Rapid mate recognition promotes greater avian-perceived plumage sexual dichromatism in true thrushes (genus: *Turdus*)

Alec B. Luro1\*, Mark E. Hauber1

1 Department of Evolution, Ecology and Behavior, School of Integrative Biology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign \*alec.b.luro@mail.com

# Abstract

## Keywords

*dichromatism*, *plumage*, *species recognition*

# Introduction


Species recognition is necessary in sexually reproducing lineages for individuals to find compatible mates and produce viable offspring [[1](#ref-andersson1994),[2](#ref-groning2008)]. Conspicuous traits signaling species and sex identity increase the ease of species recognition by reducing the time and effort expended when searching for compatible mates and lessen the likelihood of mating with heterospecifics [[3](#ref-pfennig2012)]. Alternatively, traits used in species and mate recognition may also serve as signals of status to conspecifics and reduce costly conflicts over resources and mates [[4](#ref-west-eberhard1983)]. Accordingly, distinct traits facilitating species and mate recognition should arise when closely-related species are highly sympatric, when the time to find a mate is limited, when potential mates are not encountered often, and when competition for mates and resources is high [[1](#ref-andersson1994)].

In birds, plumage colour is a highly conspicuous trait signaling species and (often) sex identity [[5](#ref-martin2015a),[6](#ref-bitton2016)] . Plumage sexual dichromatism, a distinct set of differences in the appearance of male and female feather colours, is common in birds and usually attributed to different selection pressures on males and females [[7](#ref-martin1996)–[11](#ref-dunn2015)]. Fundamentally, plumage sexual dichromatism results in a visible trait useful for recognizing an individual’s species, sex, and age (e.g., in species with delayed plumage maturation, see [[12](#ref-hawkins2012)]), reducing the time and effort necessary to identify a suitable mate [[13](#ref-hamilton1961),[14](#ref-saetre1992)]. Evidence in favor of the species recognition hypothesis for sexual dichromatism includes a positive association between migratory behaviour, shorter breeding seasons, and plumage sexual dichromatism [[9](#ref-badyaev2003)]. Specifically, bird species that migrate to and from their breeding territories and have large geographic ranges tend to have greater plumage sexual dichromatism than species that do not migrate and have limited breeding ranges [[10](#ref-dale2015),[15](#ref-friedman2009)–[17](#ref-matysiokova2017)]. Additionally, bird species that reside on mainland continents and have larger breeding ranges often have greater plumage colour elaboration and sexual dichromatism than species living on islands with limited breeding ranges [[18](#ref-badyaev1998)–[23](#ref-kearns2020)].

Moreover, plumage sexual dichromatism likely plays a role in hybridization avoidance via reproductive character displacement to facilitate species and mate recognition. For example, in European *Ficedula* flycatchers, female choice selects for divergent male plumage colouration, leading to character displacement between species and populations and reduced rates of hybridization [[24](#ref-alatalo1994)–[26](#ref-laaksonen2015)]. More broadly and across taxa, greater plumage dichromatism is positively correlated with transitions from allopatry to parapatry and increases in geographic range overlaps among passerine sister species pairs [[27](#ref-cooney2017)]. Plumage sexual dichromatism has also been found to be positively associated with species richness among sister species pairs, and dichromatism mainly increases through changes in male plumage [[28](#ref-seddon2013)], suggesting that female choice and male-male competition lead to concurrent changes in male plumage and speciation events. Further, plumage sexual dichromatism is positively associated with greater interspecific plumage colour evolution rate and divergence in *Tyrannida* suboscines [[29](#ref-cooney2019)]. Therefore, plumage sexual dichromatism may be an especially favourable trait to facilitate species and mate recognition when closely-related species have sympatric breeding ranges [[5](#ref-martin2015a),[30](#ref-martin2010)].

True thrushes (genus: *Turdus*) are an exceptionally diverse genus of passerine birds consisting of about ~86 species distributed across the globe (Fig. 1). Plumage sexual dimorphism and migratory behaviors vary substantially between species and have evolved multiple times in thrushes across the world [[31](#ref-clement2000),[32](#ref-nagy2019)]. Interestingly, there have been several documented cases of hybridization in *Turdus* thrushes, and there is a large hybird zone between four *Turdus* species (*T. atrogularis*, *T. eunomus*, *T. naumanni*, *T. ruficollis*) in north-central Asia [[33](#ref-mccarthy2006)], indicating that some sympatric *Turdus* species interbreed. Therefore, the true thrushes are an ideal passerine clade for examining the species recognition hypothesis for plumage sexual dimorphism.

Overall, ecological conditions that increase the time and degree of difficulty in finding a suitable conspecific mate should select for phenotypic traits that reliably signal species and sex identity. Taken together, repeated findings across various bird lineages of greater plumage dichromatism in species that are i) migratory rather than nonmigratory, ii) have shorter breeding seasons, ii) live on mainlands rather than islands, iv) have larger breeding ranges, and v) breed in sympatry with closely-related species suggests that circumstances where rapid species recognition is challenging strongly favour the evolution and maintenance of prominent plumage sexual dichromatism in birds. Here, we test predictions of the species recognition hypothesis for sexually-dimorphic traits. To this end, we evaluate the potential influences of breeding timing, spacing, and sympatry on plumage dichromatism in the *Turdus* thrushes .



Breeding ranges of all recognized *Turdus* species from BirdLife International. Colors indicate the number of *Turdus* thrush species in sympatry with overlapping breeding ranges. Illustrations © HBW Alive/Lynx Edicions

# Methods

## *Plumage sexual dichromatism*

A total of N=77 *Turdus* thrush species (approximately ~89% of all known true thrush species) were sampled for plumage spectral reflectance using prepared bird skin specimens at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City and the Field Museum in Chicago. Reflectance measurements spanning 300-700nm were taken in triplicate from the belly, breast, throat, crown and mantle plumage patches [[34](#ref-andersson2006)] of each individual. N=3 male and N=3 female individuals were measured for most species (exceptions: *T. lawrencii*, N=2 males and N=2 females; *T. swalesi*, N=1 male and N=1 female). Reflectance spectra were measured using a 400 μm fiber optic reflection probe fitted with a rubber stopper to maintain a consistent measuring distance of 3 mm and area of 2 mm2 at a 90° angle to the surface of the feather patch. Measurements were taken using a JAZ spectrometer with a pulsed-xenon light source (Ocean Optics, Dunedin, USA) and we used a diffuse 99% reflectance white standard (Spectralon WS-1-SL, Labsphere, North Sutton NH, USA).

We applied a receptor-noise limited visual model [[35](#ref-vorobyev1998)] of the European Blackbird (*T. merula*) visual system [[36](#ref-hart2000)] in the *pavo* [[37](#ref-maia2019)]⁠ package in R v4.0.0 [[38](#ref-rcoreteam2020)]⁠ to calculate avian-perceived chromatic and achromatic visual contrast (in units of “Just-Noticeable Differences”,or JNDs) of male vs. female plumage patches for all sampled *Turdus* species. Chromatic and achromatic JNDs were calculated for male-female pairs within each species (i.e., N=9 JND values calculated per patch for each species where N=3 males and N=3 females sampled), and then JND values were averaged for each species’ respective plumage patches. Under ideal laboratory conditions, 1 JND is generally considered to be the discriminable threshold past which an observer is predicted to be able to perceive the two colors as different. However, natural light environments vary both spatially and temporally [[39](#ref-endler1993)]⁠, bringing into question the accuracy of a 1 JND threshold for generalizing visual contrast under natural conditions. Therefore, we calculated the total number of sexually-dichromatic plumage patches per species (out of N=5 measured patches) as the number of plumage patches with average JND values > 1, 2, or 3 to account for uncertainty in visual discrimination thresholds due to variation in psychophysical and ambient lighting conditions affecting the strength of between-sex plumage visual contrast [[40](#ref-kemp2015)]⁠. Additionally, we modeled the number of divergent plumage patches (JND >1, 2, and 3) within sexes and between different sympatric species under different levels of breeding range overlap (10% increments between 0-90%, Supplementary Figure 1).

## *Life History Data*

### *Breeding Timing Model*

We collected data on migration behaviour and breeding season length from *Thrushes* [[31](#ref-clement2000)] and the *Handbook of the Birds of the World* [[41](#ref-delhoyo2017)]⁠. We assigned three different kinds of migratory behaviour: 1) *full migration* when a species description clearly stated that a species “migrates”, 2) *partial migration* when a species was described to have “altitudinal migration”, “latitudinal migration” or “movement during non-breeding season”, or 3) *sedentary* when a species was described as “resident” or “sedentary”. Breeding season length was defined as the number of months the species breeds each year.

### *Breeding Sympatry Model*

Species’ breeding ranges were acquired from *BirdLife International* [[42](#X6c896e2b80dd0fca0e8ee32fce3f4251147131f)]⁠. We calculated congener breeding range overlaps (as percentages) using the *letsR* package in R [[43](#ref-vilela2015)]⁠. We then calculated the number of sympatric species as the number of congeners with breeding ranges that overlap >30% with the focal species’ breeding range [[27](#ref-cooney2017)]. Comparisons of the number of sexually-dimorphic plumage patches vs. the number of sympatric species among different breeding range overlap thresholds are provided in Supplementary Figure 2.

### *Breeding Spacing Model*

Species’ breeding range sizes (in km2) were acquired using the *BirdLife International* breeding range maps. Species’ island vs. mainland residence was also determined using breeding ranges from *BirdLife International*. Mainland residence was assigned if the species had a breeding range on any continent and Japan. Island residence was assigned to species having a breeding range limited to a non-continental landmass entirely surrounded by an oceanic body of water.

## *Statistical modeling*

We used phylogenetically-corrected Bayesian multilevel logistic regression models using the *brms* v2.13.0 package [[44](#ref-burkner2017)] in R v4.0.0 [[38](#ref-rcoreteam2020)]⁠ where responses, the number of sexually-dichromatic patches >1, 2, and 3 chromatic and achromatic JNDs, were modelled as binomial trials (N=5 plumage patch “trials”) to test for associations with breeding timing, breeding sympatry and breeding spacing. For all phylogenetically-corrected models, we used the *Turdus* phylogeny from Nylander et al. (2008) [[45](#ref-nylander2008)] to create a covariance matrix of species’ phylogenetic relationships. All models used a dataset of N=67 out of the *Turdus* species for which all the types of data (see above) were available.

Our *breeding timing* models included the following predictors: z-scores of breeding season length (mean-centered by = 5.4 months, and scaled by one standard deviation = 2.3 months), migratory behaviour (no migration as the reference category versus partial or full migration), and their interaction. *Breeding sympatry* models included the number of sympatric species with greater than 30% breeding range overlap as the only predictor of the probability of having a sexually-dichromatic plumage patch. *Breeding spacing* models included transformed breeding range size (km2) and breeding landmass (mainland as the reference category versus island). We also ran null models (intercept only) for all responses. All models’ intercepts and response standard deviations were assigned a weak prior (Student T: df = 3, location = 0, scale = 10), and predictor coefficients were assigned flat priors. We ran each model for 6,000 iterations across 6 chains and assessed Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) convergence using the Gelman-Rubin diagnostic (Rhat) [[46](#ref-gelman2013)]. We then performed k-fold cross-validation [[47](#ref-vehtari2017)] to refit each model *K*=16 times. For each k-fold, the training dataset included a randomly selected set of or N≈63 species, and the testing dataset included or N≈4 species not included in the training dataset. Finally, we compared differences between the models’ expected log pointwise predictive densities (ELPD) to assess which model(s) best predicted the probability of having a sexually-dichromatic plumage patch. [[47](#ref-vehtari2017)]⁠.

Models’ predictor effects were assessed using 90% highest-density intervals of the posterior distributions and probability of direction, the proportion of the posterior distribution that shares the same sign (positive or negative) as the posterior median [[48](#ref-makowski2019)], to provide estimates of the probability of that a predictor has an entirely positive or negative effect on the presence of sexually-dimorphic plumage patches. We assume predictor estimates with a probability of direction ≥ 0.90 to be indicative of a true existence of a predictor’s effect on sexually-dimorphic plumage patches [[48](#ref-makowski2019)].

# Results

## *Avian visual modeling*

Among N=77 *Turdus* species, the following proportion have sexually monomorphic plumage (both achromatic and chromatic metrics): 1.3% (n=1 species) have no sexually-dimorphic patches > 1 JND , 44% (n=34 species) have no dimorphic patches > 2 JND, and 63% (n=49 species) have no dimorphic patches > 3 JND. Conversely,

## *Model comparisons*

We obtained N ≥ 4000 effective posterior samples for each model parameter and all models’ Markov Chains (MCMC) successfully converged (Rhat = 1 for all models’ parameters) (Supplementary Figure 3, 4). All *breeding sympatry*, *breeding timing*, and *breeding spacing* models performed similarly well and substantially better than *intercept only* models in predicting the probability of having a sexually dimorphic plumage patch with achromatic JND values > 1, 2, or 3 (Table 1; all models predicting achromatic plumage patches had ELPD values within 4, following the convention of Burnham and Anderson (2002)[[49](#ref-burnham2002)]). Among models predicting the probability of having a sexually-dichromatic plumage patch with chromatic JND values >1, 2, or 3, all *breeding sympatry*, *breeding timing*, and *breeding spacing* models performed much better than *intercept only* models, and *breeding sympatry* models had the top predictive performance (Table 1; *breeding sympatry* models all have ELPD =0, only the *breeding spacing* models predicting dichromatic plumage patches with had similar predictive performance).

## *Achromatic plumage sexual dimorphism predictors*

All model predictors’ effect estimates are provided as the posterior median odds-ratio (OR) and 90% highest-density interval (HDI) in Table 2. Among predictors of achromatic sexually-dimorphic plumage patches, only predictors included in the *breeding timing* model have predictors with probability of direction (*pd*) values ≥ 0.90 (Table 2). Specifically, longer breeding season length was associated with lower odds of a species having a sexually-dimorphic plumage patch with achromatic JND > 2 (breeding season length, OR [90% HDI] = 0.10 [0.01, 1.1], 89.5% decrease in odds per 2.3-month increase in breeding season) and JND > 3 (breeding season length, OR [90% HDI] = 0.25 [0.03, 1.5], 75% decrease in odds per 2.3-month increase in breeding season). Additionally, full migratory behaviour, rather than no migratory behaviour, was associated with greater odds of a species having a sexually-dimorphic plumage patch with achromatic JND > 1 (full migration, OR [90% HDI] = 4.97 [0.95, 24.4]), JND > 2 (full migration, OR [90% HDI] = 66.5 [3.2, 1802.4]) and JND > 3 (OR [90% HDI] = 22.3 [1.6, 307.9]). Finally, both full and partial migratory behaviour, rather than no migration behaviour, in conjunction with longer breeding season lengths are associated with greater odds of a species having a sexually-dimorphic plumage patch with achromatic JND > 1 (breeding season length x full migration, OR [90% HDI] = 4.84 [0.67, 39.6]), JND > 2 (breeding season length x full migration, OR = 66.3 [0.59, 11415.7]; breeding season length x partial migration, OR [90% HDI] = 20.7 [0.9, 589.1]) and JND > 3 (breeding season length x partial migration, OR [90% HDI] = 8.28 [0.76, 109.1]).

## *Chromatic plumage sexual dimorphism predictors*

Among predictors of *breeding timing* models predicting chromatic sexually-dimorphic plumage patches, longer breeding season length was associated with lower odds of a species having a plumage patch with chromatic JND > 2 (OR [90% HDI] = 0.14 [0.01, 1.42], 86% reduction in odds per 2.3 month increase in breeding season), and both full and partial migratory behaviour rather than no migration are associated with greater odds of a species having a plumage patch JND > 1 (partial migration, OR [90% HDI] = 2.2 [0.94, 4.9]), JND > 2 (full migration, OR [90% HDI] = 80.51 [2.8, 3432.9]) and JND > 3 (partial migration, OR [90% HDI] = 71.2 [0.32, 59062.9]; full migration, OR [90% HDI] = 234.7 [ 0.51, 300382.6]). For *breeding spacing models*, island residency rather than mainland residency was associated with lower odds of having a plumage patch > 1 chromatic JND (island, OR [90% HDI] = 0.27 [0.09, 0.89]). Finally, more *Turdus* species in sympatry was associated with higher odds of a species having a chromatic plumage patch with JND > 1 (number of sympatric species, OR [90% HDI] = 1.4 [1.18, 1.67], 40% increase in odds per each additional sympatic species), JND > 2 (sympatric species, OR [90% HDI] = 1.59 [1.01, 2.52], 59% increase in odds per each additional sympatric species), and JND > 3 (sympatric species, OR [90% HDI] = 2.11 [1.03, 4.46], 111% increase in odds per each additional sympatric species).

# Discussion

Our results yield observational evidence in support the species recognition hypothesis for plumage sexual dimorphism in true thrushes. We found that the odds of plumage sexual dimorphism are much greater for *Turdus* thrush species that have full or partial migration rather than no migration, have relatively short breeding seasons, and are in sympatry with many other congeneric species (Table 1,2). Further, we determined that sympatric species have distinguishable plumage coloration differences from one when measuring plumage appearance from the avian visual perspective (Supplementary Figure 1). Our results align with broader comparative studies of plumage sexual dimorphism where strong associations between migratory behavior [[10](#ref-dale2015)] and sympatry [[27](#ref-cooney2017)] were found among many species of different passerine families.

Our study does not consider differences in song, an important behavioral trait also used in avian mate choice and recognition [[50](#ref-qvarnstrom2006),[51](#ref-freeman2017)]. However, because plumage coloration is more static than song, it is likely a more reliable signal for species recognition under many circumstances, especially in breeding range locations where closely-related heterospecifics are in high sympatry [[52](#ref-emlen1975)–[54](#ref-uy2009)].

Other studies have found that closely-related species tend to have more similar plumage appearance than expected if plumage coloration had evolved to facilitate species recognition via reproductive character displacement [[55](#ref-simpson2020),[56](#ref-miller2019)], and attribute the lack of major plumage color divergence in sympatric species to constraints of a shared light environment [[57](#ref-mcnaught2002)]. Greater similarity in appearance between highly sympatric closely-related heterospecifics versus allopatric heterospecifics is expected assuming sympatric species share similar light environment constraints and natural selection pressures (e.g., predators, parasites, and weather). Despite greater similarity in plumage appearance in comparison to allopatric species, closely-related sympatric species can still have substantially different achromatic or chromatic plumage appearances when measuring plumage coloration differences from the avian visual perspective as we have in our analyses.

accounting for avian vision and differences in achromatic and chromatic differences in plumage appearance

# Conclusions

# Acknowledgements

# References

1. Andersson M. 1994 Species Recognition, Sexual Selection, and Speciation. In *Sexual Selection*, pp. 207–226. Princeton University Press. (doi:[10.2307/j.ctvs32s1x.13](https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvs32s1x.13))

2. Gröning J, Hochkirch A. 2008 Reproductive Interference Between Animal Species. *The Quarterly Review of Biology* **83**, 257–282. (doi:[10.1086/590510](https://doi.org/10.1086/590510))

3. Pfennig KS, Hurlbert AH. 2012 Heterospecific interactions and the proliferation of sexually dimorphic traits. *Current Zoology* **58**, 453–462. (doi:[10.1093/czoolo/58.3.453](https://doi.org/10.1093/czoolo/58.3.453))

4. West-Eberhard MJ. 1983 Sexual Selection, Social Competition, and Speciation. *The Quarterly Review of Biology* **58**, 155–183. (doi:[10.1086/413215](https://doi.org/10.1086/413215))

5. Martin PR, Montgomerie R, Lougheed SC. 2015 Color Patterns of Closely Related Bird Species Are More Divergent at Intermediate Levels of Breeding-Range Sympatry. *The American Naturalist* **185**, 443–451. (doi:[10.1086/680206](https://doi.org/10.1086/680206))

6. Bitton P-P, Doucet SM. 2016 Sympatric black-headed and elegant trogons focus on different plumage characteristics for species recognition. *Animal Behaviour* **116**, 213–221. (doi:[10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.03.035](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.03.035))

7. Martin TE, Badyaev AV. 1996 Sexual Dichromatism in Birds: Importance of Nest Predation and Nest Location for Females Versus Males. *Evolution* **50**, 2454–2460. (doi:[10.2307/2410712](https://doi.org/10.2307/2410712))

8. Burns KJ. 1998 A Phylogenetic Perspective on the Evolution of Sexual Dichromatism in Tanagers (thraupidae): The Role of Female Versus Male Plumage. *Evolution* **52**, 1219–1224. (doi:[10.1111/j.1558-5646.1998.tb01849.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.1998.tb01849.x))

9. Badyaev AV, Hill GE. 2003 Avian Sexual Dichromatism in Relation to Phylogeny and Ecology. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* **34**, 27–49. (doi:[10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.34.011802.132441](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.34.011802.132441))

10. Dale J, Dey C, Delhey K, Kempenaers B, Valcu M. 2015 The effects of life-history and social selection on male and female plumage coloration. *Nature* **000**, 1–17. (doi:[10.1038/nature15509](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature15509))

11. Dunn PO, Armenta JK, Whittingham LA. 2015 Natural and sexual selection act on different axes of variation in avian plumage color. *Science Advances* **1**, e1400155. (doi:[10.1126/sciadv.1400155](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1400155))

12. Hawkins GL, Hill GE, Mercadante A. 2012 Delayed plumage maturation and delayed reproductive investment in birds. *Biological Reviews* **87**, 257–274. (doi:[10.1111/j.1469-185X.2011.00193.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2011.00193.x))

13. Hamilton TH. 1961 On the Functions and Causes of Sexual Dimorphism in Breeding Plumage Characters of North American Species of Warblers and Orioles. *The American Naturalist* **45**, 64–73. (doi:[10.1086/282167](https://doi.org/10.1086/282167))

14. Saetre G-P, Slagsvold T. 1992 Evidence for sex recognition from plumage colour by the pied flycatcher, Ficedula hypoleuca. *Animal Behaviour* **44**, 293–299. (doi:[10.1016/0003-3472(92)90035-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-3472(92)90035-8))

15. Friedman NR, Hofmann CM, Kondo B, Omland KE. 2009 Correlated evolution of migration and sexual dichromatism in the new world orioles (Icterus). *Evolution* **63**, 3269–3274. (doi:[10.1111/j.1558-5646.2009.00792.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2009.00792.x))

16. Simpson RK, Johnson MA, Murphy TG. 2015 Migration and the evolution of sexual dichromatism: Evolutionary loss of female coloration with migration among wood-warblers. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **282**, 20150375. (doi:[10.1098/rspb.2015.0375](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.0375))

17. Matysioková B, Remeš V, Cockburn A. 2017 Broad-scale variation in sexual dichromatism in songbirds is not explained by sex differences in exposure to predators during incubation. *Journal of Avian Biology* **48**, 1322–1330. (doi:[10.1111/jav.01144](https://doi.org/10.1111/jav.01144))

18. Badyaev AV, Ghalambor CK. 1998 Does a Trade-Off Exist between Sexual Ornamentation and Ecological Plasticity? Sexual Dichromatism and Occupied Elevational Range in Finches. *Oikos* **82**, 319–324. (doi:[10.2307/3546972](https://doi.org/10.2307/3546972))

19. Figuerola J, Green AJ. 2000 The evolution of sexual dimorphism in relation to mating patterns, cavity nesting, insularity and sympatry in the Anseriformes. *Functional Ecology* **14**, 701–710. (doi:[10.1046/j.1365-2435.2000.00474.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2435.2000.00474.x))

20. Tobias JA, Seddon N. 2009 Sexual selection and ecological generalism are correlated in antbirds. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **22**, 623–636. (doi:[10.1111/j.1420-9101.2008.01678.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2008.01678.x))

21. Roulin A, Salamin N. 2010 Insularity and the evolution of melanism, sexual dichromatism and body size in the worldwide-distributed barn owl. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **23**, 925–934. (doi:[10.1111/j.1420-9101.2010.01961.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2010.01961.x))

22. Doutrelant C, Paquet M, Renoult JP, Grégoire A, Crochet P-A, Covas R. 2016 Worldwide patterns of bird colouration on islands. *Ecology Letters* **19**, 537–545. (doi:[10.1111/ele.12588](https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12588))

23. Kearns AM, Joseph L, Austin JJ, Driskell AC, Omland KE. 2020 Complex mosaic of sexual dichromatism and monochromatism in Pacific robins results from both gains and losses of elaborate coloration. *Journal of Avian Biology* **51**. (doi:[10.1111/jav.02404](https://doi.org/10.1111/jav.02404))

24. Alatalo RV, Gustafsson L, Lundberg A. 1994 Male coloration and species recognition in sympatric flycatchers. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* **256**, 113–118. (doi:[10.1098/rspb.1994.0057](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1994.0057))

25. Saetre G-P, Moum T, Bureš S, Král M, Adamjan M, Moreno J. 1997 A sexually selected character displacement in flycatchers reinforces premating isolation. *Nature* **387**, 589–592. (doi:[10.1038/42451](https://doi.org/10.1038/42451))

26. Laaksonen T *et al.* 2015 Sympatric divergence and clinal variation in multiple coloration traits of Ficedula flycatchers. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **28**, 779–790. (doi:[10.1111/jeb.12604](https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.12604))

27. Cooney CR, Tobias JA, Weir JT, Botero CA, Seddon N. 2017 Sexual selection, speciation and constraints on geographical range overlap in birds. *Ecology Letters* **20**, 863–871. (doi:[10.1111/ele.12780](https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12780))

28. Seddon N *et al.* 2013 Sexual selection accelerates signal evolution during speciation in birds. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **280**, 20131065. (doi:[10.1098/rspb.2013.1065](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.1065))

29. Cooney CR, Varley ZK, Nouri LO, Moody CJA, Jardine MD, Thomas GH. 2019 Sexual selection predicts the rate and direction of colour divergence in a large avian radiation. *Nature Communications* **10**, 1773. (doi:[10.1038/s41467-019-09859-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09859-7))

30. Martin PR, Montgomerie R, Lougheed SC. 2010 Rapid Sympatry Explains Greater Color Pattern Divergence in High Latitude Birds. *Evolution* **64**, 336–347. (doi:[10.1111/j.1558-5646.2009.00831.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2009.00831.x))

31. Clement P, Hathway R. 2000 *Thrushes*. London: A&C Black Publishers Ltd.

32. Nagy J, Végvári Z, Varga Z. 2019 Phylogeny, migration and life history: Filling the gaps in the origin and biogeography of the Turdus thrushes. *Journal of Ornithology* **160**, 529–543. (doi:[10.1007/s10336-019-01632-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10336-019-01632-3))

33. McCarthy EM. 2006 *Handbook of avian hybrids of the world*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

34. Andersson S, Prager M. 2006 Quantifying Colors. In *Bird coloration, Volume 1: Mechanisms and Measurements* (eds GE Hill, KJ McGraw), pp. 76–77. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

35. Vorobyev M, Osorio D. 1998 Receptor noise as a determinant of colour thresholds. *Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society* **265**, 351–8. (doi:[10.1098/rspb.1998.0302](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1998.0302))

36. Hart NS, Partridge JC, Cuthill IC, Bennett AT. 2000 Visual pigments, oil droplets, ocular media and cone photoreceptor distribution in two species of passerine bird: The blue tit (Parus caeruleus L.) And the blackbird (Turdus merula L.). *Journal of comparative physiology. A, Sensory, neural, and behavioral physiology* **186**, 375–387. (doi:[10.1007/s003590050437](https://doi.org/10.1007/s003590050437))

37. Maia R, Gruson H, Endler JA, White TE. 2019 Pavo 2: New tools for the spectral and spatial analysis of colour in r. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **10**, 1097–1107. (doi:[10.1111/2041-210X.13174](https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13174))

38. R Core Team. 2020 *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

39. Endler JA. 1993 The Color of Light in Forests and Its Implications. *Ecological Monographs* **63**, 1–27. (doi:[10.2307/2937121](https://doi.org/10.2307/2937121))

40. Kemp DJ, Herberstein ME, Fleishman LJ, Endler JA, Bennett ATD, Dyer AG, Hart NS, Marshall J, Whiting MJ. 2015 An Integrative Framework for the Appraisal of Coloration in Nature. *The American Naturalist* **185**, 705–724. (doi:[10.1086/681021](https://doi.org/10.1086/681021))

41. del Hoyo J, Elliott A, Sargatal J, Christie DA, de Juana E. 2017 *Handbook of the birds of the world alive*.

42. BirdLife International and Handbook of the Birds of the World. 2018 *Bird species distribution maps of the world. Version 2018.1.*

43. Vilela B, Villalobos F. 2015 letsR: A new R package for data handling and analysis in macroecology. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **6**, 1229–1234. (doi:[10.1111/2041-210X.12401](https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12401))

44. Bürkner PC. 2017 Brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *Journal of Statistical Software* **80**, 1–28. (doi:[10.18637/jss.v080.i01](https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v080.i01))

45. Nylander JAA, Olsson U, Alström P, Sanmartín I. 2008 Accounting for phylogenetic uncertainty in biogeography: A bayesian approach to dispersal-vicariance analysis of the thrushes (Aves: Turdus). *Systematic Biology* **57**, 257–268. (doi:[10.1080/10635150802044003](https://doi.org/10.1080/10635150802044003))

46. Gelman A, Carlin JB, Stern HS, Dunson DB, Vehtari A, Rubin DB. 2013 *Bayesian data analysis, third edition*. Third. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press. (doi:[10.1201/b16018](https://doi.org/10.1201/b16018))

47. Vehtari A, Gelman A, Gabry J. 2017 Practical Bayesian model evaluation using leave-one-out cross-validation and WAIC. *Statistics and Computing* **27**, 1413–1432. (doi:[10.1007/s11222-016-9696-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11222-016-9696-4))

48. Makowski D, Ben-Shachar MS, Chen SHA, Lüdecke D. 2019 Indices of Effect Existence and Significance in the Bayesian Framework. *Frontiers in Psychology* **10**. (doi:[10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02767](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02767))

49. Burnham KP, Anderson DR. 2002 *Model selection and multimodel inference: A practical information-theoretic approach*. 2nd ed. New York: Springer.

50. Qvarnström A, Haavie J, Sæther SA, Eriksson D, Pärt T. 2006 Song similarity predicts hybridization in flycatchers. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **19**, 1202–1209. (doi:[10.1111/j.1420-9101.2006.01140.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2006.01140.x))

51. Freeman BG, Montgomery GA. 2017 Using song playback experiments to measure species recognition between geographically isolated populations: A comparison with acoustic trait analyses. *The Auk* **134**, 857–870. (doi:[10.1642/AUK-17-63.1](https://doi.org/10.1642/AUK-17-63.1))

52. Emlen ST, Rising JD, Thompson WL. 1975 A BEHAVIORAL AND MORPHOLOGICAL STUDY OF SYMPATRY IN THE INDIGO AND LAZULI BUNTINGS OF THE GREAT PLAINS. *THE WILSON BULLETIN* **87**, 36.

53. Baker MC, Baker AEM. 1990 Reproductive Behavior of Female Buntings: Isolating Mechanisms in a Hybridizing Pair of Species. *Evolution* **44**, 332–338. (doi:[10.1111/j.1558-5646.1990.tb05202.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.1990.tb05202.x))

54. Uy JAC, Moyle RG, Filardi CE, Cheviron ZA. 2009 Difference in plumage color used in species recognition between incipient species is linked to a single amino acid substitution in the melanocortin-1 receptor. *American Naturalist* **174**, 244–254. (doi:[10.1086/600084](https://doi.org/10.1086/600084))

55. Simpson RK, Mistakidis AF, Doucet SM. 2020 Natural and sexual selection shape the evolution of colour and conspicuousness in North American wood-warblers (Parulidae). *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **130**, 89–100. (doi:[10.1093/biolinnean/blaa015](https://doi.org/10.1093/biolinnean/blaa015))

56. Miller ET, Leighton GM, Freeman BG, Lees AC, Ligon RA. 2019 Ecological and geographical overlap drive plumage evolution and mimicry in woodpeckers. *Nature Communications* **10**, 1602. (doi:[10.1038/s41467-019-09721-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09721-w))

57. McNaught MK, Owens IPF. 2002 Interspecific variation in plumage colour among birds: Species recognition or light environment? *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **15**, 505–514. (doi:[10.1046/j.1420-9101.2002.00431.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1420-9101.2002.00431.x))