1 **A global meta-analysis reveals more variable life histories in urban** 2 **birds compared to their non-urban neighbours**

3

4 **Authors:**

5 Pablo Capilla-Lasheras^{1*}, Megan J. Thompson^{2,3}, Alfredo Sánchez-Tójar⁴, Yacob Haddou¹,
6 Claire J. Branston¹, Denis Réale², Anne Charmantier³, Davide M. Dominoni¹

7

8 **Affiliations:**

9 ¹ Institute of Biodiversity Animal Health & Comparative Medicine, University of Glasgow,
10 Scotland

11 ² Département des Sciences Biologiques, Université du Québec à Montréal, Canada

12 ³ Centre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive, Université de Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE, IRD,
13 Montpellier, France

14 ⁴ Department of Evolutionary Biology, Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, 33501, Germany.

15

16 * Corresponding author: Pablo Capilla-Lasheras (pacapilla@gmail.com)

17

18 **ORCID**

19 PC-L: 0000-0001-6091-7089

20 MJT: 0000-0002-0279-5340

21 AS-T: 0000-0002-2886-0649

22 YH: 0000-0003-0557-0339

23 CB: 0000-0002-4416-0984

24 DR: 0000-0002-0419-7125

25 AC: 0000-0002-0691-2647

26 DD: 0000-0003-2063-9955

27 *Abstract.*

28 Cities pose a major ecological challenge for wildlife worldwide. Phenotypic variation is a
 29 pivotal metric to predict evolutionary potential in response to environmental change. Recent
 30 work suggests that urban populations might have higher levels of phenotypic variation than
 31 non-urban counterparts. This prediction, however, has never been tested across taxa nor
 32 over a broad geographical range. Here, we conduct a meta-analysis of the urban avian
 33 literature to compare urban *versus* non-urban means and variances for phenology and
 34 reproductive performance. First, we show that urban birds reproduce earlier and have
 35 smaller broods than non-urban ones. Second, we demonstrate that urban populations have
 36 a more variable phenology than non-urban populations. Our analyses reveal that the latter
 37 pattern arises from differences in phenological variation between individuals within breeding
 38 seasons, likely because of higher heterogeneity in the urban study areas. These findings
 39 suggest that the opportunity for selection on phenology may be stronger in urban bird
 40 populations and that the patterns of phenotypic variation in urban and non-urban avian
 41 populations may consistently differ.

42 Introduction

43 Humans have drastically changed the environmental conditions on Earth¹. The footprint of
 44 human activity is most pronounced in urban environments, where microclimatic conditions,
 45 biogeochemical cycles and the sensory landscape are considerably different to those in non-
 46 urban environments². Perhaps not surprisingly, animals and plants are changing their
 47 phenotypes in response to the novel conditions and selective pressures found in cities^{3,4}
 48 and, indeed, numerous studies have reported contrasting phenotypes between urban and
 49 non-urban populations across the globe (e.g.⁵⁻⁷; reviewed in^{3,4,8}). The extent to which
 50 populations can adapt to urban living will partly depend on how urbanisation affects
 51 phenotypic variation⁹. Phenotypic variation is tightly linked to eco-evolutionary processes: it
 52 is an essential condition for current selection, it results from past selection pressures, and it
 53 depends on gene flow and phenotypic plasticity. As such, assessing how urbanisation
 54 affects phenotypic variation is essential to understand the evolutionary drivers of and
 55 potential for phenotypic change in urban environments.

56

57 Urban evolutionary ecologists have traditionally focused on differences in mean trait values
 58 between urban and non-urban populations, typically finding altered phenology, morphology,
 59 behaviour and reproductive performance in urban populations (or populations exposed to
 60 urban-like factors) compared to non-urban counterparts¹⁰⁻¹⁴. However, no study to date has
 61 explicitly investigated how urbanisation affects phenotypic variation at a global scale (see¹⁵
 62 for a study of changes in fitness variation in response to human-related activities).

63

64 Recent single-species studies suggest that phenotypic variation may be affected by
 65 urbanisation^{9,16}. For example, in species with limited dispersal ability (i.e., whose dispersal
 66 occurs at a smaller scale than the scale at which the urban habitat varies), adaptation to
 67 local conditions may increase phenotypic variation within the urban matrix. Findings from
 68 urban and non-urban meta-populations of the common ragweed (*Ambrosia artemisiifolia*) are
 69 consistent with this prediction as inter-population variation in several fitness proxies was

greater in urban environments compared to non-urban environments¹⁶. A recent meta-analysis of selection strength found weaker selection occurring in human-disturbed populations¹⁵, which could lead to higher phenotypic variation in urban populations compared to their non-urban counterparts. Overall, these studies converge with the notion that urban populations may display higher levels of phenotypic variation (reviewed in⁹). These findings also highlight that the extent to which urbanisation may impact phenotypic variation is likely to depend on the interplay between the spatial and temporal scale at which environmental conditions fluctuate in the urban habitat, and the species' dispersal ability and longevity⁹.

79

Here, we investigate how urbanisation impacts mean phenotypic values and phenotypic variation using a meta-analysis of 409 urban – non-urban comparisons of avian life-history traits (laying dates, clutch size and number of fledglings) published between 1958 and 2020 including 33 bird species (Figure 1). Specifically, we ask the following questions: i) does urbanisation affect mean life-history avian phenotypes? ii) does urbanisation impact variation in avian life-history traits? iii) what is the temporal and spatial scale at which urbanisation affects phenotypic variation? Based on previous research^{10,13}, we predict that urban bird populations display earlier phenology and are less productive than non-urban populations. We also predict increased phenotypic variation in urban populations compared to non-urban populations (see above; and reviewed in⁹). Lastly, we disentangle urban effects on phenotypic variation across different temporal and spatial scales, suggesting an ecological cause for the effects of urbanisation on avian phenotypic variation.

92

Figure 1. Phylogenetic and geographical breadth of the meta-analytic data. (a) Phylogenetic tree of the 33 avian species included in the meta-analysis along with the number of effect sizes (i.e., urban – non-urban comparisons) included per species ('k'; which may encompass multiple years of study from the same publication) and the proportion of observations for each life-history trait (purple: Laying date; orange: Clutch size; Green: Number of fledglings). **(b)** Our meta-analysis included a broad range of species, as examples, left to right from top to bottom: *Sturnus vulgaris*, *Spinus tristis*, *Aphelocoma coerulescens*, *Strix aluco*, *Larus argentatus* and *Fulica atra*. All images are copyright free (CC - Public Domain Mark 1.0. Authors: Shenandoah National Park [first two images], Mike Carlo/U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Raini Svensson, Vanzan and Ekaterina Chernetsova) and were extracted from www.flickr.com. **(c)** Global map (excluding Antarctica) showing the location of each study included in the meta-analysis. Each point represents one study in which one or more urban – non-urban pairs of populations were sampled across a varying number of years.

Results & Discussion

After systematically inspecting 940 studies published between 1958 and 2020 (see Methods), our meta-analysis included 409 urban – non-urban comparisons for three life-history traits: laying date (151 effect sizes from 32 studies), clutch size (124 effect sizes from 42 studies) and number of fledglings (134 effect sizes from 44 studies) (Figure 1, S1 & S2). To test whether urban populations reproduce earlier, have smaller clutches, fewer nestlings survive to fledging, and display more variation in these life-history traits compared to non-urban conspecifics, we meta-analysed log response ratios ($\ln RR^{17}$) and log coefficient of variation ratios ($\ln CVR^{18,19}$) accounting for phylogenetic effects²⁰. These effect sizes were used to compare means and coefficients of variation of urban *versus* non-urban populations, and are widely used in evidence synthesis in ecology and evolution^{18,21,22}. In the context of this meta-analysis, positive values of $\ln RR$ and $\ln CVR$ indicate higher mean values and higher variation, respectively, in urban populations compared to non-urban populations (and *vice versa*; see Methods).

Combining data across the three studied life-history traits, urban populations had overall lower mean values than their non-urban counterparts ($\ln RR$ mean estimate [95% Confidence Interval] = -0.050 [-0.096, -0.004]; R^2_{total} = 98.6%; Figure S4; Table S1). Further analysis accounting for potential covariation across the three investigated traits in the response to urbanisation (i.e., using a model with an unstructured variance-covariance matrix; see Methods and Table S2) confirmed that urban populations had lower mean values in every life-history trait: urban populations laid their eggs earlier ($\ln RR$ [95% CI] = -0.056 [-0.084, -0.028]; Figure 2a), laid smaller clutches ($\ln RR$ [95% CI] = -0.075 [-0.109, -0.040]; Figure 2a), and tended to fledge fewer nestlings per clutch than non-urban populations ($\ln RR$ [95% CI] = -0.075 [-0.183, 0.034]; Figure 2a – but note that the 95% CI overlaps zero in this case, seemingly due to more variation in $\ln RR$ for fledgling number than for clutch size, see Figure S6a). This meta-analytic model estimated different random effect intercepts per trait and allowed for correlations across traits (see Methods for details). This model revealed strong

correlations in the response to urbanisation across traits: studies reporting large differences in laying dates between urban and non-urban populations also reported small differences between habitats in clutch size and number of fledglings (see 'Study ID (correlations)' in Table S3; i.e., correlations among studies in the values of lnRR for each trait).

These results indicate that urban bird populations overall lay their eggs earlier and produce smaller clutches, which results in a lower number of surviving fledglings than their non-urban neighbouring populations. These findings are largely in agreement with previous meta-analyses investigating the effects of urbanisation on mean avian life-histories^{10,13}, whose conclusions we have confirmed using a larger dataset with higher spatial, temporal and phylogenetic coverage. Additionally, our results suggest the mean response to urbanisation is correlated among traits. Interestingly, we found that earlier laying dates in urban populations compared to non-urban populations were associated with smaller differences in clutch size and number of surviving nestlings between habitats (after accounting for mean differences among traits between habitats). Clutch size decreases with laying date in multiple bird species²³, and these two traits are often hypothesized to co-evolve because of a strong negative genetic correlation²⁴. All else being equal, urban conditions that advance the onset of reproduction (e.g., light pollution²⁵) could indirectly increase clutch size and, therefore, reduce differences in reproductive output (clutch size and, possibly, number of fledglings) between urban and non-urban populations that arise via other mechanisms (e.g., resource limitation^{26,27}).

When combining data across the three studied life-history traits, the coefficient of phenotypic variation in urban populations was 8.0% higher than in non-urban populations (lnCVR mean estimate [95% CI] = 0.077 [-0.032, 0.186]; $R^2_{\text{total}} = 71.9\%$; Figure S5 and Table S1; note that the 95% CI overlapped zero). A subsequent model of lnCVR accounting for potential covariation across the three investigated traits in the response to urbanisation (see Methods and Table S4) revealed that this trend was mainly driven by urban populations having a

165 more variable phenology (lnCVR mean for laying date [95% CI] = 0.193 [0.107, 0.279], i.e.,
 166 21.9% more variation, on average, in laying date in urban than non-urban populations).
 167 Urban and non-urban populations did not statistically differ in the amount of phenotypic
 168 variation in clutch size or number of fledglings (i.e., 95% CIs overlapped zero; the direction
 169 of the effect reflected higher phenotypic variation in urban populations for both traits; Figure
 170 2b) (lnCVR mean estimates [95% CI]: clutch size = 0.052 [-0.046, 0.149], number of
 171 fledglings = 0.064 [-0.071, 0.198]). We did not find evidence for the existence of correlations
 172 among life-history traits in their lnCVR (models including correlations among traits scored
 173 more than 1.57 AIC points below the top model, which only included independent random
 174 intercepts per trait; Table S4). Differences in phenotypic variation between habitats were
 175 quantitatively very similar when we meta-analysed the amount of variation (i.e., lnVR¹⁸)
 176 instead of the coefficient of variation (i.e., lnCVR; Figure S6).

Figure 2. Urban populations have earlier phenology, lower reproductive output and more variable life-history traits than non-urban populations. (a) Urban populations laid earlier and had smaller clutches, producing fewer fledglings, than their paired non-urban populations (illustrated by negative lnRR estimates). (b) Our meta-analysis revealed that variation in life-history traits was higher in urban populations compared to non-urban counterparts, with a marked difference between habitats in laying dates (illustrated by positive estimates of lnCVR). Model estimates for (a) lnRR and (b) lnCVR are shown along with their 95% confidence intervals per trait as calculated by our meta-analytic models accounting for correlated responses to urbanisation among traits (see Table S3 & Table S5 for full model outputs and Figure S4 and S5 for overall meta-analyses of lnRR and lnCVR). Raw data and model estimates are presented in Figure S6. ‘k’ provides the number of urban – non-urban comparisons.

Higher phenotypic variation in phenology in urban compared to non-urban avian populations might indicate that the opportunity for selection to act on phenological traits is stronger in urban populations²⁸. However, the actual evolutionary implications of this finding are likely to depend on the interplay between the temporal scale at which urbanisation affects phenotypic variation and the longevity of a given species⁹. Phenotypic variation in phenology could be increased in urban bird populations by at least two temporal mechanisms acting alone or simultaneously. First, urban populations could display higher variation in phenology within a given breeding season as a result of increased spatial heterogeneity in urban habitats²⁹. Second, urban populations could display higher variation in phenology due to larger yearly fluctuations in environmental conditions, with or without differences in phenotypic variation between urban and non-urban populations within a given breeding season. In this latter scenario, natural selection in short-lived species, whose individuals mostly breed one single year, may not act on different phenotypic variation between urban and non-urban habitats.

Additional analyses attending to the temporal source of differences in phenotypic variation for laying date between urban and non-urban populations demonstrated that these arose from differences in variation within breeding seasons rather than being the result of more variation in phenology between breeding seasons (Table 1). While laying date in urban populations was more variable than in non-urban populations within breeding seasons (lnCVR mean estimate [95% CI] = 0.193 [0.094, 0.292]; Table 1), a subsequent meta-analytic model isolating effects on phenotypic variation arising from between breeding season fluctuations revealed no statistical difference between urban and non-urban populations (lnCVR intercept mean [95% CI] = 0.007 [-0.133, 0.147]; Table 1). While the sample size for this latter meta-analysis was almost four times smaller than for the meta-analysis of within breeding season differences in variation, the estimated lnCVR in both models showed large differences: mean lnCVR within breeding seasons was more than 27 times larger than mean lnCVR among breeding seasons.

Higher phenotypic variation in urban than in non-urban populations within breeding seasons can be explained by at least two different processes: i) differences in the additive genetic variance in laying dates, whereby urban birds have a wider range of genotypes for laying dates, or ii) differences in habitat heterogeneity influencing plasticity in laying dates, whereby urban areas have larger environmental variation than non-urban habitat^{30–32}. While environmental conditions are often found to be different between urban and non-urban habitats³³, and this is likely to impact patterns of phenotypic variation^{7,34}, the role of habitat heterogeneity in shaping differences in phenotypic variation between urban and non-urban avian populations has received little attention^{29,31}. Our analyses indicate that differences in urban *versus* non-urban habitat heterogeneity could indeed contribute to explain the observed pattern of increased phenotypic variation in urban populations. Using a subset of studies that reported the approximated location of their urban and non-urban populations, we quantified habitat heterogeneity and assessed whether urban populations were exposed to a more heterogeneous habitat than non-urban populations²⁹, and whether the increase in phenotypic variation in urban habitats was predicted by urban habitat heterogeneity. These additional meta-analyses, although limited by intrinsic features of the data set (see Supplementary text 1) showed that, in our data set, urban habitats were spatially more heterogeneous than non-urban habitats²⁹ (Figure 3a) and that urban habitat heterogeneity was associated with higher phenotypic variation in urban bird populations compared to their non-urban counterparts, especially at large spatial scales (Figure 3b; see Supplementary text 1 for full details and discussion of the limitations of this complementary analysis). Our findings do not suffer from common publications biases, small-study effects or time-lag effects (Supplementary text 2).

Figure 3. Urban heterogeneity effects on the difference in variation between urban and non-urban bird populations (i.e., lnCVR). (a) Habitat heterogeneity was higher in urban populations than in non-urban populations across most spatial scales (e.g., different buffer sizes). (b) The higher the difference in habitat heterogeneity between urban and non-urban populations, the higher the difference in phenotypic variation between urban and non-urban populations tended to be (i.e., positive effect of urban heterogeneity on lnCVR); particularly at a relatively large spatial scale (e.g., buffer radius larger than 2000 m). Points represent (a) mean difference in habitat heterogeneity between urban and non-urban populations (± SE), and (b) the effect size of urban habitat heterogeneity on the difference in phenotypic variation across habitats (i.e., mean lnCVR and its 95% confidence interval). ‘Buffer radius’ refers to the radius of a circular area centred at each study location and over which habitat heterogeneity was calculated (see Supplementary text 1 for more details).

Table 1. Differences in variation (lnCVR) in life-history traits between urban and non-urban populations at different temporal scales. Urban – non-urban differences in variation (lnCVR) in laying dates, clutch size and number of fledglings per clutch were meta-analysed to assess differences in variation between urban and non-urban populations within and between breeding seasons (e.g., different temporal scales). lnCVR estimates represent meta-analytic model intercepts following the model structure presented in Table S5; positive values indicate higher variation in urban populations than in non-urban populations and *vice versa*. ‘CI’ = confidence interval; ‘k’ = sample size. Terms in *italic bold* highlight lnCVR estimates whose 95%CIs do not overlap zero.

Temporal scale	lnCVR estimate [95% CI]			k
	Laying date	Clutch size	Number of fledglings	
Overall	<i>0.193</i> <i>[0.107, 0.279]</i>	0.0518 [-0.046, 0.149]	0.0635 [-0.071, 0.198]	409
Within breeding season	<i>0.193</i> <i>[0.094, 0.292]</i>	0.024 [-0.110, 0.158]	0.149 [-0.028, 0.322]	376
Between breeding seasons	0.007 [-0.133, 0.147]	0.0774 [-0.034, 0.189]	0.011 [-0.136, 0.158]	101

Conclusion

Taken together, our results show that urbanisation impacts not only the mean phenotype of avian populations but also the amount of phenotypic variation that these populations display. Our results also highlight a temporal and spatial mechanism that could generate such differences in phenotypic variation among urban and non-urban habitats. That urban avian populations have more variable phenology than non-urban conspecifics within breeding seasons (i.e., differences in phenology across habitats are seemingly not due to between-year fluctuations) suggests that the opportunity for selection could be consistently higher in urban environments than in non-urban environments, even for species in which most individuals reproduce in a single breeding season only.

Why do urban populations display higher phenotypic variation than their non-urban neighbours? Our analyses reveal this pattern and shed light on the temporal and spatial scale at which it occurs but do not explain how it is generated. One possibility that our spatial analysis highlights is that high environmental heterogeneity in urban habitats³² might allow for plastic responses to microhabitat conditions, thereby increasing the amount of phenotypic variation in urban bird populations¹⁶. Alternatively, higher phenological variation in urban environments could be a consequence of relaxed selection in this habitat³⁵ or gene flow from non-urban to urban habitats³⁶. Weaker selection for early laying in urban habitats has been found in at least one bird species³⁵, which coupled with the high dispersal ability of birds, could increase the amount of phenotypic variation in phenology. The ecological and evolutionary implications of higher phenotypic variation in urban environments will likely vary among species⁹ and our findings highlight the need for detailed investigation of these consequences. To this end, long-term studies of individually marked individuals in paired urban and non-urban environments could be particularly fruitful.

Methods

Literature review

We began our literature search by inspecting two published reviews on the impact of urbanisation on avian biology^{10,13}. As we were mainly interested in how phenology and reproduction were affected by urbanisation, we identified papers cited in Chamberlain *et al.* (2009) (N = 37) and Sepp *et al.* (2018) (N = 32) that could contain estimates for egg laying dates (hereafter laying dates), clutch size and number of nestlings fledged per breeding attempt (hereafter number of fledglings) for urban and non-urban populations. Then, we performed four searches of the Web of Science Core Collection on the 27th of October 2020 (databases covered: SCI-EXPANDED – 1900-present, SSCI – 1956-present, A&HCI – 1975-present, BKCI-S – 2005-present, BKCI-SSH – 2005-present and ESCI – 2015-present) to recover studies published since 1900 and including all languages and all document types. We performed the following four searches: (1) TS=("urban*" AND ("bird*" OR "aves" OR "avian" OR "ornithol*" OR "passerine*" OR "passeriform*" OR "songbird*" OR *list of bird genera*) AND ("laying date" OR "lay date" OR "first egg" OR "clutch size" OR "eggs laid" OR "number of eggs" OR "fledgling*" OR "fledging" OR "reproductive success" OR "fitness")); (2) TS=("urban*" AND "bird" AND "laying date"); (3) TS=("urban*" AND "bird" AND "clutch size"); (4) TS=("urban*" AND "bird" AND "fledglings"). The *list of avian genera* in the first search string consisted of a list of all avian genera and can be found in Supplementary text 3 (this search string was created by Antje Girndt – see acknowledgments). Searches 2-4 were contained within search 1; however, they were not restricted to avian genera, hence potentially capturing additional references that did not mention the scientific name of the study species. These searches found 892, 71, 198 and 167 studies, respectively, which we combined with the studies identified from Chamberlain *et al.* (2009) and Sepp *et al.* (2018) to create a list of 1,397 studies (Figure S1). We then de-duplicated this list using the R package 'revtools' (using exact matching of study titles in function 'find_duplicates'; v0.4.1³⁷) and by manually inspecting all study titles and author lists. Our final list contained 940 unique

studies (Figure S1). We screened each study by reading their title and abstract. If the title and/or abstract indicated that the paper could fit our requirements for data collection (see below), we read the study fully, aiming to extract mean, standard deviation (SD) and sample size (n) of our life-history traits of interest for urban and non-urban bird populations. If SD was not available but authors provided SE, the former was calculated as: $SD = SE \times \sqrt{n}$. When available, we extracted estimates per year (i.e., papers often reported mean, SD and n for urban and non-urban populations in multiple years of study). If a study reported incomplete information for inclusion in our meta-analysis (e.g., mean was provided but not SD or SE), we contacted the authors to ask for this missing information (a complete list of authors that provided estimates can be found in the acknowledgments).

Criteria for inclusion

We were interested in investigating the effects of urbanisation on life-history traits, with a particular interest in testing the effects of urbanisation on variation and mean trait values. Paired urban - non-urban designs, where an urban population is compared to a non-urban adjacent population are a powerful approach to identify the effects of urban living while controlling for temporal and geographical variation, as well as large-scale genetic structure among populations. Therefore, we included studies as long as they (i) compared geographically close (i.e., paired) urban and non-urban populations and (ii) reported laying dates of the first clutch of the season, clutch size or number of nestlings for the same breeding season across both habitats. When multiple populations were compared along a gradient of urbanisation, we extracted estimates for the two populations at the extremes of the gradient (i.e. most urban and least urban populations). When studies combined estimates across several breeding seasons, we included them in our meta-analysis as long as urban and non-urban populations had been sampled in the same breeding seasons. We found variation in the way that authors reported our three traits of interest. For example, 'egg laying date' often referred to the date on which clutches were completed, but sometimes this value indicated the laying date of the first egg of the clutch. Sometimes authors did not

specify if by 'laying dates' they referred to clutch completion dates or first egg laying dates. We always tried to extract information on the number of fledglings considering all breeding attempts regardless of whether none or some nestlings survived in a given attempt. However, studies sometimes reported number of fledglings across habitats considering only successful broods (i.e., those that fledged at least one nestling). Although there may be subtle methodological differences among some of the studies included in our data set, among-study variation is not likely to bias results since our effect sizes (see below) consist of within-study comparisons where the methods were the same for urban and non-urban populations.

Initially, our data set contained 427 urban – non-urban paired estimates from 33 bird species and 65 studies. Of these, three observations were removed due to missing sample sizes, and 11 observations were removed because their sample size was one (which precludes the calculation of a mean and their SD). Four observations were removed because they reported a SD of zero (these indeed had very low sample sizes: 3, 2, 7, 2 observations). One effect size for laying dates, nine effect sizes for clutch size and 13 effect sizes for number of fledglings from five studies contained missing SD data. Mean and SD are often strongly correlated³⁸, including in our dataset (Figure S3). Therefore, we imputed the 23 missing SD values based on linear regressions of log mean against log standard deviation. Our final data set included 409 comparisons between urban and non-urban populations from 65 published papers and 33 bird species (Figure 1; refs. ^{26,27,35,39–100}). Of these 409 comparisons, 151 corresponded to comparisons of laying dates (N = 32 studies), 124 corresponded to comparisons of clutch size (N = 42 studies) and 134 were comparisons of number of fledglings (N = 44 studies). Last, there were a total of 376 comparisons for single years (N = 47 studies) and an additional 33 comparisons included estimates across multiple years of study (N = 18 studies).

Coding of effect sizes

Laying date data was standardised across studies by coding it as days after January 1. In every case, mean laying date estimates across habitats fell within the same calendar year. For each of these three life-history traits we computed the log response ratio (lnRR) and the log coefficient of variation ratio (lnCVR) to investigate differences in mean values and variability between urban and non-urban populations^{18,19}. We calculated lnRR and lnCVR along with their associated sampling variances¹⁸ using the R function 'escalc' in the 'metafor' R package (v2.5-57; Viechtbauer 2010). Both lnRR and lnCVR were coded in a way that positive values meant higher estimates in urban populations compared to their non-urban counterparts. Urban and non-urban populations can differ in mean and variance levels at the same time (e.g., Taylor's Law^{38,102}), as observed in our data (Figure S3). Therefore, we chose lnCVR over lnVR (i.e., log total variation ratio¹⁸) as the former is designed to account for the mean–variance relationship^{18,19}. We handled the data set, ran all analyses and produced visualisations using R v.4.0.3¹⁰³.

Meta-analyses and random effects

To evaluate the effects of urbanisation on avian life-history traits, we fitted phylogenetic multilevel (intercept-only) meta-analyses for each response term (i.e. lnCVR or lnRR) combining all three life-history traits (i.e. laying date, clutch size and number of fledglings). All These meta-analytic models estimated five random intercept effects: publication identity (i.e., among-study variation), population identity, phylogeny (more details below) and species identity (i.e., among-species variation not explained by phylogeny), as well as a residual variance and/or within-study variation. We estimated total heterogeneity (I^2) and the proportion of variation explained by each random term in our meta-analytic (intercept-only) models following^{21,104} and as implemented in the R function 'i2_ml' ('metafor' R package v2.5-57¹⁰¹).

Modelling heterogeneous variances and correlations among traits

Laying date, clutch size and number of fledglings are often correlated in bird species²³. To assess the robustness of our results to the existence of these correlations in our data set, we built meta-analytic models that allowed us to simultaneously estimate trait-specific means (i.e., one intercept for each trait – Equation 1), trait-specific residual variances (i.e., one ‘observation identity’ variance for each trait – Equation 1 & Equation 2) and trait-specific among-study variances and correlation among traits (Equation 1 & Equation 3). Including the random-effect terms detailed above, our model with heterogeneous variances and among-study correlations among traits can be written as: (we have omitted the term associated with sampling variance for simplicity – see Nakagawa et al. (2015) for more details)

$$y_i = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{LD} \\ \mu_{CS} \\ \mu_{NF} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{i-LD} \\ \varepsilon_{i-CS} \\ \varepsilon_{i-NF} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \tau_{t-LD} \\ \tau_{t-CS} \\ \tau_{t-NF} \end{bmatrix} + v_a + a_l + h_w \text{ (Equation 1)}$$

$$\begin{matrix} \varepsilon_{i-LD} \\ \varepsilon_{i-CS} \\ \varepsilon_{i-NF} \end{matrix} \sim N \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{\varepsilon-LD}^2 \\ \sigma_{\varepsilon-CS}^2 \\ \sigma_{\varepsilon-NF}^2 \end{bmatrix} \right) \text{ (Equation 2)}$$

$$\begin{matrix} \tau_{t-LD} \\ \tau_{t-CS} \\ \tau_{t-NF} \end{matrix} \sim N \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{t-LD}^2 & p_{LD-CS} \sigma_{t-LD} \sigma_{t-CS} & p_{LD-NF} \sigma_{t-LD} \sigma_{t-NF} \\ & \sigma_{t-CS}^2 & p_{CS-NF} \sigma_{t-CS} \sigma_{t-NF} \\ & & \sigma_{t-NF}^2 \end{bmatrix} \right) \text{ (Equation 3)}$$

$$v_a \sim N(0, \sigma_v^2) \text{ (Equation 4)}$$

$$a_l \sim N(0, A\sigma_a^2) \text{ (Equation 5)}$$

$$h_w \sim N(0, \sigma_h^2) \text{ (Equation 6)}$$

435

436 Where y_i is the statistic of interest (lnRR or lnCVR) for the i th effect size ($i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, k$;
 437 where k is the number of the effect sizes included in the analysis - i.e., number of urban –
 438 non-urban paired comparisons). ‘LD’, ‘CS’, ‘NF’ refer to overall means (μ), variances (σ) and
 439 correlations (ρ) involving effect sizes for laying date (‘LD’), clutch size (‘CS’) and number of
 440 fledglings (‘NF’). ε_i is the residual deviation for the i th observation, which is assumed to
 441 follow a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance $\sigma_{\varepsilon-LD}^2$, $\sigma_{\varepsilon-CS}^2$, $\sigma_{\varepsilon-NF}^2$ for laying date,
 442 clutch size and number of fledglings, respectively. τ_{t-LD} , τ_{t-CS} , and τ_{t-NF} are the deviations
 443 from the mean associated with the t th study and trait (‘LD’, ‘CS’, or ‘NF’), each following a
 444 multivariate normal distribution with mean of 0 and variance-covariance structure detailed in
 445 Equation 5 (ρ provides the correlations between τ_{t-LD} , τ_{t-CS} , and τ_{t-NF}). v_a provides the
 446 deviation from the overall mean associated with the a th population. a_l is the phylogenetic
 447 effect for the l th species, which follows a normal distribution with mean equal to 0 and
 448 variance-covariance structure given by σ_a^2 , the variance of the phylogenetic effect, and A , a l
 449 by l matrix of distances between species calculated from a phylogenetic tree (more details
 450 below). h_w captures among species variation not explained by the phylogenetic effect and
 451 follows a normal distribution around 0 and variance σ_h^2 .

452

453 We compared models with different constraints in the parameters of the variance-covariance
 454 structure in Equation 3 to assess the strength of evidence for heterogeneous variances and
 455 correlations among traits. We fitted the meta-analytic models in the ‘metafor’ R package
 456 (v2.5-57; Viechtbauer 2010) using maximum likelihood and compared model AIC (Akaike
 457 information criterion¹⁰⁵). We then calculated a ΔAIC value for each model (i.e., the difference
 458 in AIC between a given model and the model with lowest AIC) and used this value to assess
 459 the strength of evidence for a given variance-covariance structure. We fitted models with the
 460 following constraints in the variance-covariance structure:

461 (i) Single variance across traits and no correlations:

- 462 $\sigma_{t-LD}^2 = \sigma_{t-CS}^2 = \sigma_{t-NF}^2$; and all $p = 0$
- 463 (ii) Compound symmetric variance-covariance matrix:
- 464 $\sigma_{t-LD}^2 = \sigma_{t-CS}^2 = \sigma_{t-NF}^2$; and $p_{LD-CS} = p_{LD-NF} = p_{CS-NF}$
- 465 (iii) Heteroscedastic compound symmetric variance-covariance matrix:
- 466 $\sigma_{t-LD}^2, \sigma_{t-CS}^2$ and σ_{t-NF}^2 can vary freely but $p_{LD-CS} = p_{LD-NF} = p_{CS-NF}$
- 467 (iv) Diagonal variance-covariance matrix:
- 468 $\sigma_{t-LD}^2, \sigma_{t-CS}^2$ and σ_{t-NF}^2 can vary freely but all $p = 0$
- 469 (v) Unstructured variance-covariance matrix
- 470 $\sigma_{t-LD}^2, \sigma_{t-CS}^2$ and σ_{t-NF}^2 can vary freely, as well as p_{LD-CS}, p_{LD-NF} and p_{CS-NF} (i.e.
- 471 correlation among traits).

472

473 **Within- and between-breeding season differences in phenology and life-history traits**

474 **between urban and non-urban population**

475 Urban and non-urban populations may differ in both within-breeding season and between-

476 breeding season variation in phenology and life-history traits. However, differences in

477 variation for these two temporal scales are likely generated by contrasting ecological and

478 evolutionary processes⁹. To disentangle processes operating at these two temporal scales

479 that generate differences in phenotypic variation between urban and non-urban populations,

480 we performed additional meta-analyses including 1) urban – non-urban comparisons within

481 breeding seasons ($k = 376$ comparisons in the original data set) and 2) urban – non-urban

482 comparisons between breeding seasons (i.e., combining all within-breeding season

483 estimates from a given study; $k = 33$ between-breeding season comparisons present in the

484 original data set, plus 68 additional comparison calculated from within-breeding season

485 estimates; see below). When a given study reported estimates across multiple breeding

486 seasons, we calculated between-breeding season mean and variance as:

487

488
$$\bar{x}_{among-season} = \sum_{i=1}^g \bar{x}_i \frac{n_i}{N}; \text{ where, } N = \sum_{i=1}^g n_i \text{ (Equation 10)}$$

489

$$490 \quad S_{among-season}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^g n_i s_i^2 + \sum_{i=1}^g n_i (\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_{among-season})^2 \text{ (Equation 11)}$$

491

492 Where, $\bar{x}_{among-season}$ and $S_{among-season}^2$ are mean and variance across multiple breeding
 493 seasons. g is the total number of breeding seasons reported by a given study; $\bar{x}_i$, s_i^2 , n_i , are
 494 mean, variance and sample size for each breeding season i . $\bar{x}_{among-season}$ for a given study
 495 is, therefore, the weighted average across breeding seasons (Equation 10); whereas
 496 $S_{among-season}^2$ for a given study is the weighted sum of within-season variances (first term in
 497 equation 11) and between-season mean variances (second term in Equation 11).

498

499 Phylogenies

500 Phylogenetic trees were extracted from the Open Tree of Life ^{106,107}, using the interface
 501 provided by the R package 'rotl' (v3.0.10; Michonneau et al. 2016, OpenTreeOfLife et al.
 502 2019). We calculated tree branch length ¹¹⁰ and generated a phylogenetic correlation matrix
 503 to include in our (comparative) meta-analytic models (Figure 1). We assessed phylogenetic
 504 signal in our meta-analysis based on the proportion of variation explained by the phylogeny
 505 (i.e. $I^2_{phylogeny}$; e.g., ²²).

506

507 Publication bias

508 We assessed the existence of two types of publication biases, small-study and time-lag
 509 effects, following the recommendation in ¹⁰⁶. We ran our meta-models for lnRR and lnCVR
 510 including two new moderators: 1) the square-root of the inverse of the effective sample size
 511 and 2) the year of study publication (mean-centered)^{111,112}. The statistical significance of
 512 these two moderators provides evidence for the existence of small-study effects and time-lag
 513 effects, respectively ¹¹². In order to assess the effect of the existence of small-study effect in
 514 our estimates of lnRR and lnCVR, we ran additional lnRR and lnCVR meta-regressions

515 including the inverse of the effective sample size as a moderator to estimate adjusted lnRR
 516 and lnCVR intercepts for laying dates, clutch size and number of fledglings¹⁰⁶.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Paul Bellamy, Clint Boal, Peter Ferns, Michał Gładalski, Shelley A. Hinsley, Piotr Minias, Christy Morrissey, Matthew Reudink, Staffan Roos, Renaud Scheifler, Christine Stracey, Daniel Shustack and Jarosław Wawrzyniak for replying to our data queries. We are grateful to Antje Girndt for developing the list of avian genera included in our search string.

Funding

PC-L, CJB and DMD were funded by a Highlight Topics grant from the Natural Environment Research Council awarded to DD (NE/S005773/1).

Author contributions

PC-L, MJT, DR, AC and DMD conceived the study. PC-L, AS-T, CJB and DMD performed the literature search and PC-L extracted effect sizes from suitable published papers. PC-L and YH performed all statistical analysis with advice from AS-T. PC-L wrote the first draft of the manuscript with input from MJT, AS-T, DR, AC and DMD. All authors read and commented the manuscript.

References

1. Hendry, A. P., Gotanda, K. M. & Svensson, E. I. Human influences on evolution, and the ecological and societal consequences. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B* **372**, 20160028 (2017).
2. Grimm, N. B. *et al.* Global change and the ecology of cities. *Science* **319**, 756–760 (2008).
3. Johnson, M. T. J. & Munshi-South, J. Evolution of life in urban environments. *Science* **358**, eaam8327 (2017).
4. Lambert, M. R., Brans, K. I., Des Roches, S., Donihue, C. M. & Diamond, S. E. Adaptive Evolution in Cities: Progress and Misconceptions. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **36**, 239–257 (2020).
5. Alberti, M. *et al.* Global urban signatures of phenotypic change in animal and plant populations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **114**, 8951–8956 (2017).
6. Diamond, S. E., Chick, L. D., Perez, A., Strickler, S. A. & Martin, R. A. Evolution of thermal tolerance and its fitness consequences: parallel and non-parallel responses to urban heat islands across three cities. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **285**, 20180036 (2018).
7. Campbell-Staton, S. C. *et al.* Parallel selection on thermal physiology facilitates repeated adaptation of city lizards to urban heat islands. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **4**, 652–658 (2020).
8. Diamond, S. E. & Martin, R. A. Evolution in Cities. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **52**, 519–540 (2021).
9. Thompson, M. J., Capilla-Lasheras, P., Dominoni, D. M., Réale, D. & Charmantier, A. Phenotypic variation in urban environments: mechanisms and implications. In prep.
10. Sepp, T., McGraw, K. J., Kaasik, A. & Giraudeau, M. A review of urban impacts on avian life-history evolution: Does city living lead to slower pace of life? *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **24**, 1452–1469 (2018).
11. Sanders, D., Frago, E., Kehoe, R., Patterson, C. & Gaston, K. J. Impacts of Artificial Light at Night on Biological Timings. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **68** (2020).
12. Putman, B. J. & Tippie, Z. A. Big City Living: A Global Meta-Analysis Reveals Positive Impact of Urbanization on Body Size in Lizards. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* **8**, 580745 (2020).
13. Chamberlain, D. E., Cannon, A. R., Toms, M. P. & Leech, D. I. Avian

- productivity in urban landscapes□: a review and meta-analysis. *Ibis* **151**, 1–18 (2009).
14. Vaugoyeau, M. *et al.* Interspecific variation in the relationship between clutch size, laying date and intensity of urbanization in four species of hole-nesting birds. *Ecol. Evol.* **6**, 5907–5920 (2016).
15. Fugère, V. & Hendry, A. P. Human influences on the strength of phenotypic selection. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **115**, 10070–10075 (2018).
16. Gorton, A. J., Moeller, D. A. & Tiffin, P. Little plant, big city: A test of adaptation to urban environments in common ragweed (*Ambrosia artemisiifolia*). *Proc. R. Soc. B* **285**, 20180968 (2018).
17. Hedges, L., Gurevitch, J. & Curtis, P. The Meta-Analysis of Response Ratios in Experimental Ecology. *Ecology* **80**, 1150–1156 (1999).
18. Nakagawa, S. *et al.* Meta-analysis of variation: Ecological and evolutionary applications and beyond. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **6**, 143–152 (2015).
19. Senior, A. M., Viechtbauer, W. & Nakagawa, S. Revisiting and expanding the meta-analysis of variation: The log coefficient of variation ratio. *Res. Synth. Methods* 1–15 (2020).
20. Cinar, O., Nakagawa, S. & Viechtbauer, W. hylogenetic multilevel meta-analysis: A simulation study on the importance of modeling the phylogeny. *EcoEvoRxiv* (2020).
21. Nakagawa, S. & Santos, E. S. A. Methodological issues and advances in biological meta-analysis. *Evol. Ecol.* **26**, 1253–1274 (2012).
22. Sánchez□Tójar, A., Moran, N. P., O’Dea, R. E., Reinhold, K. & Nakagawa, S. Illustrating the importance of meta□analysing variances alongside means in ecology and evolution. *J. Evol. Biol.* **33**, 1216–1223 (2020).
23. Dunn, P. O. & Møller, A. P. Changes in breeding phenology and population size of birds. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **83**, 729–739 (2014).
24. Garant, D., Hadfield, J. D., Kruuk, L. E. B. & Sheldon, B. C. Stability of genetic variance and covariance for reproductive characters in the face of climate change in a wild bird population. *Mol. Ecol.* **17**, 179–188 (2008).
25. Dominoni, D., Quetting, M. & Partecke, J. Artificial light at night advances avian reproductive physiology. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **280**, 20123017 (2013).
26. Seress, G. *et al.* Impact of urbanization on abundance and phenology of caterpillars and consequences for breeding in an insectivorous bird. *Ecol.*

- 604 *Appl.* **28**, 1143–1156 (2018).
- 605 27. Seress, G., Sándor, K., Evans, K. L. & Liker, A. Food availability limits avian
606 reproduction in the city: An experimental study on great tits *Parus major*. *J.*
607 *Anim. Ecol.* **89**, 1570–1580 (2020).
- 608 28. Downhower, J. F., Blumer, L. S. & Brown, L. Opportunity for selection: An
609 appropriate measure for evaluating variation in the potential for selection?
610 *Evolution* **41**, 1395–1400 (1987).
- 611 29. Pickett, S. T. A. *et al.* Dynamic heterogeneity: a framework to promote
612 ecological integration and hypothesis generation in urban systems. *Urban*
613 *Ecosyst.* **20**, 1–14 (2017).
- 614 30. Heisler, J. M. & Brazel, A. J. The urban physical environment: temperature and
615 urban heat islands. in *Urban Ecosystem Ecology* (eds. Aitkenhead-Petersn, J.
616 & Volder, A.) 29–56 (American Society of Agronomy, Crop Science Society of
617 America, Soil Science Society of America, 2018).
- 618 31. Strubbe, D. *et al.* Phenotypic signatures of urbanization are scale-dependent:
619 A multi-trait study on a classic urban exploiter. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* **197**,
620 103767 (2020).
- 621 32. Shochat, E., Warren, P. S., Faeth, S. H., McIntyre, N. E. & Hope, D. From
622 patterns to emerging processes in mechanistic urban ecology. *Trends Ecol.*
623 *Evol.* **21**, 186–191 (2006).
- 624 33. Arnfield, A. J. Two decades of urban climate research: A review of turbulence,
625 exchanges of energy and water, and the urban heat island. *Int. J. Climatol.* **23**,
626 1–26 (2003).
- 627 34. Rodewald, A. D. & Arcese, P. Reproductive contributions of cardinals are
628 consistent with a hypothesis of relaxed selection in urban landscapes. *Front.*
629 *Ecol. Evol.* **5**, 77 (2017).
- 630 35. Caizergues, A. E., Charmantier, A. & Grégoire, A. Urban versus forest
631 ecotypes are not explained by divergent reproductive selection. *Proc. R. Soc.*
632 *B* **285**, 20180261 (2018).
- 633 36. Salmón, P. *et al.* Continent-wide genomic signatures of adaptation to
634 urbanisation in a songbird across Europe. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 2983 (2021).
- 635 37. Westgate, M. J. revtools: An R package to support article screening for
636 evidence synthesis. *Res. Synth. Methods* **10**, 606–614 (2019).
- 637 38. Nakagawa, S. & Schielzeth, H. A general and simple method for obtaining R²

- from generalized linear mixed-effects models. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **4**, 133–142 (2013).
39. Brahmia, Z. *et al.* Breeding performance of blue tits (*Cyanistes caeruleus* ultramarinus) in relation to lead pollution and nest failure rates in rural, intermediate, and urban sites in Algeria. *Environ. Pollut.* **174**, 171–178 (2013).
40. Capilla-Lasheras, P. *et al.* Elevated Immune Gene Expression Is Associated with Poor Reproductive Success of Urban Blue Tits. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* **5**, 64 (2017).
41. Cardilini, A. P. A., Weston, M. A., Nimmo, D. G., Dann, P. & Sherman, C. D. H. Surviving in sprawling suburbs: Suburban environments represent high quality breeding habitat for a widespread shorebird. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* **115**, 72–80 (2013).
42. Conway, C. J., Garcia, V., Smith, M. D., Ellis, L. A. & Whitney, J. L. Comparative demography of Burrowing Owls in agricultural and urban landscapes in southeastern Washington. *J. F. Ornithol.* **77**, 280–290 (2006).
43. de Satgé, J. *et al.* Urbanisation lowers great tit *Parus major* breeding success at multiple spatial scales. *J. Avian Biol.* e02108 (2019) doi:10.1111/jav.02108.
44. Dhondt, A. A., Eyckerman, R., Moermans, R. & Hublé, J. Habitat and laying date of Great and Blue Tit *Parus major* and *P. caeruleus*. *Ibis (Lond. 1859)*. **126**, 388–397 (1984).
45. Eden, S. F. The comparative breeding biology of magpies *Pica pica* in an urban and a rural habitat (Aves: Corvidae). *J. Zool.* **205**, 325–334 (1985).
46. Gahbauer, M. A. *et al.* Productivity, mortality, and management of urban peregrine falcons in northeastern North America. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **79**, 10–19 (2015).
47. Gładalski, M. *et al.* Effects of extreme thermal conditions on plasticity in breeding phenology and double-broodedness of Great Tits and Blue Tits in central Poland in 2013 and 2014. *Int. J. Biometeorol.* **60**, 1795–1800 (2016).
48. Gładalski, M. *et al.* Differences in the breeding success of blue tits *Cyanistes caeruleus* between a forest and an urban area: A long-term study. *Acta Ornithol.* **52**, 59–68 (2017).
49. Gładalski, M. *et al.* Effects of nest characteristics on reproductive performance in Blue Tits *Cyanistes caeruleus* and Great Tits *Parus major*. *Avian Biol. Res.* **9**, 37–43 (2016).

- 672 50. Gładalski, M. *et al.* Inter-annual and inter-habitat variation in breeding
673 performance of blue tits (*Cyanistes caeruleus*) in central Poland. *Ornis Fenn.*
674 **92**, 34–42 (2015).
- 675 51. Gryz, J. & Krauze-Gryz, D. Influence of habitat urbanisation on time of
676 breeding and productivity of tawny Owl (*Strix aluco*). *Polish J. Ecol.* **66**, 153–
677 161 (2018).
- 678 52. Hajdasz, A. C., Otter, K. A., Baldwin, L. K. & Reudink, M. W. Caterpillar
679 phenology predicts differences in timing of mountain chickadee breeding in
680 urban and rural habitats. *Urban Ecosyst.* **22**, 1113–1122 (2019).
- 681 53. Hinsley, S. A. *et al.* Effects of structural and functional habitat gaps on
682 breeding woodland birds: Working harder for less. *Landsc. Ecol.* **23**, 615–626
683 (2008).
- 684 54. Isaksson, C. & Andersson, S. Carotenoid diet and nestling provisioning in
685 urban and rural great tits *Parus major*. *J. Avian Biol.* **38**, 564–572 (2007).
- 686 55. Isaksson, C., Johansson, A. & Andersson, S. Egg yolk carotenoids in relation
687 to habitat and reproductive investment in the great tit *Parus major*. *Physiol.*
688 *Biochem. Zool.* **81**, 112–118 (2008).
- 689 56. Jarrett, C., Powell, L. L., McDevitt, H., Helm, B. & Welch, A. J. Bitter fruits of
690 hard labour: diet metabarcoding and telemetry reveal that urban songbirds
691 travel further for lower-quality food. *Oecologia* **193**, 377–388 (2020).
- 692 57. Ibáñez-Álamo, J. D. & Soler, M. Does urbanization affect selective pressures
693 and life-history strategies in the common blackbird (*Turdus merula* L.)? *Biol. J.*
694 *Linn. Soc.* **101**, 759–766 (2010).
- 695 58. Kelleher, K. M. & O'Halloran, J. Influence of nesting habitat on breeding Song
696 Thrushes *Turdus philomelos*. *Bird Study* **54**, 221–229 (2007).
- 697 59. Antonov, A. & Atanasova, D. Y. Small-scale differences in the breeding
698 ecology of urban and rural Magpies *Pica pica*. *Ornis Fenn.* **80**, 21–30 (2003).
- 699 60. Kettel, E. F., Gentle, L. K., Yarnell, R. W. & Quinn, J. L. Breeding performance
700 of an apex predator, the peregrine falcon, across urban and rural landscapes.
701 *Urban Ecosyst.* **22**, 117–125 (2019).
- 702 61. Lee, S., Lee, H., Jablonski, P. G., Choe, J. C. & Husby, M. Microbial
703 abundance on the eggs of a passerine bird and related fitness consequences
704 between urban and rural habitats. *PLoS One* **12**, e0185411 (2017).
- 705 62. Lin, W. L., Lin, S. M., Lin, J. W., Wang, Y. & Tseng, H. Y. Breeding

- 706 performance of Crested Goshawk *Accipiter trivirgatus* in urban and rural
707 environments of Taiwan. *Bird Study* **62**, 177–184 (2015).
- 708 63. Liven-Schulman, I., Leshem, Y., Alon, D. & Yom-Tov, Y. Causes of population
709 declines of the Lesser Kestrel *Falco naumanni* in Israel. *Ibis (Lond. 1859)*. **146**,
710 145–152 (2004).
- 711 64. Luna, Á., Palma, A., Sanz-Aguilar, A., Tella, J. L. & Carrete, M. Sex,
712 personality and conspecific density influence natal dispersal with lifetime
713 fitness consequences in urban and rural burrowing owls. *PLoS One* **15**, 1–17
714 (2020).
- 715 65. Mennechez, G. & Clergeau, P. Effect of urbanisation on habitat generalists:
716 starlings not so flexible? *Acta Oecologica* **30**, 182–191 (2006).
- 717 66. Meyrier, E. *et al.* Happy to breed in the city? Urban food resources limit
718 reproductive output in Western Jackdaws. *Ecol. Evol.* **7**, 1363–1374 (2017).
- 719 67. Middleton, A. Influence of Age and Habitat on Reproduction by the American
720 Goldfinch. *Ecology* **60**, 418–432 (1979).
- 721 68. Millsap, B. *et al.* Comparative Fecundity and Survival of Bald Eagles Fledged
722 from Suburban and Rural Natal Areas in Florida. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **68**, 1018–
723 1031 (2004).
- 724 69. Minias, P. Reproduction and survival in the city: Which fitness components
725 drive urban colonization in a reed-nesting waterbird? *Curr. Zool.* **62**, 79–87
726 (2016).
- 727 70. Bailly, J. *et al.* From eggs to fledging: Negative impact of urban habitat on
728 reproduction in two tit species. *J. Ornithol.* **157**, 377–392 (2016).
- 729 71. Morrissey, C. A. *et al.* Developmental impairment in eurasian dipper nestlings
730 exposed to urban stream pollutants. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* **33**, 1315–1323
731 (2014).
- 732 72. Newhouse, M. J., Marra, P. P. & Johnson, L. S. Reproductive Success of
733 House Wrens in Suburban and Rural Landscapes. *Wilson J. Ornithol.* **120**, 99–
734 104 (2008).
- 735 73. Pande, S., Pawashe, A., Mahajan, M. N., Joglekar, C. & Mahabal, A. Effect of
736 food and habitat on breeding success in Spotted Owlets (*Athene brama*)
737 nesting in villages and rural landscapes in India. *J. Raptor Res.* **41**, 26–34
738 (2007).
- 739 74. Partecke, J., Hegyi, G., Fitze, P. S., Gasparini, J. & Schwabl, H. Maternal

- effects and urbanization: Variation of yolk androgens and immunoglobulin in city and forest blackbirds. *Ecol. Evol.* **10**, 2213–2224 (2020).
75. Perlut, N. G., Bonter, D. N., Ellis, J. C. & Friar, M. S. Roof-Top Nesting in a Declining Population of Herring Gulls (*Larus argentatus*) in Portland, Maine, USA. *Waterbirds* **39**, 68–73 (2016).
76. Perrins, C. M. Population Fluctuations and Clutch-Size in the Great Tit. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **34**, 601–647 (1965).
77. Pollock, C. J., Capilla-Lasheras, P., McGill, R. A. R., Helm, B. & Dominoni, D. M. Integrated behavioural and stable isotope data reveal altered diet linked to low breeding success in urban-dwelling blue tits (*Cyanistes caeruleus*). *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 5014 (2017).
78. Preiszner, B. *et al.* Problem-solving performance and reproductive success of great tits in urban and forest habitats. *Anim. Cogn.* **20**, 53–63 (2017).
79. Rollinson, D. J. & Jones, D. N. Variation in breeding parameters of the Australian magpie *Gymnorhina tibicen* in suburban and rural environments. *Urban Ecosyst.* **6**, 257–269 (2003).
80. Rosenfield, R. N., Hardin, M. G., Taylor, J., Sobolik, L. E. & Frater, P. N. Nesting density and dispersal movements between urban and rural habitats of cooper's Hawks (*Accipiter cooperii*) in Wisconsin: Are these source or sink habitats? *Am. Midl. Nat.* **182**, 36–51 (2019).
81. Beck, N. R. & Heinsohn, R. Group composition and reproductive success of cooperatively breeding white-winged choughs (*Corcorax melanorhamphos*) in urban and non-urban habitat. *Austral Ecol.* **31**, 588–596 (2006).
82. Schmidt, V. K.-H. & Steinbach, J. Niedriger Bruterfolg der Kohlmeise(*Parus major*) in städtischen Parks und Friedhöfen. *J. für Ornithol.* **124**, 81–83 (1983).
83. Schoech, S. J. & Bowman, R. Variation in the timing of breeding between suburban and wildland Florida Scrub-Jays: Do physiologic measures reflect different environments? in *Avian Ecology and Conservation in an Urbanizing World* (eds. Marzluff, J. M., Bowman, R. & Donnelly, R.) 289–306 (Kluwer Academic Press, 2001).
84. Schoech, S. J., Bowman, R., Bridge, E. S. & Boughton, R. K. Baseline and acute levels of corticosterone in Florida Scrub-Jays (*Aphelocoma coerulescens*): Effects of food supplementation, suburban habitat, and year. *Gen. Comp. Endocrinol.* **154**, 150–160 (2007).

- 774 85. Seress, G. *et al.* Urbanization, nestling growth and reproductive success in a
775 moderately declining house sparrow population. *J. Avian Biol.* **43**, 403–414
776 (2012).
- 777 86. Shustack, D. P. & Rodewald, A. D. Nest predation reduces benefits to early
778 clutch initiation in northern cardinals *Cardinalis cardinalis*. *J. Avian Biol.* **42**,
779 204–209 (2011).
- 780 87. Solonen, T. Breeding of the Great Tit and Blue Tit in urban and rural habitats in
781 Southern Finland. *Ornis Fenn.* **78**, 49–60 (2001).
- 782 88. Solonen, T. & Hildén, M. Breeding phenology in Great and Blue Tits (*Parus*
783 spp.): Are urban populations more resistant to climate change than rural ones?
784 *Ornis Fenn.* **91**, 209–219 (2014).
- 785 89. Solonen, T. & Ursin, K. A. Breeding of Tawny Owls *Strix aluco* in rural and
786 urban habitats in southern Finland. *Bird Study* **55**, 216–221 (2008).
- 787 90. Stout, W. E., Anderson, R. K. & Papp, J. M. Urban, suburban and rural red-
788 tailed hawk nesting habitat and populations in southeast Wisconsin. *J. Raptor*
789 *Res.* **32**, 221–228 (1998).
- 790 91. Stracey, C. M. & Robinson, S. K. Are urban habitats ecological traps for a
791 native songbird? Season-long productivity, apparent survival, and site fidelity
792 in urban and rural habitats. *J. Avian Biol.* **43**, 50–60 (2012).
- 793 92. Berardelli, D., Desmond, M. J. & Murray, L. Reproductive success of burrowing
794 owls in urban and grassland habitats in southern New Mexico. *Wilson J.*
795 *Ornithol.* **122**, 51–59 (2010).
- 796 93. Sumasgutner, P., Nemeth, E., Tebb, G., Krenn, H. W. & Gamauf, A. Hard
797 times in the city-attractive nest sites but insufficient food supply lead to low
798 reproduction rates in a bird of prey. *Front. Zool.* **34**, 17–31 (2014).
- 799 94. Thornton, M., Todd, I. & Roos, S. Breeding Success and Productivity of Urban
800 and Rural Eurasian Sparrowhawks *Accipiter nisus* in Scotland. *Ecoscience* **24**,
801 115–116 (2017).
- 802 95. Wawrzyniak, J. *et al.* Long-Term Variation in Laying Date and Clutch Size of
803 the Great Tit *Parus major* in Central Poland: A Comparison between Urban
804 Parkland and Deciduous Forest. *Ardeola* **62**, 311–322 (2015).
- 805 96. Welch-Acosta, B. C., Skipper, B. R. & Boal, C. W. Comparative breeding
806 ecology of Mississippi Kites in urban and exurban areas of West Texas. *J. F.*
807 *Ornithol.* **90**, 248–257 (2019).

97. McGowan, K. J. Avian Ecology and Conservation in an Urbanizing World. in *Avian Ecology and Conservation in an Urbanizing World* (eds. Marzluff, J. M., Bowman, R. & Donnelly, R.) 365–381 (Kluwer Academic Press, 2001).
98. Biard, C. *et al.* Growing in cities: An urban penalty for wild birds? A study of phenotypic differences between urban and rural great tit chicks (*Parus major*). *Front. Ecol. Evol.* **5**, 79 (2017).
99. Boal, C. W. & Mannan, R. . W. Comparative Breeding Ecology of Cooper's Hawks in Urban and Exurban Areas of Southeastern Arizona. *J. Wildl. Manage.* **63**, 77–84 (1999).
100. Bobek, O., Gal, A., Saltz, D. & Motro, U. Effect of nest-site microclimatic conditions on nesting success in the Lesser Kestrel *Falco naumanni*. *Bird Study* **65**, 444–450 (2018).
101. Viechtbauer, W. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor. *J. Stat. Softw.* **36**, 1–48 (2010).
102. Cohen, J. E. & Xu, M. Random sampling of skewed distributions implies Taylor's power law of fluctuation scaling. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **112**, 7749–7754 (2015).
103. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. (2020).
104. Senior, A. M. *et al.* Heterogeneity in ecological and evolutionary meta-analyses: its magnitude and implications. *Ecology* **97**, 3293–3299 (2016).
105. Burnham, K. P., Anderson, D. R. & Huyvaert, K. P. AIC model selection and multimodel inference in behavioral ecology: some background , observations , and comparisons. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **65**, 23–35 (2011).
106. Rees, J. A. & Cranston, K. Automated assembly of a reference taxonomy for phylogenetic data synthesis. *Biodivers. Data J.* **5**, e12581 (2017).
107. Hinchliff, C. E. *et al.* Synthesis of phylogeny and taxonomy into a comprehensive tree of life. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **112**, 12764–12769 (2015).
108. Michonneau, F., Brown, J. W. & Winter, D. J. rotl: an R package to interact with the Open Tree of Life data. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **7**, 1476–1481 (2016).
109. OpenTreeOfLife *et al.* Open Tree of Life Synthetic Tree. (2019) doi:10.5281/zenodo.3937741.
110. Grafen, A. The phylogenetic regression. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London* **326**,

- 842 119–157 (1989).
- 843 111. Trikalinos, T. & Ioannidis, J. P. A. Assessing the evolution of effect sizes over
844 time. in *Publication Bias in Meta-Analysis* (eds. Rothstein, H., Sutton, A. &
845 Borenstein, M.) 241–259 (John Wiley, 2005). doi:[https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1002/0470870168.ch13)
846 10.1002/0470870168.ch13.
- 847 112. Nakagawa, S. *et al.* Methods for testing publication bias in ecological and
848 evolutionary meta-analyses. *EcoEvoRxiv* (2021) doi:10.32942/osf.io/k7pmz.
- 849