength of selection on interacting parties (Cantor et al., 2021; Thorogood & Davies, 2012). Social responsiveness may also determine whether populations are resilient to environmental change (Gil et al., 2019; Thorogood et al., 2018), especially as the utility of social information depends on the availability of more-informed 'demonstrators'. For example, gene flow among populations

experiencing variable selection pressures (i.e. trait re-mixing) is thought to determine how quickly a host population responds to shifts in the strength of selection by parasites (Geographic Mosaic Theory of Coevolution; Thompson, 2005). If experienced individuals from 'hotspots' of current selection also introduce social information to naïve 'cold spots' of relaxed selection, social learning could speed up the recovery of defenses in host populations that are later reinvaded by a previous enemy. However, while recent experimental evolution studies show that social behaviors can diminish very rapidly after selection is removed (Bladon et al., 2023), the role of social cues in maintaining behaviors in 'cold spots' is still largely unknown (Lahti et al., 2009; Langmore et al., 2012).

An ideal system to test if behavioral defenses and social responsiveness decline in allopatry, altering the potential for hosts to respond to future (re)invasion, is avian brood parasitism. Virulent brood parasites lay their eggs in the nests of host species and exert strong selection for defensive behaviors such as mobbing or rejecting suspicious eggs. As many brood parasites are aggressive or Batesian mimics (Feeney et al., 2015; Welbergen & Davies, 2011), hosts are also expected to adjust defenses according to local risk to minimize costly mistakes (A. K. Lindholm & Thomas, 2000; Thorogood & Davies, 2013). . Furthermore, parasitism can also vary in time and space, with some host populations or species escaping parasitism for many generations (Grim & Stokke, 2016). Over time in allopatry, plasticity is expected to be lost with hosts either becoming resistant to reinvasion (i.e. fixation of defenses) or susceptible to extinction if defenses wane (Soler, 2014) but it is unclear which trajectory will occur as there are examples of both. Some species long separated from brood parasites (i.e. hundreds of thousands to millions of years) show persistent egg rejection when experimentally induced (Bolen et al., 2000; Briskie et al., 1992; Chaumont et al., 2021; Hale & V. Briskie, 2007; Moskát, C. et al., 2002; Rothstein, 2001), however it appears to reduce in others (Briskie et al., 1992; Davies & Brooke, 1989; Soler & Møller, 1990; Yang et al., 2015, 2021). Frontline defenses, such as mobbing of adult brood parasites, also appear to either degrade (Briskie et al., 1992; Hale & V. Briskie, 2007; Lawson et al., 2020, 2023) or be preserved (Briskie et al., 1992; Chaumont et al., 2021; Kuehn et al., 2016) under allopatry. These defenses are not necessarily coupled, for

example egg rejection may be expressed while mobbing is not (Hale & V. Briskie, 2007; Thorogood & Davies, 2016). In addition, apparently naïve species can obtain host defenses very rapidly if invaded (Nakamura, 1991) but whether these changes represent the cryptic persistence of defenses in the population, gene flow from parasitized areas, or novel learning is unknown.

Here we use allopatric populations of Common reed warblers (*Acrocephalus scirpaceus*) at the northern- and southernmost extents of their European breeding range to test for the retention of behavioral defenses and social responsiveness to brood-parasitic Common cuckoos (*Cuculus canorus*). Reed warblers colonized Finland ca. 100 years ago (Järvinen & Ulfstrand, 1980), most likely expanding from the southwest (Bergman et al., 2025) and away from regularly parasitized areas in the range core (Avilés et al., 2006). Cuckoos in Finland use different host species, away from reedbeds. In Sicily, reed warblers are likely to have escaped parasitism by cuckoos for much longer – cuckoos only occur on mountainsides while reed warblers are largely restricted to coastal areas, and mentions of both species in historical records are not in association with each other (Arnott, 2007). At parasitized sites in their range-core, reed warblers upregulate mobbing (Campobello & Sealy, 2011; Davies & Welbergen, 2009) and egg rejection (Thorogood & Davies, 2016) defenses after observing their neighbors attack cuckoos. Among populations not currently exposed to parasitism, however, egg rejection rates vary widely (e.g. from 0–40%; (Thorogood & Davies, 2013) and mobbing responses are reduced (e.g. 25% of pairs; (Welbergen & Davies, 2012). However, as in other studies of brood-parasite host defenses in allopatry (see also Rothstein 2001), perceived parasitism risk has not yet been manipulated (e.g. via social information) so the extent to which host defenses reduce under relaxed selection remains unclear.

Therefore, we experimentally manipulated social information and simulated parasitism in field experiments to test if defenses and/or social responsiveness decay in allopatry. We predicted that if defenses are retained, then providing social information should induce plasticity (i.e. social responsiveness) and lead to an increase in mobbing (propensity and

intensity) and egg rejection, as previously shown in range-core populations. However, if defenses are not upregulated in response to our manipulated cues, then this would provide evidence that these behaviors are being lost under relaxed selection. Additionally, we assess changes in latency to approach threats at the nest as a more subtle indication of how these hosts perceive cuckoos, since we expect reed warblers to be more attentive when they perceive parasitism risk to be greater (Davies & Welbergen, 2009), and more cautious to approach if they mistake cuckoos for predatory hawks (Thorogood & Davies, 2012; Welbergen & Davies, 2011).

Materials and Methods

Study areas and host populations

We studied unparasitised populations of Common reed warblers breeding in May-July around Helsinki, southern Finland (30 discrete reed-lined bays along 100km of coastline, 60.19848N 24.07305E to 60.34039N 25.71162E, in 2019 and 2020) and in the Fiume Ciane nature reserve near Siracusa, Sicily, Italy (37.04285N 15.24273E, in 2022), avoiding re-use of areas across years in Finland to avoid contamination of experience or pseudoreplication. Reed warblers nest at relatively low densities in Helsinki (Tolman et al., 2021) but are more numerous in Fiume Ciane (median distance to closest nest = 36 m, inter-quartile range = 24-53 m). We found nests by cold-searching or monitoring singing males and recorded location and distance to the nearest potential cuckoo vantage point [tree >3 m in height, a possible indirect cue of parasitism risk; (Oien et al., 1996; Welbergen & Davies, 2009)] using handheld GPS (accuracy ± 1 m).

Experimental protocols

To compare results to previously-studied parasitized populations in the range-core, we adopted published protocols (Davies & Welbergen, 2009; Thorogood & Davies, 2016) as follows. Experiments started on the day the fourth egg was laid (clutch sizes = 3-5 eggs, incubation begins with the penultimate egg; Cramp & Brooks, 1992)). At each nest we measured the change in mobbing response to a cuckoo after presentation of social information of either a cuckoo or control. We used the same 3D-printed model cuckoos

182 (painted by an artist, see Tolman et al., 2021 for details) in Finland and Sicily but controls
183 differed. In Finland we used a commercially-available plastic common magpie (*Pica pica*;
184 Live Decoys) to assess whether changes in mobbing may be due to nest predators or
185 specific to cuckoos, and in Sicily we used plastic female common teal hunting decoys
186 (*Anas crecca;* Flambeau Outdoors), similar to previous range-core experiments using
187 innocuous controls (Davies & Welbergen, 2009). Although this difference precludes
188 comparisons of responses to controls, our focus was on probing the generality of previous
189 findings in the context of relaxed selection, and at parasitized sites there has been similar
190 variation in controls and presentation orders (Campobello & Sealy, 2011; Davies &
191 Welbergen, 2009; Thorogood & Davies, 2012, 2016). To also compare how reed warblers
192 at each site responded to a benign control, we presented teal models at 48 additional nests
193 across the same bays in Finland in 2018-2020, partially overlapping with the timing of the
194 social information experiment. Model cuckoos elicit similar responses as taxidermy
195 specimens (Chen et al., 2022; Welbergen & Davies, 2008) and ours were printed using the
196 same 3D template as independent work (e.g. Marton *et al.* 2019).
197
198 To assay mobbing behavior (bill snaps and rasping calls; Welbergen & Davies, 2008), we
199 placed a model adjacent to the nest rim and recorded latency of the first bird to arrive within
200 3 m after the model was placed and the observer retreated (using a stopwatch, seconds).
201 Latency to arrive was measured to test for changes in nest attentiveness within pairs, which
202 is related to whether birds perceive cuckoos as brood parasites or predatory hawks
203 (Thorogood & Davies, 2012; Welbergen & Davies, 2011). Unrelated variation in latency
204 (e.g. prolonged foraging trips) can be large, but this was minimized since birds were
205 already incubating during experiments and we were mostly interested in changes within
206 pairs but between treatments. We filmed each trial with a small action camera on a pole 1
207 m from the nest while observing from 3-5 m away, and counted mobbing vocalizations for
208 5 min (mobbing intensity). Visibility among nests varied, but we only performed
209 experiments when wind conditions were suitable to observe birds moving characteristically
210 through the reeds. Three observers carried out experiments in Finland, each with a different
211 set of models. One observer also performed trials in Sicily. There was high consistency

among observers' counts of bill snaps [ICC: 0.92 (95%CI 0.80–0.98), $p < 0.001$] and rasps [ICC: 0.98 (95%CI 0.95–1.0), $p < 0.001$], as assessed using the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) in the *irr* package in R (see Statistical analyses below) from data collected later using 10 videos and blind to field-collected data.

We used simulated neighbor presentations to provide social information 10 m from the focal nest (cf. active neighbors < 40 m in Davies & Welbergen 2009). A previously collected reed warbler nest was attached to reeds at a similar height to the focal nest, with either a model cuckoo or control adjacent to it (treatments assigned alternately). Regardless of the model being presented, we then broadcast one of 5 playback tracks of reed warblers mobbing a model cuckoo [recorded for range-core experiments; (Davies & Welbergen, 2009; Thorogood & Davies, 2016)] for 10 min from a speaker placed under the dummy nest. Focal nests were at least 40 m from other nests or experimental neighbor playbacks to avoid contamination of information. Live mobbing by neighbors does not influence social responsiveness to playbacks (Davies & Welbergen, 2009; Thorogood & Davies, 2012) and simulated vs. active nests previously elicited similar responses to social information treatments in previous experiments (Campobello & Sealy, 2011; Thorogood & Davies, 2016). In Sicily, where densities were higher, we used active neighboring nests for social information presentations in 4 trials (3 cuckoo and 1 teal; < 20m from the focal nest) but none of these focal pairs mobbed a cuckoo. Results were robust as to whether these pairs were included in analyses.

In Finland, we always presented the cuckoo model at the start of the experiment (P1) and after (P3) presentation of social information (SI) of either a magpie control or a cuckoo (Fig. 1A). To avoid pairs in the cuckoo SI treatment being exposed to cuckoos more (i.e. P1, SI, P3) than in the magpie SI treatment (P1 & P3 only), we included a second presentation (P2) of either a cuckoo (magpie SI treatment) or magpie (cuckoo SI treatment) before SI (Fig. 1A). This design also allowed us to compare whether any changes in behavior were due to repeated exposure rather than the SI treatment. To rule out order effects, in Sicily (Fig. 1D) we followed the same design as (Davies & Welbergen, 2009):

here each nest was presented with a cuckoo and control (teal) in random order before (P1 & P2) and after (P3 & P4) social information (SI). We did not randomize the order of social information presentations in either study area; however, the likelihood that habituation to models could influence social responsiveness is small as previous experiments exposing reed warblers to additional models before social information was manipulated still detected strong effects (at a parasitized site; Thorogood & Davies 2012). We waited at least 1.5 h between presentations at both sites and conducted trials between 10:00 and 18:00 local time as cuckoos tend to lay in the afternoon. As such, presentations were split over 2 days for each nest.

In trials where mobbing responses were very weak (i.e. fewer than 20 vocalizations), we later confirmed sounds from video recordings of the trial and excluded five cases where three observers could not discern or agree on sound categorization. We also excluded 4 nests (1 in Finland and 3 in Sicily) where birds failed to appear at one or more cuckoo presentations at their nest (field observations confirmed by video). In total, we analyzed mobbing from 83 Finnish nests (Cuckoo treatment n = 42; Magpie treatment n = 41) and 40 Sicilian nests (Cuckoo treatment n = 22; Teal treatment n = 18).

Measuring egg rejection defenses

After the final model presentation, we colored one egg at random from the focal nest with 40 equally-spaced brown dots using a Staedtler permanent felt tip pen (Lumocolor® 314-7) to measure rejection (as in Thorogood & Davies 2016) of a pseudo reed warbler-gens 'cuckoo egg' (Finland: Cuckoo treatment n = 24, Magpie treatment n = 25; Sicily: Cuckoo treatment n = 22, Teal treatment n = 18). Due to a low response (see Results), for trials conducted in Finland in 2020 we then used custom 3D-printed eggs with the same dimensions and color (Citadel© blue acrylic paints, custom mixed) as a highly non-mimetic redstart-gens cuckoo egg (Cuckoo treatment n = 29, Magpie treatment n = 27). In all trials, nests were checked 3-6 days later for removal of the 'cuckoo egg' (reed warblers most often reject within 3 days; Davies & Brooke 1988) or evidence of damage (reed warblers were not able to pierce and remove 3D-printed models despite vigorous pecking: 4/25

rejection trials filmed in a subsequent year, unpublished data). Evidence of damage was treated as a rejection attempt. Finally, in Sicily we also assessed non-mimetic egg rejection without any information of cuckoo presence (n = 11) and with personal information of parasitism risk (i.e. by presenting a cuckoo model at the nest; n = 12) by coloring one egg in the nest entirely with a blue felt-tip pen (Copic Ciao B). Immaculate blue eggs (resembling redstart-gens cuckoo eggs) are highly dissimilar from reed warblers' and consistently elicit some of the highest rejection rates (often >60%) from this host despite little standardization of color or size across studies (Davies & Brooke, 1988; Dyrcz & Halupka, 2007; Stokke et al., 1999, 2010).

Statistical analyses

All analyses were conducted in R v.4.3.2 (R Core Team, 2023). First, we used GLMs to check for bias of potential indirect cues (i.e. distance to potential cuckoo vantage points, see Supporting Information S1) and to confirm that initial responses to cuckoos (i.e. P1 in Finland, or P1|P2 in Sicily) were similar in the treatment groups and among years of the study (in Finland). We then used GLMMs with a random effect for nest identity when modelling change in response across multiple presentations (i.e. P1 vs. P3, or P1 vs. P2) as implemented in the package *glmmTMB* (Brooks et al., 2017). To investigate whether social information led to a change in mobbing propensity or intensity, we only included responses to the first and last presentation of a cuckoo at the nest (i.e. P1 and P3 in Finland). However, due to a large proportion of zeroes and lack of suitable fit for a zero-inflated model structure, we adopted a hurdle approach to model mobbing propensity (i.e. binary variable, binomial error structure and logit-link function) and intensity (i.e. number of calls in at least one presentation > 0, quasi-poisson (*nbinom1*) distribution) separately in Finland. For mobbing data from Sicily, we used Fisher's Exact tests to compare treatment effects on mobbing propensity and quasi-binomial GLMMs to investigate changes in mobbing intensity across all pairs, due to the smaller sample size. To investigate whether social information affected egg rejection decisions, we used a GLM (binomial error structure, logit-link function) which included clutch size as a covariate predictor. Despite data being

collected across 30 discrete sites in Finland, including location as a random effect did not improve model fit (Akaike Information Criterion > 2) so it was not part of our final models.

Finally, we investigated latency to approach the threat at the nest during experiments to assess more subtle differences in reaction to cuckoos (i.e. cryptic recognition without a mobbing response). We used separate GLMMs with Tweedie distributions to test if change in latency across presentations differed (i) between treatments and (ii) between mobbing versus non-mobbing pairs as we lacked power to test a Presentation order*SI treatment*Mobbing status 3-way interaction. Nest identity was included as a random effect and pairwise contrasts were estimated using estimated marginal means with Tukey-adjusted p-values. We used QQ-normality plots, residuals vs. predicted plots, and dispersion and outlier tests using package *DHARMa* (Hartig, 2022) to assess assumptions and fits of all models, and we present estimated mean effect sizes (± standard error), *z*-statistics, and *p*-values. Summary tables of all models are available in Supporting Information S2.

Results

Mobbing defenses

When first presented with a cuckoo at the nest, 36% (30/83) of pairs in Finland and 13% (5/40) of pairs in Sicily showed a mobbing response (Fig. 1). This initial propensity to mob did not differ between social information (SI) treatment groups (Finland, GLM: estimate = 0.16 ± 0.46, z = -0.35, $p = 0.73$; Sicily, Fisher's Exact test: $p = 1.0$; Table S2.1 in Supporting Information) or among years of the study in Finland (GLM: estimate = 0.25 ± 0.48, z = 0.52, $p = 0.60$; Table S2.1).

Providing social information about the risk of parasitism in the local area did not induce significantly more reed warblers to mob cuckoos than pairs exposed to information about magpies (in Finland, GLMM Presentation order * SI treatment: estimate = 3.99 ± 2.39, $z = 1.67$, $p = 0.099$, Fig. 1B, Fig. 2A; Table S2.2) or when compared to social information about innocuous teals (in Sicily, across treatments $n = 10$ pairs with calls >0, Fisher's exact

test: $p = 1.0$, Fig. 2A). This lack of effect was not because social information about controls also induced increased mobbing propensity (Finland: Fig. 1C, Fig. 2A; Sicily: Fig. 1F).

Social information about cuckoos did, however, increase mobbing intensity (i.e. number of signals) but only for pairs who responded in Finland (across treatments $n = 36$ pairs with calls >0, Fig. 1B,C; GLMM Presentation order * SI treatment: estimate = 0.97 ± 0.45, $z = 2.14$, $p = 0.032$, Fig. 2B; Table S2.2). There was no significant change among presentations in the group who received social information about magpies (GLMM estimate = -0.28 ± 0.33, $z = -0.84$, $p = 0.40$, Fig. 2B; Table S2.2). Instead, these pairs were just as likely to increase or reduce mobbing intensity by the third presentation (P3; Fig. 1C). In Sicily, social information had no effect on mobbing intensity (GLMM Presentation order * SI treatment: estimate = -1.20 ± 0.88, $z = -1.36$, $p = 0.17$, Fig. 2B; Fig. 1E, F; Table S2.3). Teal were mobbed at similar intensities between Sicily and Finland ($n = 96$, GLM: estimate = -0.39 ± 0.31, $z = -1.27$, $p = 0.21$; Table S2.5).

Egg rejection defenses

Reed warblers did not reject 'mimetic' brown-spotted eggs in either Finland (Cuckoo treatment = 0/24; Magpie treatment = 0/25; Fig. 3) or Sicily (Cuckoo treatment = 0/21; Teal treatment = 0/19), and there was no rejection of non-mimetic blue eggs in Sicily (no cuckoo presentation = 0/11, after cuckoo presentation at nest = 0/12). Blue eggs were however rejected at low rates in Finland, although this did not differ between social information treatments (GLM: estimate = 0.11 ± 0.64, $z = 0.17$, $p = 0.97$; Fig. 3; Table S2.6).

Recognition of cuckoos vs. response

In Finland, non-mobbing birds were slower initially to approach a cuckoo at their nest than mobbing pairs (P1 data only, GLM: estimate = -0.42 ± 0.19, $z = -2.29$, $p = 0.022$; Fig. 4; Table S2.7) but became faster with subsequent presentations (GLMM Mobbing status * Presentation order, P1 and P3 only, interaction: estimate = 0.54 ± 0.28, $z = 1.96$, $p = 0.049$; Fig. 4; Table S2.8). However, this was not specific to social information because non-

361 mobbers already reduced their latency to approach cuckoos by P2 (P1 vs P2 non-mobbers,
362 GLMM: estimate = -0.44 ± 0.21, z = -2.04, p = 0.10; Table S2.9), and they decreased again
363 after social information of magpies (P2 vs P3 non-mobbers: estimate = -0.43 ± 0.24, z = -
364 1.8, p = 0.17; Table S2.9; Fig. 4B). Mobbing pairs showed no change in latency to approach
365 cuckoos across the experiment (P1 vs P3 Cuckoo, GLMM: estimate = 0.10 ± 0.29, z = 0.33,
366 p = 0.94; Table S2.10; Magpie: estimate = 0.17 ± 0.28, z = 0.61, p = 0.81; Table S2.9), and
367 all were more wary of approaching a magpie at the nest than a cuckoo (P2 between
368 treatments, GLM: estimate = 0.72 ± 0.26, z = 2.81, p = 0.005; Fig. 4A; Table S2.11) even
369 if they never mobbed (mobbing status * threat: estimate = 0.11 ± 0.38, z = 0.29, p = 0.78;
370 Fig. 4; Table S2.11).
371
372 Reed warblers' latencies in Sicily did not change over the experiment, either overall
373 (GLMM Presentation order: estimate = 0.20 ± 0.21, z = 0.95, p = 0.34; Table S2.11) or
374 differently according to social information treatments (GLMM Presentation order * SI
375 treatment: estimate = 0.67 ± 0.42, z = 1.58, p = 0.12; Table S2.12). They also approached
376 teal as quickly as they did cuckoos (estimate = 0.065 ± 0.168, z = 0.39, p = 0.67; Table
377 S2.13).
378
379 **Discussion**
380 A wealth of prior research in parasitized areas has revealed that reed warblers' defenses
381 predictably match local brood parasitism risk, including responding to social information
382 of cuckoos by consistently increasing mobbing and egg rejection rates (Campobello &
383 Sealy, 2011; Davies & Welbergen, 2009; Thorogood & Davies, 2016). But, theory also
384 predicts that the loss of defenses in non-parasitized populations is a key part of determining
385 coevolutionary outcomes (Soler, 2014; Thompson, 2005). Although behaviors are assumed
386 hard to lose under relaxed selection, by using social information to simulate increased
387 brood parasitism risk, we found that defenses and social responsiveness of a common host
388 of cuckoos are degrading in areas of allopatry. At the recent range front in Finland, only
389 pairs that mobbed a cuckoo increased their mobbing intensity after receiving social
390 information. The other two-thirds of birds largely remained quiet, although they potentially

retained some recognition of cuckoos since both mobbing and non-mobbing pairs approached the nest more quickly than when presented with a magpie, suggesting the decrease in latency of non-mobbers was not purely driven by habituation to disturbance in general, but is specific to the threat. Still, this may reflect avoidance of magpies (Trnka & Požgayová, 2017) rather than awareness of cuckoos and requires further experimental work. Our findings in Finland are enhanced by our results from the Sicilian population, where reed warblers have been in allopatry for longer. There, they showed an even greater reduction in defenses and no evidence of social information use. Importantly, mimetic 'cuckoo' eggs remained in nests, and although non-mimetic eggs were rejected at low rates in Finland, social information had no influence on this defense either. This suggests that both allopatric populations would be unlikely to express plasticity or mount significant resistance should cuckoos invade.

Our results are likely evidence for the decay of ancestral defenses rather than a methodological failure to detect responses, for three reasons. First, providing social information experimentally led to an increase in mobbing intensity in Finland, even if not in Sicily. Second, we followed very similar methods to previous studies conducted with reed warblers at parasitized sites, where social information heightened near-absent egg rejection of similarly manipulated eggs ten-fold (Thorogood & Davies, 2016) and induced mobbing of cuckoos (Campobello & Sealy, 2011; Davies & Welbergen, 2009; Thorogood & Davies, 2012), including for pairs that showed no initial response (e.g. 54% of quiet pairs mobbed cuckoos after social information: Davies & Welbergen, 2009). Although there were some differences in our use of controls and presentations of cuckoos at the nest, these represent similar variation to range-core experiments (refs). Third, the differences we detected were specific to cuckoos as responses to a control teal and nest predator (magpie) were similar at our sites and to parasitized areas (Welbergen & Davies, 2008; Campobello & Sealy, 2010; Tolman et al., 2021; Welbergen & Davies, 2012) despite large ecological differences (i.e. climate, nesting density). Some level of cuckoo recognition might be retained in Finland as non-mobbers were slower initially to approach a cuckoo at their nest than mobbing pairs, but became faster with subsequent presentations. If non-mobbers

perceived cuckoo models as hawks, we expected that they would instead become more wary (Thorogood & Davies, 2012), but mobbing pairs did not decrease their latency as expected, so it is difficult to conclude that this change in attentiveness is evidence of recognition after all. By using consistent experimental designs to previous studies, testing a large number of reed warblers nesting across a broad range of environmental variation, and considering social responsiveness explicitly, we can therefore be confident that the weak defenses in our allopatric study populations are not the result of cryptic plasticity (Scheiner & Levis, 2021). Instead, they provide compelling evidence that behavioral defenses may sometimes decay in allopatry from cuckoos.

Given that studies of animal culture across a range of taxa demonstrate that the spread of even arbitrary behaviors is possible (Whiten, 2021), it is surprising that we did not detect evidence for social learning among 'naïve' reed warblers (i.e. those that did not mob cuckoos). For example, juvenile superb fairy wrens begin to mob cuckoos after observing adults do so (Feeney & Langmore, 2013) and naïve individuals of several species can be trained to recognize novel predators [e.g. introduced species (Rowell et al., 2020)] when paired with mobbing calls. Often social learning of threats requires only one exposure (i.e. similar to our experimental design; reviewed by Crane & Ferrari 2013) and can even be effective when using arbitrary cues (Hämäläinen et al., 2022). Why then did so many birds not mob cuckoos or reject eggs? One possible explanation is that ontogenetic experience or repeated exposure may be necessary before behaviors are expressed, as in the antipredator responses of several fish and mammals (Kelley & Magurran, 2003; Mineka et al., 1984) and personal encounters with avian or piscine brood parasites (Blažek et al., 2018; Hauber et al., 2006; Stokke et al., 2007). Alternatively, but not mutually exclusively, multiple opportunities to learn socially may be needed to elicit a response. While we cannot exclude these possibilities, they seem unlikely to explain the lack of response we detected here: we provided three encounters with cuckoos at or near their nests, yet most birds still did not respond, and under natural conditions naïve pairs are unlikely to repeatedly encounter more responsive neighbors when parasitism rates are low to absent. Perhaps with

relaxed selection, there is an initial loss of recognition that then limits hosts' potential for observational learning.

Temporal and geographical variation in host defenses has typically been explained by plasticity (Langmore et al., 2012; A. Lindholm, 2000; Welbergen & Davies, 2012), particularly in reed warblers where individuals track local parasitism risk and adjust defenses accordingly (Thorogood & Davies, 2013). However, here we found only limited evidence for plasticity in our allopatric populations in response to either indirect environmental or social cues of heightened parasitism risk. This is surprising, given that in a previous study at another unparasitised site of similar length of allopatry to Finland (Llangorse lake, Wales; Lindholm, 1999), reed warblers responded more aggressively to cuckoo models if nesting closer to vantage points for cuckoos (Welbergen & Davies, 2012). We found no evidence for this indirect cue use: instead, birds nesting further from vantage points in Finland were *more* likely to mob, and mobbing in Sicily was unaffected (Supporting Information S1). Nevertheless, of the birds that mobbed, their initial intensities were similar across all three allopatric sites (Finland: 225 ± 43 calls per 5-min, Sicily: 280 ± 120, Llangorse: 281 ± 64; Welbergen & Davies, 2012), suggesting that while the frequency of birds retaining recognition of cuckoos may vary across allopatric populations, reaction norm intercepts have the potential to remain similar. However, comparing reactions to social cues experimentally presented in a similar manner across studies highlights a key difference in allopatry. Previous studies at Wicken Fen, a parasitized site, induced positive social plasticity (*sensu* de Groot et al., 2023) in almost all responding pairs (94.4% across two studies (0+2/18+18 = 5.6%; Davies & Welbergen, 2009, Thorogood & Davies, 2012). At our allopatric sites, on the other hand, reed warblers appeared to be more often 'confused', with 30-40% of responding pairs instead reducing mobbing intensity after social information of cuckoos (NEW FIGURE). Interestingly, a similar proportion of negative slopes was observed for birds presented with an unfamiliar cuckoo morph at Wicken Fen (observed only once in 30 years at site; 4/14 pairs declined = 28.6%, Thorogood & Davies 2012). Together this suggests that, as well as a reduction in

479 pairs responding at all, social responsiveness may also weaken in allopatry, potentially
480 leading to the eventual loss of defenses in the absence of cuckoo parasitism (Soler, 2014).
481
482 If we were to revisit the Llangorse or Finnish populations in future, would their responses
483 have diminished further and look more like those in Sicily? Quolls' antipredator behaviors
484 have been found to decay on a predator-free island over even fewer generations than have
485 existed of reed warblers in Finland (Jolly et al., 2018), suggesting gene flow mediates the
486 speed at which behaviors can be lost. There is already some genomic evidence from reed
487 warblers to suggest local adaptation to the strength of parasitism (Smith et al., 2025), but
488 whether the decay in defenses and social responsiveness that we detected is due to genetic
489 change, or a need for additional experience, is yet to be determined. However, it is
490 important to note that the Sicilian population may represent a never-parasitized state where
491 defenses have not previously evolved. The stark lack of defenses in Sicily is therefore an
492 interesting case study of long-term allopatry but, alone, is not evidence for the decay of
493 behaviors in this system. Nevertheless, our findings in Finland are evidence of this, since
494 reed warblers recently arrived in Finland from the parasitized range-core (Bergman et al.,
495 2025). Anti-parasite behaviors are thus assumed to represent the historically selected state,
496 and our cue manipulation should elicit their expression if relevant reaction norms are
497 retained (Campobello & Sealy, 2011; Davies & Welbergen, 2009; Thorogood & Davies,
498 2012, 2016).
499
500 Overall, our results suggest that it may be possible for host populations freed from
501 parasitism to lose expression of defenses, rendering them vulnerable to future reinvasion.
502 The recovery of resistance is unlikely to be enhanced through social transmission, because
503 even if there are individuals who retain recognition of cuckoos, our results show that social
504 responsiveness may also be lost and opportunities for learning would be scarce. Such a
505 reduction of defenses under relaxed selection is one of the key components of geographic
506 mosaic theory explaining the maintenance of coevolution across time and space: rather
507 than the arms race continually escalating, parasites are hypothesized to recurrently invade
508 host populations, or host species, whose defenses have waned in their absence. These so-

called coevolutionary cycles (Rothstein, 2001) are thought to only exist during 'intermediate phases' of host-parasite interactions, before defenses reach fixation (Soler, 2014), but the rapidity with which a brood parasite host species can acquire (or lose) successful resistance has received little attention. Our results suggest that range expansions and a geographic mosaic of coevolution may moderate the arms race, with defenses decaying within even relatively short time frames (e.g. approximately 35 generations in Finland; Ceresa et al., 2015), allowing the longer-term persistence of parasites until host switching becomes more favorable (Nuismer et al., 2003). As both social information use and behavioral defenses against enemies are common across the animal kingdom, and species' ranges are changing rapidly, it is now crucial to determine how socially-mediated plasticity degrades under relaxed selection in the wild.

References

Arnott, W. G. (2007). *Birds in the Ancient World from A to Z* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203946626

Avilés, J. M., Stokke, B. G., Moksnes, A., Røskaft, E., Åsmul, M., & Møller, A. P. (2006). Rapid increase in cuckoo egg matching in a recently parasitized reed warbler population. *J. Evol. Biol.*, *19*(6), 1901–1910. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2006.01166.x

Bergman, N. M., Lehikoinen, P., Kluen, E., Bensch, S., Lo Cascio Sætre, C., Eroukhmanoff, F., Fossøy, F., Procházka, P., Smith, W. J., Stokke, B. G., Primmer, C. R., Thorogood, R., & Rönkä, K. (2025). Combined Evidence Reveals the Origin of a Rapid Range Expansion Despite Retained Genetic Diversity and a Weak Founder Effect. *Mol. Ecol.*, e70077. https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.70077

Bladon, E. K., Pascoal, S., Bird, N., Mashoodh, R., & Kilner, R. M. (2023). The evolutionary demise of a social interaction: Experimentally induced loss of traits involved in the supply and demand of care. *Evol. Lett.*, *7*(3), 168–175. https://doi.org/10.1093/evlett/qrad016

Blažek, R., Polačik, M., Smith, C., Honza, M., Meyer, A., & Reichard, M. (2018). Success of cuckoo catfish brood parasitism reflects coevolutionary history and individual experience of their cichlid hosts. *Sci. Adv.*, *4*(5), eaar4380. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aar4380

Bolen, G. M., Rothstein, S. I., & Trost, C. H. (2000). Egg Recognition in Yellow-Billed and Black-Billed Magpies in the Absence of Interspecific Parasitism: Implications for Parasite-Host Coevolution. *Condor*, *102*(2), 432–438. https://doi.org/10.1093/condor/102.2.432

Briskie, J. V., Sealy, S. G., & Hobson, K. A. (1992). Behavioral defenses against avian brood parasitism in sympatric and allopatric host populations. *Evolution*, *46*(2), 334–340. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.1992.tb02041.x

Brooks, M. E., Kristensen, K., Benthem, K. J. van, Magnusson, A., Berg, C. W., Nielsen, A., Skaug, H. J., Maechler, M., & Bolker, B. M. (2017). glmmTMB Balances Speed and Flexibility Among Packages for Zero-inflated Generalized Linear Mixed Modeling. *The R Journal*, *9*(2), 378–400. https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2017-066

Campobello, D., & Sealy, S. G. (2010). Enemy Recognition of Reed Warblers (*Acrocephalus scirpaceus*): Threats and Reproductive Value Act Independently in Nest Defence Modulation. *Ethology*, *116*(6), 498–508. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0310.2010.01764.x

Campobello, D., & Sealy, S. G. (2011). Use of social over personal information enhances nest defense against avian brood parasitism. *Behav. Ecol.*, *22*(2), 422–428. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arq225

Candolin, U., & Wong, B. (2015). *Behavioural Responses to a Changing World: Mechanisms & Consequences* (p. 280). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199602568.001.0001

Cantor, M., Maldonado-Chaparro, A. A., Beck, K. B., Brandl, H. B., Carter, G. G., He, P., Hillemann, F., Klarevas-Irby, J. A., Ogino, M., Papageorgiou, D., Prox, L., & Farine, D. R. (2021). The importance of individual-to-society feedbacks in animal ecology and evolution. *J. Anim. Ecol.*, *90*(1), 27–44. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13336

Ceresa, F., Belda, E. J., Kvist, L., Rguibi-Idrissi, H., & Monrós, J. S. (2015). Does fragmentation of wetlands affect gene flow in sympatric Acrocephalus warblers with different migration strategies? *J. Avian Biol.*, *46*(6), 577–588. https://doi.org/10.1111/jav.00589

Chaumont, M. H. J., Langmore, N. E., & Welbergen, J. A. (2021). The ghosts of parasitism past: Lingering frontline anti-brood parasite defenses in a former host. *Current Zoology*, *67*(6), 573–583. https://doi.org/10.1093/cz/zoab014

Chen, X., Cai, Y., Wang, J., & Yang, C. (2022). Use of 3D-printed animal models as a standard method to test avian behavioral responses toward nest intruders in the studies of avian brood parasitism. *Avian Research*, *13*, 100061. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avrs.2022.100061

Cramp, S., & Brooks, D. (1992). *Handbook of the birds of Europe, the Middle East and North Africa. The birds of the western Palearctic, vol. VI. Warblers* (Vol. 906). Oxford University Press.

Crane, A. L., & Ferrari, M. C. (2013). Social learning of predation risk: A review and prospectus. *Social Learning Theory: Phylogenetic Considerations across Animal, Plant, and Microbial Taxa*, 53–82.

Dall, S. R. X., Giraldeau, L.-A., Olsson, O., McNamara, J. M., & Stephens, D. W. (2005). Information and its use by animals in evolutionary ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *20*(4), 187–193. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2005.01.010

Davies, N. B., & Brooke, M. D. L. (1989). An Experimental Study of Co-Evolution Between the Cuckoo, *Cuculus canorus*, and its Hosts. I. Host Egg Discrimination. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, *58*(1), 207–224. https://doi.org/10.2307/4995

Davies, N. B., & Brooke, M. de L. (1988). Cuckoos versus reed warblers: Adaptations and counteradaptations. *Animal Behaviour*, *36*(1), 262–284. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(88)80269-0

Davies, N. B., & Welbergen, J. A. (2009). Social Transmission of a Host Defense Against Cuckoo Parasitism. *Science*, *324*(5932), 1318–1320. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1172227

de Groot, C., Wijnhorst, R. E., Ratz, T., Murray, M., Araya-Ajoy, Y. G., Wright, J., & Dingemanse, N. J. (2023). The importance of distinguishing individual differences in 'social impact' versus 'social responsiveness' when quantifying indirect genetic effects on the evolution of social plasticity. *Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev.*, *144*, 104996. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2022.104996

Dyrcz, A., & Halupka, K. (2007). Why Does the Frequency of Nest Parasitism by the Cuckoo Differ Considerably Between Two Populations of Warblers Living in the Same Habitat? *Ethology*, *113*(3), 209–213. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0310.2006.01308.x

Feeney, W. E., & Langmore, N. E. (2013). Social learning of a brood parasite by its host. *Biol. Lett.*, *9*(4), 20130443. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2013.0443

Feeney, W. E., Troscianko, J., Langmore, N. E., & Spottiswoode, C. N. (2015). Evidence for aggressive mimicry in an adult brood parasitic bird, and generalized defences in its host. *Proc. R. Soc. B*, *282*(1810), 20150795. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.0795

Foster, S. A. (2013). Evolution of behavioural phenotypes: Influences of ancestry and expression. *Anim. Behav.*, *85*(5), 1061–1075. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.02.008

Gil, M. A., Baskett, M. L., & Schreiber, S. J. (2019). Social information drives ecological outcomes among competing species. *Ecology*, *100*(11), e02835. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2835

Gil, M. A., Hein, A. M., Spiegel, O., Baskett, M. L., & Sih, A. (2018). Social Information Links Individual Behavior to Population and Community Dynamics. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, *33*(7), 535–548. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2018.04.010

Gilman, S. E., Urban, M. C., Tewksbury, J., Gilchrist, G. W., & Holt, R. D. (2010). A framework for community interactions under climate change. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, *25*(6), 325–331. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2010.03.002

Grim, T., & Stokke, B. G. (2016). In the Light of Introduction: Importance of Introduced Populations for the Study of Brood Parasite–Host Coevolution. In *Biological invasions and animal behaviour* (pp. 133–157). Cambridge University Press.

Hale, K., & V. Briskie, J. (2007). Response of introduced European birds in New Zealand to experimental brood parasitism. *J. Avian Biol.*, *38*(2), 198–204. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2007.0908-8857.03734.x

Hämäläinen, L., M. Rowland, H., Mappes, J., & Thorogood, R. (2022). Social information use by predators: Expanding the information ecology of prey defences. *Oikos*, *2022*(10), e08743. https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.08743

Hartig, F. (2022). *DHARMa: Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchical (Multi-Level / Mixed) Regression Models*. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DHARMa

Hauber, M. E., Moskát, C., & Bán, M. (2006). Experimental shift in hosts' acceptance threshold of inaccurate-mimic brood parasite eggs. *Biol. Lett.*, *2*(2), 177–180. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2005.0438

Järvinen, O., & Ulfstrand, S. (1980). Species turnover of a continental bird fauna: Northern Europe, 1850–1970. *Oecologia*, *46*(2), 186–195. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00540125

Jolly, C. J., Webb, J. K., & Phillips, B. L. (2018). The perils of paradise: An endangered species conserved on an island loses antipredator behaviours within 13 generations. *Biol. Lett.*, *14*(6), 20180222. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2018.0222

Kelley, J. L., & Magurran, A. E. (2003). Effects of relaxed predation pressure on visual predator recognition in the guppy. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.*, *54*(3), 225–232. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-003-0621-4

Kuehn, M. J., Peer, B. D., McCleery, R. A., & Rothstein, S. I. (2016). Yellow warbler defenses are retained in the absence of brood parasitism but enhanced by experience with cowbirds. *Behav. Ecol.*, *27*(1), 279–286. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arv145

Lahti, D. C., Johnson, N. A., Ajie, B. C., Otto, S. P., Hendry, A. P., Blumstein, D. T., Coss, R. G., Donohue, K., & Foster, S. A. (2009). Relaxed selection in the wild. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, *24*(9), 487–496. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2009.03.010

Langmore, N. E., Feeney, W. E., Crowe-Riddell, J., Luan, H., Louwrens, K. M., & Cockburn, A. (2012). Learned recognition of brood parasitic cuckoos in the superb fairy-wren *Malurus cyaneus*. *Behav. Ecol.*, *23*(4), 798–805. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/ars033

Lawson, S. L., Enos, J. K., Fernandez-Duque, F., Kleindorfer, S., Ward, M. P., Gill, S. A., & Hauber, M. E. (2023). Absence of Referential Alarm Calls in Long-term Allopatry from the Referent: A Case Study with Galapagos Yellow Warblers. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.*, *77*(8), 99. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-023-03372-0

Lawson, S. L., Leuschner, N., Enos, J. K., & Hauber, M. E. (2020). Loss of graded enemy recognition in a Whitehead population allopatric with brood-parasitic Long-tailed Cuckoos. *Avocetta*, *44*(1), 4–10. https://doi.org/10.30456/AVO.2020104

Lindholm, A. (2000). Tests of phenotypic plasticity in reed warbler defences against cuckoo parasitism. *Behaviour*, *137*(1), 43–60. https://doi.org/10.1163/156853900501863

Lindholm, A. K. (1999). Brood parasitism by the cuckoo on patchy reed warbler populations in Britain. *J. Anim. Ecol.*, *68*(2), 293–309. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2656.1999.00286.x

Lindholm, A. K., & Thomas, R. J. (2000). Differences between Populations of Reed Warblers in Defences against Brood Parasitism. *Behaviour*, *137*(1), 25–42.

Marton, A., Fülöp, A., Ozogány, K., Moskát, C., & Bán, M. (2019). Host alarm calls attract the unwanted attention of the brood parasitic common cuckoo. *Sci. Rep.*, *9*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-54909-1

Mineka, S., Davidson, M., Cook, M., & Keir, R. (1984). Observational conditioning of snake fear in rhesus monkeys. *J. Abnorm. Psychol.*, *93*(4), 355–372. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.93.4.355

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*(10), 1313–1329. JSTOR.

Nakamura, H. (1991). Brood Parasitism by the Cuckoo Cuculus canorus in Japan and the Start of New Parasitism on the Azure-winged Magpie Cyanopica cyana. *Japanese Journal of Ornithology*, *39*(1), 1–18.

Nuismer, S. L., Thompson, J. N., & Gomulkiewicz, R. (2003). Coevolution between hosts and parasites with partially overlapping geographic ranges. *J. Evol. Biol.*, *16*(6), 1337–1345. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1420-9101.2003.00609.x

O'Connor, M. I., Pennell, M. W., Altermatt, F., Matthews, B., Melián, C. J., & Gonzalez, A. (2019). Principles of Ecology Revisited: Integrating Information and Ecological Theories for a More Unified Science. *Front. Ecol. Evol.*, *7*. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fevo.2019.00219

Oien, I. J., Honza, M., Moksnes, A., & Roskaft, E. (1996). The Risk of Parasitism in Relation to the Distance from Reed Warbler Nests to Cuckoo Perches. *J. Anim. Ecol.*, *65*(2), 147–153. https://doi.org/10.2307/5717

R Core Team. (2023). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. https://www.R-project.org/

Rothstein, S. (2001). Relic behaviours, coevolution and the retention versus loss of host defences after episodes of avian brood parasitism. *Anim. Behav.*, *61*, 95–107. https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.2000.1570

Rowell, T. A. A. D., Magrath, M. J. L., & Magrath, R. D. (2020). Predator-awareness training in terrestrial vertebrates: Progress, problems and possibilities. *Biol. Conserv.*, *252*, 108740. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108740

Scheiner, S. M., & Levis, N. A. (2021). The Loss of Phenotypic Plasticity Via Natural Selection: Genetic Assimilation. In *Phenotypic Plasticity & Evolution*. CRC Press.

Smith, W. J., Rönkä, K., Bensch, S., Bergman, N. M., Dudaniec, R. Y., Eroukhmanoff, F., Fossøy, F., Hansson, B., Jezierski, M. T., Kluen, E., Procházka, P., Sætre, C. L. C., Stokke, B. G., & Thorogood, R. (2025). Putative signatures of genomic adaptation to Cuckoo brood parasitism in Reed Warbler hosts across Europe. *bioRxiv*, 2025.01.06.631542. https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.01.06.631542

Soler, M. (2014). Long-term coevolution between avian brood parasites and their hosts. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.*, *89*(3), 688–704. https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12075

Soler, M., & Møller, A. P. (1990). Duration of sympatry and coevolution between the great spotted cuckoo and its magpie host. *Nature*, *343*(6260), 748–750. https://doi.org/10.1038/343748a0

Stokke, B. G., Moksnes, A., R⃠skaft, E., Rudolfsen, S., & Honza, M. (1999). Rejection of artificial cuckoo (Cuculus canorus) eggs in relation to variation in egg appearance among reed warblers (Acrocephalus scirpaceus). *Proc. R. Soc. B*, *266*(1427), 1483–1488. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1999.0804

Stokke, B. G., Polačiková, L., Dyrcz, A., Hafstad, I., Moksnes, A., & Røskaft, E. (2010). Responses of Reed Warblers Acrocephalus scirpaceus to Non-Mimetic Eggs of Different Sizes in a Nest Parasitism Experiment. *Acta Ornithol.*, *45*(1), 98–104. https://doi.org/10.3161/000164510X516137

Stokke, B. G., 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*(9), 2212–2228. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2007.00176.x

Thompson, J. N. (2005). Coevolution: The Geographic Mosaic of Coevolutionary Arms Races. *Curr. Biol.*, *15*(24), 992–994. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2005.11.046

Thorogood, R., & Davies, N. B. (2012). Cuckoos Combat Socially Transmitted Defenses of Reed Warbler Hosts with a Plumage Polymorphism. *Science*, *337*(6094), 578–580. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1220759

Thorogood, R., & Davies, N. B. (2013). Reed Warbler Hosts Fine-Tune Their Defenses to Track Three Decades of Cuckoo Decline. *Evolution*, *67*(12), 3545–3555. https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.12213

Thorogood, R., & Davies, N. B. (2016). Combining personal with social information facilitates host defences and explains why cuckoos should be secretive. *Sci. Rep.*, *6*(1), 19872. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep19872

Thorogood, R., Kokko, H., & Mappes, J. (2018). Social transmission of avoidance among predators facilitates the spread of novel prey. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.*, *2*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-017-0418-x

Tolman, D., Campobello, D., Rönkä, K., Kluen, E., & Thorogood, R. (2021). Reed Warbler Hosts Do Not Fine-Tune Mobbing Defenses During the Breeding Season, Even When Cuckoos Are Rare. *Front. Ecol. and Evol.*, *9*, 547. https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2021.725467

Trnka, A., & Požgayová, M. (2017). Does conspicuous colouration of Magpies Pica pica influence aggressive behaviour in nesting Great Reed Warblers *Acrocephalus arundinaceus*? *Bird Study*, *64*(1), 108–111. https://doi.org/10.1080/00063657.2016.1273878

Welbergen, J. A., & Davies, N. B. (2008). Reed warblers discriminate cuckoos from sparrowhawks with graded alarm signals that attract mates and neighbours. *Anim. Behav.*, *76*(3), 811–822. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2008.03.020

Welbergen, J. A., & Davies, N. B. (2009). Strategic Variation in Mobbing as a Front Line of Defense against Brood Parasitism. *Curr. Biol.*, *19*(3), 235–240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2008.12.041

Welbergen, J. A., & Davies, N. B. (2011). A parasite in wolf's clothing: Hawk mimicry reduces mobbing of cuckoos by hosts. *Behav. Ecol.*, *22*(3), 574–579. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arr008

Welbergen, J. A., & Davies, N. B. (2012). Direct and indirect assessment of parasitism risk by a cuckoo host. *Behav. Ecol.*, *23*(4), 783–789. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/ars031

Whiten, A. (2021). The burgeoning reach of animal culture. *Science*, *372*(6537), eabe6514. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abe6514

Yang, C., Huang, J., Liang, W., & Møller, A. P. (2021). Absence of anti-parasitic defenses in an Asian population of the magpie, a regular host of the great spotted cuckoo in Europe. *Curr. Zool.*, *67*(3), 345–347. https://doi.org/10.1093/cz/zoaa018

Yang, C., Wang, L., Cheng, S.-J., Hsu, Y.-C., Stokke, B. G., Røskaft, E., Moksnes, A., Liang, W., & Møller, A. P. (2015). Deficiency in egg rejection in a host species as a response to the absence of brood parasitism. *Behav. Ecol.*, *26*(2), 406–415. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/aru202

775 **Figures and Tables**

776

777 **Figure 1.** Reed warbler mobbing defences (calls per 5 minutes) in allopatry (Finland: A-
778 C, Sicily: D-F) before (grey dots) and after (coloured dots) experimental manipulation of
779 social information ('SI') about cuckoos (B, E) versus a control (C – magpie, F – teal).
780 Details of experimental design are shown in A and D. In Finland (A), the first model
781 presented at nests in Finland (P1) was always a cuckoo, followed by either a cuckoo or
782 magpie (P2) depending on social information treatment (SI), and finished with a cuckoo
783 presentation (P3) for the "after" comparison. In Sicily (D), cuckoo and control model
784 presentation order was alternated before (P1-P2) and after (P3-P4) the social information
785 presentations.
786 **Alt text:** Visual depictions of model presentation order for social information experiments
787 and graphs showing mobbing call rates of reed warblers before and after social information
788 treatments in Finland and Sicily.

789

790 **Figure 2.** (A) Propensity to mob cuckoos did not change after social information about
791 cuckoos or a control in Finland or Sicily. (B) Mobbing pairs showed social responsiveness
792 (i.e. increased intensity) to cuckoos, but only in Finland (distributions of changes in
793 mobbing intensity, vertical lines = medians). (C) Mobbing reaction norms of reed warblers
794 across parasitism risk (before and after social information of cuckoo activity) were more
795 frequently positive in parasitized Wicken Fen (produced from Davies & Welbergen, 2009
796 and Thorogood & Davies, 2012 with permission) than in Finland and Sicily. Negative
797 slopes are highlighted in red and sample sizes represent total number of pairs tested (top)
798 and number of slopes that remained at 0 (i.e. did not mob at all; bottom).
799 **Alt text:** Graphs showing mobbing propensity and intensity of reed warblers toward
800 cuckoos before and after social information treatments.

801

802 **Figure 3.** Rejection rates of experimental eggs in Finland (inset illustrations). Blue non-
803 mimetic eggs (left) were rejected at the same rate regardless of whether social information

was provided about cuckoos (24%) or magpies (22%). Mimetic brown-spotted eggs (right) were not rejected.

Alt text: Graph showing egg rejection rates of non-mimetic and mimetic eggs in Finland between social information treatments.

Figure 4. Latency of mobbing and non-mobbing pairs to approach presentations of models at their nest (indicated by icons) before and after social information (SI; dashed line) about (A) cuckoos (yellow) or (B) a magpie control (blue) in Finland. Raw data are plotted as diamonds, with darker symbols indicating pairs that mobbed cuckoos. Predicted mean values (± standard error) from a GLMM are plotted as circles and bars, with connecting lines indicating change across model presentation order (P1-P3).

Alt text: Graphs showing latencies to approach threat at nest across presentations according to social information treatment and mobbing status.


A
P1
P2
SI
P3
Treatments
Focal nest
>1.5 hrs
+1 day
>1.5 hrs
Finland
B
C
Nest
SI
n = 42
n = 41
0
500
1000
Mobbing calls per 5 mins
P1
P2
SI
P3
P4
X
X
Sicily
E
F
n = 22
n = 18


A
Social Information
Cuckoo
Magpie
Cuckoo
Teal
14 / 42
16 / 42
16 / 41
13 / 41
3 / 22
5 / 22
2 / 18
4 / 18
0%
10%
20%
30%
40%
50%
Propensity to Mob Cuckoo
B
Social Information
Cuckoo
Magpie
Cuckoo
Teal
-500
0
500
1000
Change in Mobbing Intensity
C
Mobbing calls (log)
1000
100
10
0
n = 50
n = 11
n = 42
n = 23
n = 22
n = 17
Before
After
Wicken Fen, UK
(parasitised)
Finland
(non-parasitised)
Sicily
(non-parasitised)


40%
30%
20%
10%
0%
Egg rejection rate
6 / 27
7 / 29
0 / 25
0 / 24
Cuckoo
Magpie
Cuckoo
Magpie
Social information


A
B
Mobbing status
non-mobbers
mobbers
Latency to arrive at nest (seconds)
750
500
250
0
1
2
SI
3
Presentation