Is energetics or competition a stronger driver of male smallmouth bass seasonal reproductive timing?

Running title: Energetics or Competition?

Robert A.S. Laroche^a, Kelly L. Weinersmith^a, Lisa Angeloni^b, Jeffrey R. Baylis^c, Steven P. Newman^d, Scott P. Egan^a, Daniel D. Wiegmann^e

^aDepartment of BioSciences, Rice University, 6100 Main St, Houston, TX

77005, ^bDepartment of Biology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO

80523, ^cDepartment of Integrative Biology, University of Wisconsin Madison, Madison,

WI 53706, ^dWisconsin Department of Natural Resources, WI, and ^eDepartment of

Biological Sciences, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green OH 43403

Corresponding author Robert A.S. Laroche, G.R.B. W-200I 6100 South Main St, Houston, TX 77005, (832) 576-4607, ral11@rice.edu

1 LAY SUMMARY

2

3 In many animals, larger individuals reproduce earlier in a season. We collected data on
4 reproductive timing in a wild population of bass, and examined whether bigger males
5 breed earlier because they are better competitors, or because they are energetically
6 prepared to breed earlier in the season. Our results suggest that larger males reproduce
7 earlier in a season because they recuperate energy lost in the over-winter period of
8 starvation more rapidly, not because of competitive advantage.

9

TITLE

Is energetics or competition a stronger driver of male smallmouth bass seasonal reproductive timing?

Running Title: Energetics or Competition?

ABSTRACT

Intraspecific competitive ability is often associated with body size and has been shown to influence reproductive timing in many species. However, energetic constraints provide an alternative explanation for size-related differences of reproductive timing. In temperate fishes that experience a winter starvation period, for instance, a negative allometric relationship between body size and winter energy loss might explain why larger males spawn earlier in a season than smaller males, especially in fishes that exhibit paternal care, which is energetically costly and limits parental foraging opportunities. Male smallmouth bass, *Micropterus dolomieu*, defend nesting territories in which they care for offspring over an extended period. In northern populations, males rely on energy reserves over a winter starvation period and in spring must recoup energy losses before initiating reproduction, making them ideal systems in which to study contributions of competition and energetic allometry on differences of reproductive timing. Here, we harness data on parental male *M. dolomieu* from a 10-year study and show that larger males required fewer degree days—a measure of thermal energy experienced—in spring before they spawned each year and that the time of peak seasonal reproduction in the population was negatively related to the number of degree days accumulated before reproduction started. Furthermore, we found that growth of individual males between seasons better predicted changes in timing of reproduction

33 than changes in size relative to competitors. Together, these results suggest that timing
34 of reproduction in this population is more strongly influenced by energetic constraints
35 than size-based competition amongst males.

36 *Key words:* **allometry, temperature, body size, reproductive timing, Centrarchidae,**
37 **degree days**

38

INTRODUCTION

Intraspecific competition has a strong influence on reproductive success in many species (Boeuf 1974; Essington et al. 2000; Wong and Candolin 2005; Boesch et al. 2006; Lane et al. 2009). When competition is between males, body size is often the factor that determines which individuals have a competitive advantage (Alcock 1994; Candolin and Volgt 2001; McElligott et al. 2001; Sih et al. 2002; Newbolt et al. 2016). It comes as no surprise, then, that many studies have found evidence that larger males outcompete smaller males for mates and breed earlier than smaller males, both within and between reproductive seasons (Côte and Hunte 1989; Gibbons 1989; Dufresne et al. 1990; Dickerson et al. 2002; Ciuti and Apollonio 2016).

However, there is an alternative explanation for why bigger individuals of some species breed earlier. In diverse taxa, including fishes, reptiles, insects, amphibians, birds and mammals, larger individuals use less energy proportionate to their mass than smaller individuals (i.e., they show negative allometric relationships with mass specific basal metabolic rate) (Kleiber 1947; Lasiewski and Dawson 1967; Cargnelli and Gross 1997; West et al. 1997; Clarke and Johnston 1999; Hurst and Conover 2003; Nagy 2005; Blanckenhorn et al. 2007; Brodeur et al. 2020). These relationships imply that smaller males will require more time to accumulate energy stores prior to reproduction in species that, say, experience a winter dormant period. Indeed, energetic constraints are known to produce a negative relationship between body size and reproductive timing in a number of species (Tejedo 1992; Danylchuk and Fox 1994; Dobson and Michener 1995; Descamps et al. 2011).

In fishes, where indeterminate growth can lead to substantial variation in size among mature adults, there is an increased opportunity for size to play a role in reproductive timing (Ridgway and Friesen 1992; Knapp et al. 1996; Wiegmann et al. 1997; Dickerson et al. 2005). In some species, within-season variation in timing of reproduction is known to have large fitness consequences (Cargnelli and Gross 1996; Post et al. 1998; Post 2003). Indeed, when males compete for a breeding territory or mates, larger males often have a distinct advantage (Karino 1995; Candolin and Volgt 2001; Stiver and Alonzo 2010). However, a negative allometric relationship to mass specific basal metabolism has also been noted in fishes (Shuter and Post 1990; Cargnelli and Gross 1997; Clarke and Johnston 1999). In north-temperate fishes, where males rely entirely on stored energy reserves throughout winter, such a negative allometric relationship could explain why larger males, which lose proportionately less of their winter energy reserves, spawn earlier in a season than smaller males (Post and Evans 1989; Ridgway et al. 1991; Fullerton et al. 2000). In fishes that exhibit male territoriality and paternal care, both energetics and competitive interactions may contribute to variation in reproductive timing, as is known to occur in other taxa (Langston et al. 1990; Cuadrado and Loman 1999).

Here, we use a 10-year dataset on smallmouth bass, *Micropterus dolomieu*, to tease apart the influence of competition and energetics on reproductive timing. In particular, we follow the reproductive behavior of individual males throughout their lives in a closed population to investigate how male body size, thermal history, and competitive ability impact reproductive timing. There is some evidence that energetics, rather than competition, constrains reproductive timing in *M. dolomieu* (Ridgway et al. 1991; Gillooly

and Baylis 1999). However, other aspects of their biology, such as a female preference for larger males and aggressive male-to-male territorial interactions, could also impact reproductive timing (see Ridgway 1988; Ridgway 1989; Baylis et al. 1993; Ongarato and Snucins 1993; Wiegmann et al. 1992; Wiegmann and Baylis 1995). First, we test the hypothesis that larger males reproduce earlier in the spring after the accumulation of fewer degree days, a measure of the thermal energy experienced by an individual. Then, we consider the reproductive timing of the population and test the hypothesis that timing of peak reproduction is negatively related to the number of degree days accumulated before reproduction starts in the spring. Finally, we use comparisons of change in individual male length versus change in competitive status across years to test the hypothesis that an energetic rather than competitive advantage of large body size better predicts changes in within-season reproductive timing.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Natural history

Smallmouth bass, *Micropterus dolomieu*, are native to North America and reproduce seasonally, when water temperatures approach 15 °C (Hubbs and Bailey 1938; Shuter et al. 1980). Males construct nests in the littoral zone into which females deposit eggs. Typically, males mate with only one female and researchers have observed no sneaker behavior (Ridgway 1989; Raffetto et al. 1990; Wiegmann et al. 1992). After spawning, males remain in close proximity to their nest and defend offspring until their fry swim up and disperse, a period that may last several weeks (Hinch and Collins 1991). Parental behavior is costly and leads to a net loss of lean mass, as males rarely feed in this period (Gillooly and Baylis 1999). The energetic cost of parental care in combination with

the fact that smaller males end winter with a proportionately larger energy deficit than larger males may allow larger males to spawn earlier within a season than smaller males (Ridgway et al. 1991). In northern populations, smallmouth bass activity ceases when temperatures drop below 10 °C and individuals are largely dormant over winter (Hubbs and Bailey 1938; Munther 1970; Oliver et al. 1979; but see Lyons and Kanehl 2002; Schreer and Cooke 2002).

Study site

We conducted this study in 1999 and 2001-2009 on Palette Lake, a 70-ha research lake in the Northern Highlands Fishery Research Area of north-central Wisconsin (46.067° N/89.604° W). The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources manages this lake, which is closed to fish migration and has a maximum depth of approximately 20 m. Saunders et al. (2002) describe the benthic and limnological characteristics of the lake in detail. Anglers are subject to a mandatory creel census. From 1999-2006, regulations required anglers to return to the lake any male less than 41 cm total length and from 2007 onwards all males under 51 cm had to be returned. From 1999-2006 only 7% of breeding males were larger than 41 cm and from 2007 onward no breeding males were larger than the 51 cm size limit (Table 1).

Nest census

We initiated surveys each year when the water temperature approached 15 °C, typically in mid to late May, and continued until males ceased nest construction (late June to early July) and progeny in most nests had dispersed. Two to three crew members with snorkels searched for nests as they swam transects running from the shoreline out to a

depth of about 4 m. This depth was well beyond both the average 1.7 m depth at which nests in the lake were found and the maximum depth found in studies of other Wisconsin lakes (Bozek et al. 2002). Snorkelers placed a numbered tag constructed from a strip of Rite-n-Rain paper tied to a sinker on the edge of each nest and recorded the date, stage of embryos (if present), depth, location and distinctive landmarks that might be useful to relocate a nest when each nest was discovered. They also recorded the developmental stage of any progeny at each subsequent visit to nests, where progressive ontogenetic stages were categorized as eggs, clear fry, grey fry, black-striped fry, black fry or swim-up fry.

Characteristics of parental males

We captured parental males from their nests with hand nets and recorded their total length (cm). We used uniquely numbered Floy FD-67C anchor tags to track males across years (University of Wisconsin RARC protocol A-48-9700-L00173-2-04-99). We estimated competitors as the number of unique nesting males captured each season (Table 1). We also calculated the average size of these competitors each year. Further, we calculated average growth (cm) and change in competitive ability (i.e., body size, ranked relative to other parental males in a season) for males who bred in consecutive years (Table 1).

Temperature and degree days

We used temperature data to estimate the thermal energy experienced by parental males prior to reproduction in each year. A thermograph positioned near the shoreline at an approximate depth of 1 m recorded the water temperature (°C) hourly when the lake

was not covered by ice. Thermograph malfunctions or other disturbances (e.g., removal of the thermograph from the lake by an unknown person) resulted in some missing temperature records. We estimated these records using regression equations that characterized the relationship between water temperature in Palette Lake and nearby Sparkling Lake (46.010° N/89.701° W), a North Temperate Lakes Long-Term Ecological Research lake (64 ha; maximum depth 20 m) that has a nearly identical temperature profile as Palette Lake (Supplement; Supplementary Figure S1; Supplementary Table S1).

Each year we define the growth season as the period between the first day the average temperature climbed above 10 °C and the last day before average temperature dropped below 10 °C (Shuter et al., 1980; Ridgway et al., 1991). We calculated the average and maximum temperature of the growth season for every year. We also calculated winter length, defined as the number of days between growth seasons (Table 1).

We calculated degree days, a measure of the thermal energy experienced by an individual, as the sum of positive differences between the average daily water temperature at 1 m and the threshold $T_0 = 10$ °C for each day up to some specified time period (Shuter et al. 1980; Ridgway et al. 1991; Lukas and Orth 1995; Welsh et al. 2017; reviewed by Chezick et al. 2014a, b). In particular, we summed degree days each year from the first date on which the water temperature exceeded 10 °C until the date at which eggs were found in the nest of a male to produce a measure of the seasonal thermal energy experienced by each parental male prior to reproduction (Shuter et al. 1980; Ridgway et al. 1991). In addition, for each year we calculated the number of

degree days accumulated by the date that the average water temperature reached 15 °C, the temperature at which reproductive activity is typically initiated. We used this to predict a population-level response time to the rate at which the water temperature increased, where the response time is the interval (days) between the date on which the mean water temperature first reached 15 °C and the median date on which eggs were found in nests (Shuter et al. 1980).

Statistical analyses

Individual behavioral response to temperature

We used linear mixed models to determine the relationship between male total length ($\log_e$ transformed) and the number of degree days ($\log_e$ transformed, threshold $T_0 = 10$ °C) that had accumulated up to the date on which a male spawned (i.e., the date a nest was found to contain eggs), where individual was included as a random effect (because 316 individuals bred in more than one season). We fit models with and without year as a covariate and with and without an interaction term between year and male total length and the Akaike information criterion was used to choose between models (Akaike 1973). We restricted the analysis to the first date that a male spawned within a year, if a male spawned more than once within a season ($N = 127$). We excluded males on nests that were discovered after eggs had hatched from the analysis. The total sample included 1,261 observations. If larger males experience less severe winter energy losses, then the slope of the coefficient associated with male length is expected to be negative in each year (Ridgway et al. 1991).

Population-level responses to temperature

We used linear regression to predict annual population response times, the time interval between the date on which the mean water temperature reached 15 °C and the median date on which eggs were found in nests, from the number of degree days accumulated before the first 15 °C day each year. If temperature controls individual reproductive readiness, then we expect the slope of this relationship to be negative (Shuter et al. 1980).

Energetics versus competition

We used a subset of males ($N = 265$) that spawned in consecutive years to disentangle the potential influences of competition and thermal history on within-season reproductive timing. If the negative allometric association between male body size and winter energy losses controls reproductive timing, then a large increase in male length in a particular year should result in a large decrease in the degree days accumulated before reproduction in the subsequent year. If reproductive timing is controlled by male competitive ability, in contrast, then a male should spawn earlier in a season when confronted with competitors that are relatively small and shifts in competitive status should explain differences of reproductive timing between years. We ranked all males that spawned in each year based on their total lengths, assigning the largest male a rank of zero and smaller males consecutively larger integers (same-sized males received mid-ranks). Notably, this means that a decrease in rank by a male that spawned in two consecutive years corresponds to an increase in size relative to competitors. We used the change of male rank for males that spawned in consecutive years to predict the difference in accumulated degree days before reproduction between years.

We created linear models using either change in rank or change in length ($\log_e$ transformed) between consecutive years to determine the extent to which either factor predicted the respective yearly change in degree days ($\log_e$ transformed) accumulated before individuals reproduced. We also computed the correlation between change in rank and change in length for each year to determine the strength of the association between the two factors (Table 2). Due to the fact that some males appeared in more years than others, it was not possible to include all years in a single analysis with a random effect for individual. Consequentially, we created separate models for each pair of consecutive years to ensure independence of statistics. These models were then compared using the Akaike information criterion (Table 2).

RESULTS

Characteristics of parental males and seasonal temperature variation

Males were caught over 2,055 nests throughout the course of the study and 847 unique males were tagged. We failed to catch 5.39% of parental males from nests throughout the course of the study. The most males we ever failed to catch in a year was 26 (in 2005). The majority of these instances occurred when offspring died and the nest was abandoned before a male was captured. The number of males on nests ranged from 102 to 284. The total length of males in our data set ranged from 17 cm to 47.5 cm ($N = 1261$) and the seasonal average ranged from 29.8 to 35.1 cm. The mean change in rank and change in size between males that reproduced in consecutive years ranged from –20.0 to –59 (a negative change in rank indicates an increase in relative size) and 2.5 to 5.4 respectively (Table 1). Temperature patterns also varied year by year. Winter length ranged from 174 days before the 2001 reproductive season to 211 days before the 2002

reproductive season. The mean and maximum temperatures of the growth season ranged from 17.4 to 20.1 °C and 23.7 to 27.2 °C, respectively (Table 1).

Responses to temperature

Individual behavior

In all ten years of the study, a linear relation with negative slope linked male total length ($\log_e$ transformed) to the degree days a male accumulated prior to reproduction (Figure 1). The model that was best supported by the Akaike information criterion had a weight of 0.98, included year and male total length, and no interaction term between these two factors ($N = 1261$, $R^2 = 0.63$, $P < 0.0001$; Figure 1). The common coefficient for male total length was $b = -1.27 \pm 0.035$. The year effect indicates that the y-intercepts differed significantly between seasons (Figure 1).

Population-level responses

The dates on which peak reproduction occurred ranged from 23 May in 2001 to 10 June 10 in 2004. The degree days accumulated before the first day that temperatures reached an average of 15 °C varied greatly between years, from 13.1 in 2002 to 77.3 in 2009. In years where more degree days accumulated before the first 15 °C day, the population-level response time was shorter ($N = 9$, $r^2 = 0.46$, $P = 0.02$; Figure 2). Indeed, in 2009 peak reproduction actually occurred 3 days before the first day that the average temperature reached 15 °C.

Energetics versus competition

In 1,009 instances, a male was captured from a nest in consecutive years and for a subset of 444 of these cases—265 unique individuals—the date on which a male spawned (i.e., its nest was discovered with eggs) was known in both years. The difference in male total length between the two years was a significant predictor of the difference in the number of degree days before reproduction in five out of eight (62.5%) of consecutive year pairs, where males that grew more showed larger reductions in degree days before they spawned between the two years ($R^2 = 0.08-0.47$; Figure 3; Table 2). In comparison, the difference in male rank relative to competitors between the two years was a significant predictor of the change of timing in just three out of the eight (37.5%) of year pairs, where a reduction of body size rank (i.e., increase of competitive status) was associated larger reductions in degree days before they spawned between the two years ($R^2 = 0.08-0.29$; Table 2). In every year where the relationship between either difference in length or difference in rank was a significant predictor of the difference in the number of degree days before reproduction, models that used difference in length as a predictor received greater weights using the Akaike information criterion (Table 2).

Notably, the change of male length between years was a significant predictor in all three year pairs in which the change of male competitive status was a significant predictor. Indeed, in all year pairs—even the two year pairs for which the change in male total length alone predicted the seasonal change of reproductive timing—the two predictors were highly correlated (Table 2). Furthermore, male competitive status appears to have been influential only when the change of male length between years had the strongest associations with changes of reproductive timing ($R^2 > 0.2$). Together, these results

suggest that the ostensible contribution of competitive status on reproductive timing was an artifact of its correlation with male growth between years.

DISCUSSION

The observed patterns of reproductive timing at both the individual and population level suggest that energetics, rather than competition, explains why larger male *M. dolomieu* spawn earlier in a season than smaller males. Larger males spawned after an accumulation of fewer degree days post winter dormancy than smaller males in all 10 years of the study. At the population level, the delay between the temperature cue that triggers reproduction and the date of peak reproduction was shorter in years where more degree days accumulated prior to the temperature signal. Higher thermal energy experienced by the population appears to drive the distribution of reproduction dates closer to the environmental signal, presumably because males are able to recoup winter energy losses and reach some threshold energetic reserve that is sufficient to carry them through the parental period.

Energetics over competition

The observed changes of reproductive timing by males that spawned in two consecutive years was better explained by their growth than by changes of their competitive status relative to other males. The change of male total length between years predicted changes of reproductive timing in five of the eight consecutive year pairs we examined, whereas changes of male competitive status—the size-based rank of a male relative to competitors—was a significant predictor of changes in reproductive timing in only three year pairs (Table 2). In the three years where both change in length and change in size-

based rank were significant predictors, models using change in length received greater weights based on the Akaike information criterion.

We could identify no social or environmental explanation for why a change in competitive status would be important in some years rather than others (Table 1). The years 2002-2003, 2006-2007 and 2008–2009, where changes of male competitive status appeared to be influential, did not have a larger shift in the number of male competitors than other year pairs, nor did males experience a greater change in status. Especially short winters might in principle relax energetic constraints on reproductive timing and thereby enhance the importance of competition, but none of these year pairs were separated by unusually short winters. Long periods of high temperatures early in the season might have a similar effect and, indeed, 2009 had the highest number of degree days (77.3) accumulated before the average water temperature reached 15 °C. However, this explanation, too, seems unlikely, as 2007 had the second lowest number of degree days (16.4) accumulated before the water temperature reached 15 °C. Lastly, neither the mean nor maximum water temperature, which are known to increase aggressive behavior in fishes, were particularly high in these year pairs (Biro et al. 2010; Colchen et al. 2017; Brandão et al. 2018; Angiulli et al. 2020; Table 1).

The size-based measure of competitive status (i.e., size rank relative to other males) we used presumably also ranks males with regard to female preferences. Hence, female mate preference probably contribute little influence on reproductive timing by males. The female preference for larger males implied in earlier studies by positive correlations between male body size and the number of eggs they acquired seems more likely

attributable to a size-related energetic constraint on reproductive timing in females that is similar to that of males (Ridgway et al. 1991; Wiegmann et al. 1992; Baylis et al. 1993).

The effect of growth on changes in reproductive timing was also not observed in all year pairs, but there is a seemingly straightforward explanation, namely that male growth varied considerably between years (Table 1; Figure 3). In year pairs for which no relationship was observed, there were few males that grew especially well and the range of growth was also small, both of which likely impeded the detection of an association (Figure 3). Indeed, the average range of growth in years in which growth was not a significant predictor of changes of reproductive timing was 6.03 cm, compared to 7.38 cm in years where growth was a significant predictor (Table 1).

Comparisons to previous studies

The control of reproductive timing by individual thermal history is in accord with an earlier study in which parental male removal was not followed by earlier occupancy of nests by smaller males, which would be expected if competition forced smaller males to breed later in the season (Ridgway et al. 1991). There is an additional similarity between our results and those of earlier studies that further supports our hypothesis that reproductive timing in *M. dolomieu* is driven by an underlying metabolic process. Both Ridgway et al. (1991) and Lukas and Orth (1995) examined the association between male total length and degree days accumulated prior to reproduction in Opeongo Lake, Nipissing District, Ontario and North Anna River, Virginia, respectively. In these studies, male length was regressed on degree days (both log transformed) and Lukas and Orth (1995) noted the similarity of the slopes between the two studies, -0.355 and -0.391.

The analysis conducted by Ridgway et al. (1991) included data collected over six years and their analyses indicated that the slope of the relationship did not differ significantly across years. Here, we regressed degree days on male size because we wanted to know how body size influences the number of degree days accumulated by a male before he spawns. But, an equivalent regression analysis with our data (not shown) produced a slope of -0.375, which is remarkably similar to those found in these two earlier studies.

Neuheimer and Taggart (2007) found that a single parameterization of length-at-age as a function of degree days is sufficient to explain growth variation of fish that experience constant or variable water temperatures. The similarity of slopes that characterize the relationship between male body size and accumulated degree days prior to reproduction in geographically separated smallmouth bass systems suggests that reproductive timing is controlled by a conserved metabolic pathway and that a single parameterization based on physiological time—that is, accumulated thermal energy—may explain reproductive timing in diverse systems. Indeed, Shuter and Ridgway (2002) were able to accurately predict *M. dolomieu* start and end reproduction dates based on the regression analysis of Ridgway et al. (1991) in ten water bodies that varied considerably with regard to water temperature and the size distribution of adult males. If competition were the underlying cause of differences in timing of reproduction by males of different sizes, then we would expect the slope to vary both between populations and within populations between years with differences of population density and physical attributes of adult males. The consistent nature of the relationship between male size and degree days before reproduction across the long duration of our study, which encompassed

considerable annual variability, provides added confidence that the similarity of slopes between Ridgway et al. (1991) and Lukas and Orth (1995) was not coincidental.

Applications for management and conservation

For popular game fishes like smallmouth bass, which have a history of management that stretches back nearly 200 years, the identification of broadly consistent behavior between habitats may support current efforts focused on the restoration of native populations (Long et al. 2015). In other high latitude North American fishes, especially those that experience cold winters that impose energetic requirements for individual survival, similar relationships between temperature, size and reproductive timing also likely apply (e.g., Cargnelli and Gross 1997; Hurst and Conover 2003). Changing climate conditions have the potential to greatly disrupt the dynamics of reproductive timing and northern freshwater fish communities are particularly vulnerable to these changes (Visser and Both 2005; Todd et al. 2011; Shuter et al. 2012; Hovel et al. 2017). For example, shorter, less severe winters could relax energetic constraints and permit smaller individuals to reproduce earlier in a season or even at an earlier age, with ample energy reserves, and induce a reversal of control of reproductive timing from one based on energetics to one more dependent on male competitive status. Because the transfer of thermal heat from the environment to fishes accumulates with time, even small changes of temperature over development might cause significant differences in growth trajectories throughout the life of an individual (Neuheimer and Taggart 2007). Further studies that address how energetic constraints and competition influence phenology will be critical to understanding how population dynamics will change as temperatures continue to shift across the globe.

FUNDING

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation awards (1755387) to S.P.E. and K.L.W. and (1755421) to D.D.W.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the University of Wisconsin Trout Lake Biological Station for housing, equipment and other support. Temperature data were provided by Greg Sass and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. For their help in the field we thank S. Bassak, R. Cox, K. Deem, C. Freund, N. Frisch Welch, M. Healey-McNamara, A. Johnson, A. Kautza, K. Kouns, D. Logan, D. Lubin, M. Rice, B. Saetre, V. Schwantes, B. Shefveland, R. Thoni, L. Trayber, J. van Schyndel, J. Weiss, K. Wernert and P. White.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Data will be deposited in Dryad in accordance with the journal's data archiving guidelines upon acceptance of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Akaike H. 1973. Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. Proceedings of the 2nd international symposium on information theory. Second Int Symp Inf Theory.
- Alcock J. 1994. Body size and its effect on male-male competition in *Hylaeus alcyoneus* (Hymenoptera: Colletidae). J Insect Behav. doi:10.1007/BF01988901.
- Angiulli E, Pagliara V, Cioni C, Frabetti F, Pizzetti F, Alleva E, Toni M. 2020. Increase in environmental temperature affects exploratory behaviour, anxiety and social preference in *Danio rerio*. Sci Rep. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-62331-1.
- Baylis JR, Wiegmann DD, Hoff MH. 1993. Alternating life histories of smallmouth bass. Trans Am Fish Soc. doi:10.1577/1548-8659(1993)122<0500:alhosb>2.3.co;2.
- Biro PA, Beckmann C, Stamps JA. 2010. Small within-day increases in temperature affects boldness and alters personality in coral reef fish. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci. doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.1346.
- Blanckenhorn WU, Fanti J, Reim C. 2007. Size-dependent energy reserves, energy utilization and longevity in the yellow dung fly. Physiol Entomol. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3032.2007.00589.x.
- Boesch C, Kohou G, Néné H, Vigilant L. 2006. Male competition and paternity in wild chimpanzees of the Taï forest. Am J Phys Anthropol. doi:10.1002/ajpa.20341.
- Bozek MA, Short PH, Edwards CJ, Jennings MJ, Newman SP. 2002. Habitat selection of nesting smallmouth bass *Micropterus dolomieu* in two north temperate lakes. Am Fish Soc Symp.

445 Brandão ML, Colognesi G, Bolognesi MC, Costa-Ferreira RS, Carvalho TB, Gonçalves-
446 de-Freitas E. 2018. Water temperature affects aggressive interactions in a
447 Neotropical cichlid fish. *Neotrop Ichthyol.* doi:10.1590/1982-0224-20170081.

448 Brodeur JC, Vera Candiotti J, Damonte MJ, Bahl MF, Poliserpi MB, D'Andrea MF. 2020.
449 Frog somatic indices: Importance of considering allometric scaling, relation with
450 body condition and seasonal variation in the frog *Leptodactylus latrans*. *Ecol*
451 *Indic.* doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2020.106496.

452 Candolin U, Voigt HR. 2001. Correlation between male size and territory quality:
453 Consequence of male competition or predation susceptibility? *Oikos*.
454 doi:10.1034/j.1600-0706.2001.950204.x.

455 Cargnelli LM, Gross MR. 1996. The temporal dimension in fish recruitment: Birth date,
456 body size, and size-dependent survival in a sunfish (bluegill: *Lepomis*
457 *macrochirus*). *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.* doi:10.1139/f95-193.

458 Cargnelli LM, Gross MR. 1997. Notes: Fish energetics: larger individuals emerge from
459 winter in better condition. *Trans Am Fish Soc.* doi:10.1577/1548-
460 8659(1997)126<0153:nfelie>2.3.co;2.

461 Chezik KA, Lester NP, Venturelli PA. 2014a. Fish growth and degree-days II: Selecting a
462 base temperature for an among-population study. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.*
463 doi:10.1139/cjfas-2013-0615.

464 Chezik KA, Lester NP, Venturelli PA. 2014b. Fish growth and degree-days I: Selecting a
465 base temperature for a within-population study. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci.*
466 doi:10.1139/cjfas-2013-0295.

467 Ciuti S, Apollonio M. 2016. Reproductive timing in a lekking mammal: Male fallow deer
468 getting ready for female estrus. *Behav Ecol.* doi:10.1093/beheco/arw076.

469 Clarke A, Johnston NM. 1999. Scaling of metabolic rate with body mass and
470 temperature in teleost fish. J Anim Ecol. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2656.1999.00337.x.

471 Colchen T, Teletchea F, Fontaine P, Pasquet A. 2017. Temperature modifies activity,
472 inter-individual relationships and group structure in a fish. Curr Zool.
473 doi:10.1093/cz/zow048.

474 Côte IM, Hunte W. 1989. Male and female mate choice in the redlip blenny: why bigger
475 is better. Anim Behav. doi:10.1016/S0003-3472(89)80067-3.

476 Cuadrado M, Loman J. 1999. The effects of age and size on reproductive timing in
477 female *Chamaeleo chamaeleon*. J Herpetol. doi:10.2307/1565536.

478 Danylchuk AJ, Fox MG. 1994. Age and size-dependent variation in the seasonal timing
479 and probability of reproduction among mature female pumpkinseed, *Lepomis*
480 *gibbosus*. Environ Biol Fishes. doi:10.1007/BF00004929.

481 Descamps S, Bêty J, Love OP, Gilchrist HG. 2011. Individual optimization of
482 reproduction in a long-lived migratory bird: A test of the condition-dependent
483 model of laying date and clutch size. Funct Ecol. doi:10.1111/j.1365-
484 2435.2010.01824.x.

485 Dickerson BR, Brinck KW, Willson MF, Bentzen P, Quinn TP. 2005. Relative importance
486 of salmon body size and arrival time at breeding grounds to reproductive
487 success. Ecology. doi:10.1890/03-625.

488 Dickerson BR, Quinn TP, Willson MF. 2002. Body size, arrival date, and reproductive
489 success of pink salmon, *Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*. Ethol Ecol Evol.
490 doi:10.1080/08927014.2002.9522759.

491 Dobson FS, Michener GR. 1995. Maternal traits and reproduction in Richardson's
492 ground squirrels. Ecology. doi:10.2307/1939350.

493 Dufresne F, Fitzgerald GJ, Lachance S. 1990. Age and size-related differences in
494 reproductive success and reproductive costs in threespine sticklebacks
495 (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*). Behav Ecol. doi:10.1093/beheco/1.2.140.

496 Essington TE, Quinn TP, Ewert VE. 2000. Intra- and inter-specific competition and the
497 reproductive success of sympatric Pacific salmon. Can J Fish Aquat Sci.
498 doi:10.1139/f99-198.

499 Fullerton AH, Garvey JE, Wright RA, Stein RA. 2000. Overwinter growth and survival of
500 largemouth bass: interactions among size, food, origin, and winter severity. Trans
501 Am Fish Soc. doi:10.1577/1548-8659(2000)129<0001:ogasl>2.0.co;2.

502 Gibbons DW. 1989. Seasonal reproductive success of the Moorhen *Gallinula chloropus*:
503 the importance of male weight. Ibis (Lond 1859). doi:10.1111/j.1474-
504 919X.1989.tb02744.x.

505 Gillooly JF, Baylis JR. 1999. Reproductive success and the energetic cost of parental
506 care in male smallmouth bass. J Fish Biol. doi:10.1006/jfbi.1998.0888.

507 Hinch SG, Collins NC. 1991. Importance of diurnal and nocturnal nest defense in the
508 energy budget of male smallmouth bass: Insights from direct video observations.
509 Trans Am Fish Soc. doi:10.1080/1548-8659(1991)120[0657:IODANN]2.3.CO;2.

510 Hovel RA, Carlson SM, Quinn TP. 2017. Climate change alters the reproductive
511 phenology and investment of a lacustrine fish, the three-spine stickleback. Glob
512 Chang Biol. doi:10.1111/gcb.13531.

513 Hubbs CL, Bailey RM. 1938. The small-mouthed bass. Cranbrook Institute of Science
514 Bulletin 10. 92 pp.

515 Hurst TP, Conover DO. 2003. Seasonal and interannual variation in the allometry of
516 energy allocation in juvenile striped bass. Ecology. doi:10.1890/02-0562.

517 Karino K. 1995. Male-male competition and female mate choice through courtship
518 display in the territorial damselfish *Stegastes nigricans*. *Ethology*.
519 doi:10.1111/j.1439-0310.1995.tb00320.x.

520 Kleiber M. 1947. Body size and metabolic rate. *Physiol Rev*.
521 doi:10.1152/physrev.1947.27.4.511.

522 Knapp RA, Vredenburg VT. 1996. Spawning by California golden trout: characteristics of
523 spawning fish, seasonal and daily timing, redd characteristics, and microhabitat
524 Preferences. *Trans Am Fish Soc*. doi:10.1577/1548-
525 8659(1996)125<0519:sbcgtc>2.3.co;2.

526 Lane JE, Boutin S, Gunn MR, Coltman DW. 2009. Sexually selected behaviour: Red
527 squirrel males search for reproductive success. *J Anim Ecol*. doi:10.1111/j.1365-
528 2656.2008.01502.x.

529 Langston NE, Freeman S, Rohwer S, Gori D. 1990. The evolution of female body size in
530 red-winged blackbirds: the effects of timing of breeding, social competition, and
531 reproductive energetics. *Evolution (N Y)*. doi:10.1111/j.1558-
532 5646.1990.tb05247.x.

533 Lasiewski RC, Dawson WR. 1967. A re-examination of the relation between standard
534 metabolic rate and body weight in birds. *Condor*. doi:10.2307/1366368.

535 Le Boeuf BJ. 1974. Male-male competition and reproductive success in elephant seals.
536 *Integr Comp Biol*. doi:10.1093/icb/14.1.163.

537 Long J, Allen M, Porak W, Suski C. 2015. A historical perspective of black bass
538 management in the United States. *Am Fish Soc Symp*.

539 Lukas JA, Orth DJ. 1995. Factors affecting nesting success of smallmouth bass in a
540 regulated Virginia stream. Trans Am Fish Soc. doi:10.1577/1548-
541 8659(1995)124<0726:fansos>2.3.co;2.

542 Lyons J, Kanehl P. 2002. Seasonal movements of smallmouth bass in streams. Am
543 Fish Soc Symp 31, 149-160.

544 [dataset] Magnuson, J., S. Carpenter, and E. Stanley. 2020. North Temperate Lakes
545 LTER: High Frequency Meteorological and Dissolved Oxygen Data - Sparkling
546 Lake Raft 1989 - current ver 32. Environmental Data Initiative.
547 <https://doi.org/10.6073/pasta/101ae920e5b5a97fadd3cb439440ac3f>.

548 McElligott AG, Gammell MP, Harty HC, Pains DR, Murphy DT, Walsh JT, Hayden TJ.
549 2001. Sexual size dimorphism in fallow deer (*Dama dama*): Do larger, heavier
550 males gain greater mating success? Behav Ecol Sociobiol.
551 doi:10.1007/s002650000293.

552 Munther GL. 1970. Movement and distribution of smallmouth bass in the Middle Snake
553 River. Trans Am Fish Soc. doi:10.1577/1548-
554 8659(1970)99<44:madosb>2.0.co;2.

555 Neuheimer, AB, Taggart, CT. 2007. The growing degree-day and fish size-at-age: the
556 overlooked metric. Can J Fish Aquat Sci 64, 375-385.

557 Nagy KA. 2005. Field metabolic rate and body size. J Exp Biol. doi:10.1242/jeb.01553.

558 Newbolt CH, Acker PK, Neuman TJ, Hoffman SI, Ditchkoff SS, Steury TD. 2017. Factors
559 influencing reproductive success in male white-tailed deer. J Wildl Manage.
560 doi:10.1002/jwmg.21191.

561 Oliver JD, Holeton GF, Chua KE. 1979. Overwinter mortality of fingerling smallmouth
562 bass in relation to size, relative energy stores, and environmental temperature.
563 Trans Am Fish Soc. doi:10.1577/1548-8659(1979)108<130:omofsb>2.0.co;2.

564 Ongarato RJ, Snucins EJ. 1993. Aggression of guarding male smallmouth bass
565 (*Micropterus dolomieu*) towards potential brood predators near the nest. Can J
566 Zool. doi:10.1139/z93-062.

567 Post DM. 2003. Individual variation in the timing of ontogenetic niche shifts in
568 largemouth bass. Ecology. doi:10.1890/0012-
569 9658(2003)084[1298:IVITTO]2.0.CO;2.

570 Post DM, Kitchell JF, Hodgson JR. 1998. Interactions among adult demography,
571 spawning date, growth rate, predation, overwinter mortality, and the recruitment
572 of largemouth bass in a northern lake. Can J Fish Aquat Sci. doi:10.1139/f98-
573 139.

574 Post JR, Evans DO. 1989. Size-dependent overwinter mortality of young-of-the-year
575 yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*): laboratory, in situ enclosure, and field
576 experiments. Can J Fish Aquat Sci. doi:10.1139/f89-246.

577 Raffetto NS, Baylis JR, Serns SL. 1990. Complete estimates of reproductive success in
578 a closed population of smallmouth bass (*Micropterus dolomieu*). Ecology.
579 doi:10.2307/1938289.

580 Ridgway MS. 1988. Developmental stage of offspring and brood defense in smallmouth
581 bass (*Micropterus dolomieu*). Can J Zool. doi:10.1139/z88-248.

582 Ridgway MS, Shuter BJ, Post EE. 1991. The relative influence of body size and
583 territorial behaviour on nesting asynchrony in male smallmouth bass, *Micropterus*
584 *dolomieu* (Pisces: Centrarchidae). J Anim Ecol. doi:10.2307/5304.

585 Ridgway MS. 1989. The parental response to brood size manipulation in smallmouth
586 bass (*Micropterus dolomieu*). Ethology. doi:10.1111/j.1439-
587 0310.1989.tb00728.x.

588 Ridgway MS, Friesen TG. 1992. Annual variation in parental care in smallmouth bass,
589 *Micropterus dolomieu*. Environ Biol Fishes. doi:10.1007/BF00001890.

590 Saunders R, Bozek MA, Edwards CJ, Jennings MJ, Newman SP. 2002. Habitat features
591 affecting smallmouth bass *Micropterus dolomieu* nesting success in four northern
592 Wisconsin lakes. Am Fish Soc Symp 31, 123-134.

593 Schreer JF, Cooke SJ. 2002. Behavioral and physiological responses to smallmouth
594 bass to a dynamic thermal environment. Am Fish Soc Symp 31, 191-203

595 Shuter BJ, Finstad AG, Helland IP, Zweimüller I, Hölker F. 2012. The role of winter
596 phenology in shaping the ecology of freshwater fish and their sensitivities to
597 climate change. Aquat Sci. doi:10.1007/s00027-012-0274-3.

598 Shuter BJ, Maclean JA, Fry FEJ, Regier HA. 1980. Stochastic simulation of temperature
599 effects on first-year survival of smallmouth bass. Trans Am Fish Soc.
600 doi:10.1577/1548-8659(1980)109<1:ssoteo>2.0.co;2.

601 Shuter BJ, Post JR. 1990. Climate, population viability, and the zoogeography of
602 temperate fishes. Trans Am Fish Soc. doi:10.1577/1548-
603 8659(1990)119<0314:cpvatz>2.3.co;2.

604 Shuter BJ, Ridgway MS. 2002. Bass in time and space: operational definitions of risk.
605 Am Fish Soc Symp 31, 235-249.

606 Sih A, Lauer M, Krupa JJ. 2002. Path analysis and the relative importance of male-
607 female conflict, female choice and male-male competition in water striders. Anim
608 Behav. doi:10.1006/anbe.2002.2002.

609 Stiver KA, Alonzo SH. 2010. Large males have a mating advantage in a species of
610 darter with smaller, allopaternal males *Etheostoma olmstedii*. Curr Zool.
611 doi:10.1093/czoolo/56.1.1.

612 Tejedo M. 1992. Effects of body size and timing of reproduction on reproductive success
613 in female natterjack toads (*Bufo calamita*). J Zool. doi:10.1111/j.1469-
614 7998.1992.tb04454.x.

615 Todd BD, Scott DE, Pechmann JHK, Whitfield Gibbons J. 2011. Climate change
616 correlates with rapid delays and advancements in reproductive timing in an
617 amphibian community. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci. doi:10.1098/rspb.2010.1768.

618 Visser ME, Both C. 2005. Shifts in phenology due to global climate change: The need for
619 a yardstick. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci. doi:10.1098/rspb.2005.3356.

620 Welsh DP, Wiegmann DD, Angeloni LM, Newman SP, Miner JG, Baylis JR. 2017.
621 Condition-dependent reproductive tactics in male smallmouth bass: evidence of
622 an inconsistent birthdate effect on early growth and age at first reproduction. J
623 Zool. doi:10.1111/jzo.12454.

624 West GB, Brown JH, Enquist BJ. 1997. A general model for the origin of allometric
625 scaling laws in biology. Science (80-). doi:10.1126/science.276.5309.122.

626 Wiegmann DD, Baylis JR, Hoff MH. 1992. Sexual selection and fitness variation in a
627 population of smallmouth bass, *Micropterus dolomieu* (Pisces: Centrarchidae).
628 Evolution (N Y). doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.1992.tb01166.x.

629 Wiegmann DD, Baylis JR. 1995. Male body size and paternal behaviour in smallmouth
630 bass, *Micropterus dolomieu* (Pisces: Centrarchidae). Anim Behav.
631 doi:10.1016/0003-3472(95)80010-7.

- 632 Wiegmann DD, Baylis JR, Hoff MH. 1997. Male fitness, body size and timing of
 633 reproduction in smallmouth bass, *Micropterus dolomieu*. Ecology.
 634 doi:10.2307/2265983.
- 635 Wong BBM, Candolin U. 2005. How is female mate choice affected by male
 636 competition? Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc. doi:10.1017/S1464793105006809.
- 637

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Relationships between parental male length ($\log_e$ transformed) and the degree days accumulated before eggs were observed in nests ($\log_e$ transformed) for 1999, 2001-2009. Data are presented on log-scaled axes.

Figure 2. Relationship between the degree days accumulated before the first average daily water temperature of 15 °C (dashed line) and the reproductive response time of the population each year.

Figure 3. Relationships between change in $\log_e$ -transformed total length and change in $\log_e$ -transformed degree days before reproduction for males that spawned in consecutive years. Trend lines are included in years where the relationship is significant. The letter R is written under year pairs for which the change of rank was a significant predictor. Data are summarized in Table 2.

TABLES AND TABLE LEGENDS

Table 1

Male smallmouth bass and temperature characteristics within and between years.

Year	Males on Nests	Average Size (cm)	Rank Change	Size Change (cm)	Range of Growth	Winter Length (days)	Mean Temp (°C)	Max Temp (°C)	DD before 15 °C
1999	102	31.4 ± 0.7	NA	NA	NA	NA	19.3	26.7	57.4
2001	152	29.9 ± 0.6	NA	NA	NA	174	18.9	24.8	35.6
2002	221	29.8 ± 0.4	-23.3 ± 1.8	5.2 ± 0.2	7.5	211	20.1	26.0	13.1
2003	234	32.3 ± 0.4	-23.6 ± 1.7	5.4 ± 0.2	8.3	199	18.7	24.5	40.7
2004	284	31.6 ± 0.4	-32.7 ± 1.4	4.0 ± 0.1	7.0	197	17.4	23.8	67.2
2005	216	31.9 ± 0.4	-59 ± 2.1	2.6 ± 0.1	4.7	186	19.7	27.2	20.8
2006	188	33.9 ± 0.4	-43.1 ± 1.8	4.8 ± 0.2	8.3	186	19.8	25.5	27.9
2007	157	35.1 ± 0.4	-39.2 ± 1.6	3.7 ± 0.2	6.4	198	18.7	25.9	16.4
2008	198	33.7 ± 0.4	-20.0 ± 1.3	3.0 ± 0.2	6.4	192	18.4	23.7	32.1
2009	176	34.8 ± 0.4	-23.4 ± 1.4	2.5 ± 0.2	6.4	181	17.8	23.9	77.3

Rank change and size (total length) change indicate mean differences ± SE from the previous year. Range of growth indicates the difference between the largest and smallest change in length of an individual from the previous year. Data were not collected in 1998 or 2000 and, hence, these differences were not computed for 1999 or 2001. Degree days (DD) were calculated using the threshold $T_0 = 10$ °C. Temperature and Maximum are abbreviated as Temp and Max.

Table 2

Linear relationships between change in log_e-transformed male length (ΔL) and competitive status (ΔR) and the change in log_e-transformed degree days (ΔDD) for males breeding in consecutive years.

Year pair	<i>N</i>		Intercept	Coefficient	Adjusted <i>R</i> ²	<i>P</i>	AIC Weight	Correlation (ΔR , ΔL)
2001-2002	46	ΔR	-0.443	0.004	-0.008	0.420	0.09	<i>r</i> = -0.591
		ΔL	-0.271	-1.628	0.090	0.024	0.91	<i>P</i> < 0.001
2002-2003	61	ΔR	0.277	0.013	0.285	< 0.001	0.00	<i>r</i> = -0.821
		ΔL	0.611	-3.680	0.465	< 0.001	1.00	<i>P</i> < 0.001
2003-2004	60	ΔR	-0.018	-0.004	0.023	0.130	0.77	<i>r</i> = -0.867
		ΔL	0.104	0.103	-0.017	0.882	0.23	<i>P</i> < 0.001
2004-2005	44	ΔR	-0.401	0.003	0.027	0.148	0.37	<i>r</i> = -0.929
		ΔL	-0.424	-1.482	0.050	0.078	0.63	<i>P</i> < 0.001
2005-2006	49	ΔR	-0.101	0.003	0.051	0.064	0.34	<i>r</i> = -0.907
		ΔL	-0.103	-0.871	0.077	0.030	0.66	<i>P</i> < 0.001
2006-2007	62	ΔR	0.591	0.009	0.181	< 0.001	0.10	<i>r</i> = -0.862
		ΔL	0.548	-2.779	0.238	< 0.001	0.90	<i>P</i> < 0.001
2007-2008	65	ΔR	-0.301	0.0002	-0.016	0.931	0.50	<i>r</i> = -0.885
		ΔL	-0.309	0.052	-0.016	0.909	0.50	<i>P</i> < 0.001
2008-2009	57	ΔR	-0.063	0.009	0.084	0.016	0.02	<i>r</i> = -0.891
		ΔL	-0.019	-3.398	0.204	< 0.001	0.98	<i>P</i> < 0.001

Degree days were measured up until the point eggs were found in the nest of a male. Bold *P* values indicate *P* < 0.05. The Akaike information criterion is abbreviated as AIC.

FIGURES

Figure 1.

Figure 2.

Figure 3.