# Individual variation in thermal plasticity and its impact on energetic scaling

Fonti Kar1, Shinichi Nakagawa1,2, Christopher R Friesen3, Daniel W.A. Noble1,2,4

1 *School of Biological Earth and Environmental Sciences, Ecology and Evolution Research Centre, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia*

2 *Diabetes and Metabolism Division, Garvan Institute of Medical Research, 384 Victoria Street, Darlinghurst, Sydney, NSW 2010, Australia*

3 *School of Earth, Atmospheric and Life Sciences, Faculty of Science, Medicine and Health, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, NSW, Australia*

4 Division of *Ecology and Evolution, Research School of Biology, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia*

Corresponding author: Fonti Kar

Correspondence email: [fonti.kar@gmail.com](mailto:fonti.kar@gmail.com)

# Abstract

1. There is a long-held belief that its relationship with body mass (mass scaling) and temperature (temperature scaling) is remarkably similar across large taxonomic scales. Individuals’ metabolic rate may show different plastic responses to temperature (metabolic thermal plasticity) affecting mass scaling at the individual level.
2. This can impact scaling patterns across populations and species but this has rarely been considered before and whether individuals consistently differ in their metabolic thermal plasticity is not well understood.
3. To characterise the repeatability of metabolic thermal plasticity and to identify the patterns of phenotypic correlations of metabolic rate at different temperatures (cross-temperature correlations), we repeatedly measured individual metabolic rates across a temperature gradient in an ectotherm model (*Lampropholis delicata* – the delicate skink). We also explored mass-scaling both at the within- and among-individual levels and whether mass scaling changed with temperature.
4. Making use of both the ‘function-valued’ and ‘character-state’ approaches, we found that thermal plasticity of metabolic rate were significantly repeatable. We also show that repeatability of metabolic rate increased as a function of temperature, which was associated with individuals responding more predictably (a decrease in within-individual variance) at higher temperatures. We found significant differences in mass scaling between the among- and within- individual levels but they did not change with temperature. Cross-temperature correlations in metabolic rate differed between the two modelling approaches and revealed different implications on how thermal plasticity may evolve by natural selection.
5. Our work suggests that metabolic thermal plasticity has the capacity to respond to selection, which has crucial implications for animals coping with rapid temperature changes. Moreover, we show that the mass scaling is not the same at the within- and among-individual levels, therefore studies using the predictive power of metabolic scaling relationships should bear in mind the different levels of variation.

# Keywords


Phenotypic plasticity, reaction norm, thermal sensitivity, repeatability

# Introduction

All biological processes hinges on the availability of energy. Resting metabolic rate represents an individual’s ‘energetic overhead’. It restricts how much energy is allocated to competing processes such as growth, reproduction and maintenance (De Jong & Van Noordwijk 1992; Biro & Stamps 2008). An individual’s metabolic rate also contributes to the flow of energy, biomass, and nutrients in the population, community and ecosystems (Allen, Gillooly & Brown 2005; Barneche *et al.* 2014). Resting metabolic rate can vary several-fold among individuals and is likely to be targeted by natural selection. Metabolic rate has been shown to be important for fitness and survival due to its strong links performance, behaviour and life-history traits (Réale *et al.* 2010; Ricklefs & Wikelski 2002; Friesen, Johansson & Olsson 2017; Malishev, Bull & Kearney 2017). For example, tropical birds tend to have low basal metabolic rate, produce fewer slow-growing offspring and have longer lifespans relative to their temperate-region counterparts (Wiersma *et al.* 2007; Williams *et al.* 2010). Given its ecological and evolutionary significance, there is growing interest in understanding how metabolic changes with body mass and temperature (Norin, Malte & Clark 2016, Pettersen, White & Marshall 2016).

Body mass is a key determinant of metabolic rate. Numerous studies have found that metabolic rate covaries body mass (mass scaling) in a similar manner which suggests that there is commonality in the processes that govern mass scaling patterns. This sparked the development of metabolic theories that attempt to unify large-scale ecological processes based on metabolic processes at the individual level (Brown *et al.* 2004). According to this body of work, metabolic rate exhibits a ‘fixed’ power function with body mass with the form of metabolic rate = *a* mass*b*, where *a* is normalization constant and *b* is the mass scaling exponent (Gillooly *et al.* 2001; Brown *et al.* 2004). The mass scaling exponent has been purported to be ‘universally’ 0.75 but this remains contentious in the field (i.e. ¾ power law, Glazier 2005). Such generalisation may be overly simplistic given that physiological mechanisms that determine how metabolic rate changes with body mass and temperature at the individual level are highly complex and plastic (Glazier 2005; White & Kearney 2012). For example, many explanations for an ‘universal’ mass-scaling exponent are based on the assumption that supply of macronutrients to the metabolic machinery is constant, but this is known to vary among individuals (Speakman *et al.* 2004; Steyermark 2005; Metcalfe 2005).

Mass scaling exponents are influenced by numerous factors, challenging the ‘one-size-fits-all’ line of thinking. Accumulating evidence shows that mass scaling exponents are inconsistent among vertebrate taxa (Uyeda *et al.* 2017), populations of the same species (Burton *et al.* 2011) and even among individuals of the same population (Norin & Gamperl 2018). Variation in mass scaling exponents may have some biological basis, but they may also be erroneously extrapolated from lower levels of biological organisation (van de Pol, 2009). For example, processes governing metabolic rate within individuals can influence among-individual mass scaling that can ultimately carry-over to patterns observed at the population level (Fig. 1). If the goal of metabolic theories is to use metabolic scaling as a means to understand and predict ecological processes across large scales (Glazier 2015), it is in our best interest to account for and model hierarchical variation in metabolic rate and body mass. While the mechanisms driving variability in mass scaling exponents is still debated, processes that determine the relationship between metabolic rate and temperature at individual level may provide important insight.



**Figure 1** – Diagram representing the hierarchical organisation of log metabolic rate and log body mass data (mass scaling) of two populations, illustrating that mass-scaling exponents can vary depending on the level of interest. The large dots represent the mean log metabolic rate and mean log body mass of each population. The small dots represent the mean log metabolic rate and mean log body mass for one individual in the sample of each population. The black line represents the metabolic scaling relationship across the populations, the coloured lines represent the scaling relationship within each population. The top 'magnified' box shows the relationship of metabolic rate with temperature of three individuals (metabolic thermal plasticity). The bottom ‘magnified’ box shows the mass scaling relationship of one individual, that could erroneously be attributed to higher levels if not properly modelled.

Temperature impacts metabolism by altering the rate of biochemical processes. Based on first principles of chemistry and physics, metabolic rate is expected to scale with temperature following a logarithmic relationship (temperature scaling) (Gillooly *et al.* 2001). However, temperature scaling neglects to consider physiological mechanisms that alters how individuals responds to temperature (Fig. 1). At the individual level, temperature-induced changes in metabolic rate (metabolic thermal plasticity) is depicted by a ‘reaction norm’ and the shape of the reaction norm describes the sensitivity of metabolic rate, which is somewhat conceptually similar to temperature scaling (Fig. 1). Individuals of the same mass can differ in membrane composition (Hulbert *et al.* 2007), enzyme structure and function

(Somero 1978) and mitochondrial capacity (Salin *et al.* 2012) which affects the shape of the reaction norm. Metabolic thermal plasticity can thus contribute to variability in mass scaling exponents, but this rarely considered in theoretical and empirical studies (Uyeda *et al.* 2017).

Currently it is unclear whether individuals show consistently differ in metabolic thermal plasticity. Consistent inter-individual variation is represented as repeatability (the proportion of phenotypic variation that is attributed to individual differences; Nakagawa & Schielzeth 2010) and has important evolutionary consequences because it is the raw material on which natural selection acts. While it is established that metabolic rate is a heritable and repeatable trait (reviewed in Nespolo & Franco 2007; White, Schimpf & Cassey 2013; Auer *et al.* 2016), consistent variation in metabolic thermal plasticity has only been reported in a few species (Briga & Verhulst 2017; Careau, Gifford & Biro 2014b). Characterising repeatability in reaction norms is logistically tedious but fundamental in understanding the capacity for plasticity itself to evolve. Repeated measures of metabolic thermal plasticity over an ecologically relevant duration may be important for metabolic scaling studies because body mass and metabolic rate tend to be measured only once making these studies susceptible to sampling variability.

An additional challenge in quantifying the repeatability of metabolic thermal plasticity is that there are multiple ways in which plasticity can be statistically modelled (Arnold, Kruuk, Nicotra 2019). Broadly speaking, two approaches to modelling plasticity are prevalent in evolutionary biology (Via *et al.* 1995; Hunt 2014). Character-state models considers phenotypic change in a set of environments as discrete ‘states’ or categories. Selection processes act on variability in ‘character-states’ in each environment independently. In contrast, the function-valued approach (also known as ‘polynomial’ approach, Via *et al.* 1995), describes changes in a trait across an environmental gradient using parameters of a mathematical function. In this circumstance, the model parameters (e.g. intercept and slope) are the main targets of selection. Granted that the same phenotypic trait measured in multiple environments are inherently correlated, this may give rise to evolutionary constraints on how the reaction norm can be moulded (Falconer 1952). Non-zero correlations between ‘states’ in different environments, and between the intercept and slope can dictate the extent to which these must evolve in tandem (Hunt 2014). While the conceptual differences between the modelling approaches have sparked debates, both approaches can contribute to our understanding on how the shape of reaction norms can evolve. To the best of our knowledge, no study has assessed the merits of both approaches in understanding individual variation in reaction norms.

Here we examine how individuals vary in their resting metabolic rate (RMR) in relation to body size and temperature using an ectotherm model, the delicate skink (*Lampropholis delicata*). We take advantage of both function-valued and character state models to answer four questions to better understand whether thermal plasticity of metabolic rate (i.e. temperature scaling) has the capacity to undergo selection, and whether mass scaling is invariant at different hierarchical levels. We ask (1) Do individuals’ metabolic rate consistently differ in their plastic responses to temperature (i.e. thermal plasticity) over time? (2) What are the cross-environment correlations of metabolic rates between different temperatures? (3) Does among-individual mass scaling exponents change when variation at the within- individual level is partitioned? (Fig. 1) (4) Does mass-scaling exponents change with temperature?

# Materials and Methods

## Lizard collection and husbandry

Between 28 August and 8 September 2015, forty-two male *L. delicata* were collected from two sites near Sydney, Australia. Lizards were caught by hand or by mealworm fishing and were transported individually in calico bags in an ice-cooler to Macquarie University. Lizards were housed in a temperature-controlled room set at 26ºC and were provided with a thermal gradient to allow thermoregulation. Each lizard was kept individually in an opaque plastic enclosure measuring 35cm x 25cm x 15cm (L x W x H). Each enclosure was lined with newspaper and lizards were given access to a water bowl and tree bark as a refuge. Enclosures were placed under UV light (11L:13D). Lizards were fed three to four small crickets (*Acheta domestica*) dusted with calcium powder and multi-vitamin every two days when metabolism measurements were not taking place. Animal collection was approved by the New South Wales National Parks and Wildlife Service (SL101549) and procedures were approved by the Macquarie University Ethics committee (ARA 2015/015) and University of New South Wales Animal Care and Ethics committee (ACEC 15/51A).

## Quantifying metabolic reaction norms

Closed-system respirometry assays were conducted between 26 December 2016 - 19 March 2017. We measured resting metabolic rate (RMR) as CO2 production per unit time ( mL min-1). RMR is the metabolic rate of animals at a given temperature (usually its preferred body temperature) in a resting, post-absorptive state but also includes energetic costs of random activity that we were not able to completely control for (Withers 1992). Due to logistical constraints, lizards were randomly assigned to one of two blocks for metabolism measurements (block 1: n = 23, block 2: n = 22). We used two incubators (LabWit, ZXSD-R1090) to precisely control the ambient temperature at which measurements were taken (+/- 1ºC). Measurements were taken between 22ºC – 32ºC at 2ºC increments over a three days (measurements at two temperatures per day) and were repeated every 10 days (10 sampling sessions in total). In order to account for carry over effects of extreme temperatures experienced by an individual on subsequent metabolic measurements at other temperatures, the temperature order was randomly allocated (using the sample function in R) to the incubators across the three days, for each sampling session.

After a minimum of a 24 hour fast, the body temperature of each individual inside their enclosure was taken using an infrared laser gun (Stanley stht0-77365) in the morning (~06:00). Each lizard was gently encouraged into their 146mL opaque chamber and then weighed using a digital scale to the nearest 0.01g (Ohaus SP-202). The chambers were placed inside the incubators in the dark at a predetermined temperature for 30 minutes. The lids of the chambers were left ajar during this habituation period to minimise CO2 build up. After 30 minutes, each chamber was flushed with fresh air and sealed. A 3 mL air sample was taken via a two-way valve to account for any residual CO2 that was not flushed from the chambers. The chambers were left in the incubator at the set temperature for animals to respire. After 90 minutes, two 3mL air samples were taken from each chamber before they were reopened to flush with fresh air and placed back into the incubator for the next measurement temperature following the same procedure.

All air samples were injected into the inlet line of a Sables System FMS (Las Vegas NV, USA) with the flow rate set to 200 mL min-1 to measure *.* Water vapour was scrubbed from the inlet air with Drierite. Output peaks were integrated using WartHog Systems LabAnalyst software to calculate the percentage of CO2 (Mark Chappell, Regents of University of California). The rate of CO2 produced by an individual was calculated as following Lighton (2008):

Eqn: 1

where:

%CO2 is the percentage of CO2 in air sample, which was corrected by subtracting any ‘residual’ CO2 from the initial flush from the larger of the two air samples;

Vchamber is the volume of the chamber (146mL);

Vlizard is the volume of the lizard, assuming that the mass of the lizard is the same as its volume, and;

*t* is the duration of time in minutes after where the chamber has been sealed and the first air sample was taken (90 minutes).

## Statistical analyses

All statistical analyses were conducted using ‘R’ (v 3.31, Core Team 2013). We used a dataset of 2418 observations. For more details on data cleaning see electronic supplementary materials (ESM). All data and code with which to generate our results are openly available via the Open Science Framework (see Data Accessibility).

In all our models, is log-transformed. Collinearity between our predictor variables were checked using a scatterplot matrix (Fig. S1) and Pearson correlation coefficients are presented in Table S2. Initial analyses show that there were no differences in log2 between blocks of lizards or incubators, therefore these parameters were not included in our final models (see ESM for these analysis). Although lizards were kept in a temperature-controlled room, there may still have been temperature differences between enclosures that, due to acclimation, had carry-over effects on metabolic rate. We therefore tested whether the previous measurement temperature or body temperature measured in home enclosure influenced log at subsequent temperatures. We found that the model containing ‘previous temperature experience’ as a covariate was better supported compared to a model without it (wAIC (Full model – reduced model) = -4.73 and loo = -4.73), we therefore included ‘previous temperature experience’ in all subsequent analyses (Table S1).

We made use of Bayesian generalised linear mixed models (LMM) from either the R package ‘brms’ (v 2.3.1, Bürkner 2017) or ‘MCMCglmm' (v 2.25, Hadfield 2010). For every model, we pooled the posterior estimates for multiple chains. For ‘brms’ models, we used default priors and ran 4 chains of 2000 iterations with a burn in of 1000 and a thinning interval of 1. For ‘MCMCglmm’ models, we used uninformative, parameter expanded priors to assist with model convergence (Hadfield 2010). We ran 3 chains of 7,510,000 iterations with a burn in of 10000 and a thinning interval of 5000 for our ‘MCMCglmm’ models. All models were checked for proper mixing and convergence by visually inspecting trace plots and ensuring scale reduction factors were smaller than 1.1. We also checked that our chains were not autocorrelated. We present pooled posterior means and their 95% credible intervals. Below, we present our model structures following O'Hara (2009).

## Repeatability of thermal reaction norms

We used function-valued and character state approaches to quantify the repeatability of thermal reaction norms in metabolism to determine whether they differed consistently among individuals. All function-valued models were run using ‘MCMCglmm’, while the one character-state model was run using ‘brms’. In all our repeatability models, metabolic rate and temperature were log-transformed, body mass was first log-transformed and then z-transformed (mean of 0 and sd of 1).

## Reaction norm intercept – average metabolic response at each temperature

Repeatable reaction norm intercepts indicate that individuals’ average metabolic rate vary consistently at a particular temperature. Typically, the intercept represents the average trait value when *x* = 0 (i.e. log temperature = 0). We compared three methods of calculating adjusted repeatability of the intercept (hereafter referred to as ‘repeatability’, Nakagawa & Schielzeth 2010).

## Function-valued methods

The first function-valued method involves shifting the mean to set the intercept at each of the six temperatures. We fitted six models, each centered on a different temperature with the following structure,

log ~ logTempcen + zlogBodyMass + logPriorTemp + (1+ logTempcen | ID) + (1+ logTempcen | seriesID)

where:

log is log-transformed ;

logTempcen is the mean-centered log temperature in degrees Celsius at a given measurement temperature so that the intercept represents the average response at given log measurement temperature;

zlogBodyMass is log-transformed body mass that is then subsequently z-transformed;

logPriorTemp is log-transformed previous temperature.

Individual ID was included as a random intercept. Given that metabolic rate of the same individual can change throughout the ten sampling sessions of the experiment, we also included ‘series ID’ as a random intercept. This categorical variable denotes a unique combination of individual IDs and the sampling session IDs and is assigned to every measurement that pertains to a given individual in a given sampling session. For example, if ID001 was measured at six temperatures in session five, then its six measurements would be assigned the series ID of ID005\_session5. For further explanation, see provided code and Araya-Ajoy, Mathot & Dingemanse (2015). logTempcen was fitted as random slopes for Individual ID and series ID.

Repeatability of the intercept at each measurement temperature (equation 2) as well as, ‘short term’ (equation 3) and ‘long term’ (equation 4) repeatability was calculated according to Araya-Ajoy *et al.* 2015 to assess how repeatability of the intercept changed over the course of our study.

Equation 2:

where:

is the repeatability estimate for logat a particular temperature;

*Vind0* is the individual intercept;

*Vseries0* is the series intercept;

*Ve0* is the residual variance.

‘Short-term’ repeatability can be interpreted as among-individual variation that includes both intrinsic differences among individuals as well as the effects of the sampling session. In contrast, ‘long-term’ repeatability is a more conservative measure and represents repeatability in the classical sense, where phenotypic variation due sampling session is a part of the total pool of variation in the data (i.e. in the denominator of the calculation, Nakagawa & Schielzeth 2010).

The second function-valued method requires deriving ‘conditional’ repeatability of intercepts at each temperature from the covariance of the intercept and slope (Singer & Willett 2003 and Briffa, Bridger & Biro 2013). We therefore fitted a model that had the following structure,

log ~ logTemp + zlogBodyMass + logPriorTemp + sessionID +(1+ logTemp| ID)

where: sessionID is the sampling session when measurements took place.

To the best of our knowledge, the method to derive ‘conditional’ repeatability has not been extended to multiple random effects, therefore session was included as a fixed predictor, as opposed to using ‘series ID’ as a random effect.

Temperature-specific repeatability estimates were derived using equation 6,

Equation 6:

where *Covind0,ind1* is the covariance of the individual intercepts and individual slopes;

*T* is the measurement temperature at which repeatability is estimated.

## Character-state methods

The final method to calculate temperature-specific repeatability uses the character-state method described by Hunt 2014 (see also Houslay 2017). This approach assumes variation of log at each temperature are ‘distinct’ categorical traits that are correlated. We treated log measured at each temperature as a 6 x 6 response matrix.

~ zlogBodyMass + logPriorTemp + (1|ID) + (1|sessionID)

where, is the metabolic rate for individual 1 in sampling session 1 at 22ºC and so forth.

Note that temperature is no longer a predictor as this is now part of the response. We also included individual ID and session ID as random intercepts. This process requires a substantial amount of data because the model estimates variance, as well as their covariances with every other temperature at the among-individual and within-individual level (Hunt 2014; Houslay 2017).

Using the variance-covariance matrix, we calculated temperature specific repeatability () following Equation 8. Indeed, this equation is equivalent to Equation 4, except that it is using temperature-specific variance components (Nakagawa & Schielzeth 2010).

Equation 8:

where*Vind0,T* represents the individual intercept;

*Vseries0,T*  is the series intercept

*Ve0,T* is the residual variance component at a given temperature.

## Slope – plasticity

Function-valued approaches use the slope of a linear thermal reaction norm to represent the plasticity of a trait over a temperature gradient. If slopes are repeatable, this would indicate that individuals differ consistently in how they respond to temperature over time. We used the following function-valued model that has the same structure as the models except that logTemp is not mean-centered. This is because we also used this model to derive cross-temperature correlations (see below).

log ~ logTemp + zlogBodyMass + logPriorTemp + (1+ logTemp| ID) + (1+ logTemp| seriesID)

The above model was used to calculate the repeatability of the slope following Araya-Ajoy *et al.* 2015,

Equation 9:

where:

Vindis the individual slope;

*Vseries1* is the series slope.

The character state approach does not estimate a slope because it assumes that login each environment are “distinct” traits, However, one can assess the thermal plasticity of a trait by identifying changes in repeatability across temperatures using RT (equation 8).

## Cross-temperature correlations in metabolic rate

*A priori*, we expect metabolic rate measured at one temperature to be correlated with metabolic rate measured at another temperature. We estimated these cross-environment correlations using both statistical approaches. Correlations are conveniently estimated by character-state models at both the among- and within individual level. However, cross-temperature correlations need to be derived using matrix algebra in function-valued models, as they are part of the slope describing the reaction norm. We derived among-individual and within-individual-among-sampling sessions (using seriesID) correlations following Brommer (2013). We used the same model that was used to calculate the repeatability of the slope (see above). The variance-covariance (*K*) from this model is denoted as:

Equation 10:

where or is the covariance of the slope and intercept.

The six measurement temperatures can be represented as a 2 x 6 matrix,

Equation 11:

where the first column contains ones and the second column is the six unique measurement temperatures on the same scale as the predictor used to estimate *K* (e.g. logTemp).

The among-individual phenotypic variance-covariance matrix, *P,* for the six temperatures can then be derived by multiplying K with and its transpose in equation 12.

Equation 12:

which results in a 6 x 6 variance-covariance matrix as follows,

where the diagonal , , are the among-individual variances in log metabolic rate at all six temperatures and the off-diagonals represent the covariances of log metabolic rates between all six temperatures. The same calculation is repeated using the seriesID variance-covariance matrix to obtain within-individual (among-sampling-session) phenotypic variance-covariance matrix. Cross-temperature covariances can then be scaled to correlations by dividing the covariance between two temperatures by the square-root product of the variance in each of the two temperatures (i.e. the standard deviation at each temperature).

Equation 13:

## Among- and within-individual mass-scaling exponents at different temperatures

Mass-scaling exponents describe the relationship between metabolic rate and body mass across a sample of individuals. However, sample population estimates of scaling exponents may be a result of (1) an among-individual effect whereby individuals of different weight have different metabolic rates, or (2) a within-individual effect in which an individual’s metabolic rate can vary as its weight changes, or (3) a composite of both within- and among-individual effects. Exploratory statistics showed that the mean percentage change in mass within an individual, across the experiment (mass at the first sampling session – the last sampling session) was 9.13% (n = 42, SE = 0.32, range in percentage change= -5.15, 27.53), which could influence sample population estimates. We therefore wanted to explore whether accounting for within-individual effects would influence the overall estimates of among-individual mass-scaling exponents at different temperatures.

We partitioned among- and within-individual variation in body mass, by first calculating the mean mass across all sampling sessions for each individual (among-individual effect). Then, we calculated a within-individual effect by subtracting an individual’s mass from its own mean (i.e. within-individual centering, see van de Pol & Wright 2009). Using ‘brms’, we fitted two models. Model 1 had the following structure,

log~ Temp \* AmongIDMass + Temp \* WithinIDMass + (1 + WithinIDMass|ID)

where:

Temp \* AmongIDMass is the interaction term between the among individual mass effect with temperature;

Temp \* WithinIDMass is the interaction term between the within individual mass effect with temperature.

We also included individual ID as a random intercept and WithinIDMass as a random slope given that individuals mass change at different rates through the study (See Fig 5B).

Model two did not include the temperature interactions and had the following structure,

log~ Temp + AmongIDMass + WithinIDMass + (1 + WithinIDMass|ID)


We also compared the within- and among individual scaling exponents with exponents from a model that represents the typical analysis of a metabolic scaling study model (i.e. does not account for the hierarchal variation in the data). This analysis is presented in the ESM. In order to test for temperature dependence, we compared information criterions (wAIC and loo values) between model one and two to see which model was a better supported.


.

# Results

## Repeatability of thermal reaction norms

Overall, repeatability in metabolic rate increased with temperature (Fig. 2A). Although there was a trend for metabolic rate and body mass to decrease across the sampling sessions (Fig. S6), there was significant among-individual variation in intercepts (average metabolic rate) at all temperatures over short and long temporal scales (Table 1). Both function-valued methods showed highest repeatability at 32ºC. On the other hand, the character-state approach found repeatability highest at 30ºC (Fig. 2A). Upon closer inspection of the variance components at each temperature, within individual variation decreased over the temperature gradient, whereas among individual variation remained relatively consistent and only increased slightly with temperature (Fig 2B). In other words, individuals were responding more consistently as temperatures became hotter and while variation among individuals increased slightly. Congruent with the change in repeatability with temperature, individual slopes were significantly repeatable (Rslope = 0.48, Lower C.I = 0.06, Upper C.I = 0.91) indicating a significant individual by environment interaction (I x E) that was consistent over time (Fig. 3).



**Figure 2** – A) Posterior mean of repeatability of log (mL) at six measurement temperatures. Orange circles represent function-valued approaches in modelling thermal plasticity, orange open circles represent the function-valued ‘conditional’ repeatability method (equation 6), orange filled circles represent the function-valued ‘long’ term repeatability method (equation 5). Blue filled circles represent the character state approach in estimating repeatability. See Statistical analyses for more details. Error bars represent 95% credible intervals. B) Posterior mean of variance of log (mL) at the among (right panel) and within (left panel) individual level across six measurement temperatures. Error bars represent 95% credible intervals. 

**Figure 3** – Predicted individual reaction norms for forty-two individuals of log (mL) across six measurement temperatures at an average log mass at sampling session one (left panel), five (middle panel) and ten (right panel) reaction norms were estimated using (A) function-valued approaches and (B) character-state approaches. Points represent predicted trait values. Each line represents a unique individual (n = 42)

## Cross-temperature correlations in metabolic rate

Metabolic rate across temperatures were positively correlated at both the among-individual and within-individual level (Fig. 4, Table 2). However the magnitude of correlations were weaker at the within-individual level. Certain individuals maintained a high metabolic rate relative to other individuals, while others had a relatively low metabolic rate across all temperatures (Fig. S3). This created a positive relationship between metabolic rate at the among individual-level. Metabolic rate measured at neighbouring temperatures (e.g. 22ºC and 24ºC) were strongly correlated, but the strength of this correlation decreased with increasing differences between the two temperatures (Fig. 4).

Overall, cross-temperature correlations estimated using the function-valued approaches were a lot higher and the credible intervals were very narrow compared to the character-state approach. The correlations estimated using function-valued approaches are congruent with the character-state approach. The function-valued estimates were generally larger (i.e. stronger correlation) however there were estimation issues with the credible intervals as some *R*2 exceeded 1.



**Figure 4** – Cross-temperature correlations of log (mL) estimated using the function-valued approach (top) and the character-state approach using ‘brms’ (bottom) at the among-individual level (left) and at the within-individual level (right). Lower triangle represents posterior mean estimates, width and colour of the ellipse represents the strength of the correlation.

## Temperature dependence of mass scaling exponents at the among-individual level

The model containing no interactions between temperature and our among- and within-individual mass effects was better supported than a model that included the interaction (Model with no interaction: wAIC = 1868.53, loo = 1869.02, Model with interaction: wAIC = 1876.58, loo = 1877.34) suggesting a lack of temperature dependence in coefficients (Fig. 5, Table 3). However, there was a trend for within-individual exponents to be larger than among-individual exponents (Fig. S4, Table S3). When the within- and among-individual effects were not statistically accounted for, mass-scaling exponents tended to be spurious and estimated with a larger degree of error (Fig S5, Table S4).

****

**Figure 5** – (A) Posterior mean estimates of among-individual mass scaling exponents of (mL) across six measurement temperatures when within individual variation has been properly partitioned. The dashed line represents the exponent of 0.83 estimated for squamates from Uyeda (2017). Error bars represent 95% credible intervals. (B) Raw log plotted against log body mass for a random subset of 20 individuals across six measurement temperatures. Each uniquely coloured point represents one individual. Parameter estimates and credible intervals are presented in Table 4. Thick bold line represents the change in log over log body mass across all individuals. Faint grey lines represent the change in log over log body mass within an individual.

# Discussion

We took advantage of both function-valued and character-state approaches to investigate the repeatability of thermal plasticity in metabolic rate. In addition, we characterised the patterns of cross-temperature correlations in thermal reaction norms at the among- and within-individual level and also explored how massscaling exponents changed with temperature when within-individual variation is statistically accounted for. Our results show consistent among-individual differences in how metabolic rate plastically responds to the environment, over both short and long-time scales. Repeatability in metabolic rate increased with temperature largely due to decreased within-individual variance in metabolism. Cross-temperature correlations of metabolic rate were positive at the among- and within-individual level. However, the strength of these correlations was not uniform across all temperatures and differed between the character-state and function-valued approach. Despite there being consistent individual differences in metabolic thermal plasticity, mass scaling exponents were not strongly affected by temperature. We showed that mass scaling exponents were more precise and in line with values reported for lizards and snakes when within-individual effects are partitioned out. Below we discuss the details of our main results, and their implications on understanding how plasticity may evolve and how metabolic rate scales at different hierarchical levels.

## Consistent variation in thermal reaction norms

Consistent among-individual variation is a key prerequisite for any trait to evolve and sets the ‘upper limit of heritability’ because it is the raw material that natural selection acts on (Falconer 1952, c.f. Dohm 2002). Our findings show that metabolic plasticity (i.e., the slope of metabolic reaction norms) was significantly repeatable over time, in other words, there was consistent among-individual differences in plasticity. Repeatability of metabolic rate increased as a function of temperature owing to the changes in the relative contributions of among- and within- individual variance components. Within-individual variation, also referred to as ‘predictability’, constitutes the deviation of an individual relative it its own mean (Westneat, Wright & Dingemanse 2014; Cleasby, Nakagawa & Schielzeth 2014). Interestingly, while variation among individuals was relatively consistent across temperatures, within individual variance decreased with increasing temperature. In other words, an individual’s metabolic rate had greater predictability as temperatures became hotter. It is unlikely that individuals reached a physiological ‘ceiling’ given that we were not measuring maximal metabolic rate and these temperatures were within their normal operative range (Biro et al 2018). Alternatively, the breakdown of macronutrients and the production of ATP may be at a homeostatic balance at warmer temperatures which could promote consistency within individuals

(Somero 1978). Indeed, 32ºC is well within the range of preferred temperatures of this species where biochemical activities are likely to be operating optimally (Merritt, Matthews & White 2013; Goulet, Thompson & Chapple 2016). The compounded effect of high among-individual and low within-individual variation in warmer environments may mean that, not only is there a greater opportunity for selection in hot thermal environments, but selection can operate more effectively (Cleasby *et al.* 2014; Nakagawa *et al.* 2015). This may facilitate adaptive evolutionary changes in the population metabolic reaction norm, particularly in thermal environments that are novel to the population (Ghalambor *et al.* 2007).

## Cross-temperature correlations of metabolic rate: Implications of different modelling approaches for understanding metabolic plasticity

Metabolic rate was positively correlated across all temperatures at both the within- and among-individual level. This suggests that individuals differ in their plastic responses but their rank order in metabolic rate is maintained across different thermal environments. This result is contrary to the idea performance at one temperature is traded-off with function at another temperature as seen in killifish (*Fundulus heteroclitus*) where there are hot and cold temperature specialists for swimming endurance within the same population (Powers & Schulte 1998; Angilletta *et al.* 2003). Consistent individual differences in metabolic rate, irrespective of the thermal environment, may be functionally linked with consistent differences in behaviour and life-history. Our results support that notion that individual differences in energetic expenditure may drive different ‘paces-of-life’ or correlated suites of traits within the same population (Biro & Stamps 2008; Careau *et al.* 2009). For example, consistent differences in energy expenditure can favour ‘proactive’ individuals with a high metabolic rate and greater activity, that reproduce earlier at the cost of a shorter lifespan (Réale *et al.* 2010).

Assuming phenotypic correlations are congruent with underlying genetic correlations (Roff 1995), cross-temperature correlations may have important implications in understanding constraints on the evolution of metabolic plasticity. Correlation strength can dictate how strongly selection acting on one component of the reaction norm will result in indirect selection on another (Via *et al.* 1995). We found that the strength of cross-temperature correlations between neighbouring temperatures (e.g., 28°C vs. 32°C) were stronger compared to correlations at more distant temperatures (e.g., 22°C vs. 32°C) when modelling with the character-state approach. Greater measurement error at cooler temperatures could explain this change in the strength of correlation as lizards were not respiring as much as they did in warmer temperatures. While there were estimation issues with the function-valued approach, correlations across all temperatures remained strong and were in agreement with the character-state approach. This may be due to the important assumption of function-valued approaches whereby phenotypic values are strongly dependent on the covariance between the intercept and slope. When modelling using the character-state approach, the shape of thermal reaction norms may evolve with weaker constraints and greater malleability. Although differences between statistical approaches may be ameliorated when curvature is properly modelled in non-linear reaction norms. However, we were unable to test this because our measurement temperatures spanned the normal operative temperature of the species where the reaction norm is mostly linear (Doody 2009).

## Mass scaling at the among-individual level across different temperatures

Our results are inconsistent with the growing number of studies that show temperature dependence of mass scaling exponents even when accounting for known mass changes at the within-individual level (Glazier 2005; Killen *et al.* 2010; Price *et al.* 2012; Glazier 2015; Barneche *et al.* 2016). Generally, these studies demonstrate that mass scaling exponents increased with temperature and vary among species of different ecology (e.g. benthic or pelagic lifestyle, Killen *et al.* 2010). Disparity between our results and these studies may be due to the method with which we quantified mass scaling exponents. In our study, we sampled sexual mature adults repeatedly in order to estimate a static mass scaling relationship, while other studies tend to measure ontogenetic allometry (i.e. measure body mass and metabolic rate throughout development, e.g. Glazier 2009). The energetic demands of growth during ontogeny may be more sensitive to changes to temperature and therefore result in temperature-dependence in ontogenetic mass scaling exponents (Hirst, Glazier & Atkinson 2014; Barneche & Allen 2018). In support of this, a recent comparative analysis has shown that development shows stronger temperature dependence than growth (the increase in mass, Forster, Hirst & Woodward 2011).

The magnitude and precision of mass scaling exponents may be affected by processes occurring at different hierarchical levels. Genetic and developmental differences that impact the physiological system can maintain variation among individuals (Dingemanse & Wolf 2013). While reversible fluctuations in the internal environment, such as circulating hormones and body composition, can affect predictability of an individual’s response (Scott, Mitchell & Evans 1996; McCue 2010; Dupoué, Brischoux, Lourdais, Angelier 2013). We show that mass scaling exponents were not strongly affected, even when accounting for changes in metabolic rate at the within individual level. Although, we did see an improvement on the precision and slight changes in magnitude. This has important implications for current designs of metabolic scaling studies as metabolic rate and body mass tend to only be measured once, making them sensitive to sampling error and within-individual ‘noise’. Moreover, predictive models that make use of energetic scaling should be more aware of the different sources of variation when trying to extrapolate individual level processes to ecosystems. Future work is needed to investigate the degree to which variance in metabolic rate and body mass at lower levels of biological organisation impact scaling exponents as this has largely been neglected and yet may help elucidate why mass scaling exponents are variable at higher levels of biological organisation (Glazier, 2005).

# Conclusion

Our study emphasises the importance of considering individual variation in metabolic plasticity in response to changes in temperature and body mass. The relationship between metabolic rate and body mass is organised hierarchically and if variation in individual data is not correctly modelled, mass scaling relationships may be mix of among- and within individual effects. This can lead to ‘hasty generalisations’, particularly in theoretical models that utilise mass scaling across taxa to predict ecological system dynamics. From our study, it is apparent that thermal plasticity of metabolic rate is indeed repeatable and could be subjected to natural selection to shape population reaction norms in the face of warming climate. Given that within-individual variance declined with increasing temperatures, this may allow selection to operate more efficiently at higher temperatures. Our results show that metabolic reaction norms may not be strictly linear and may even have the capacity to evolve more malleable forms, however this was dependent on what statistical approach we used. While we do not advocate the use of any single approach in modelling plasticity, our goal is to illustrate how differences in assumptions between the function-valued and character-state approach can influence the inferences we draw from them. Molecular studies elucidating the mechanisms of metabolic plasticity in response to the internal and external environment would be invaluable to better explain deviations from the ¾ power law and ‘universal temperature dependence’ as well as, the capacity for metabolic reaction norms to evolve.

# Author contributions

All authors conceived the ideas and designed the study; FK and CF collected the data; FK, DN, SN analysed the data; FK wrote the first draft and all authors contributed to writing the manuscript

# Acknowledgements

This study would not have been possible without the support of the Australian Research Council (ARC) Discovery Early Career Research Award to D. W. A. N (DE150101774); also, S.N. was supported by an ARC Future Fellowship (FT13010026). We recognise The Office of Environment and Heritable, New South Wales for our wildlife collection permit and the animal ethics committee from University of New South Wales and Macquarie University for our animal ethics permit. We express gratitude for all the members of the Lizard Lab at Macquarie University for assistance and support throughout this study. Especially, A/Prof. Martin Whiting for the use of his facilities. We are in debt to Christine Wilson for her assistance with animal husbandry. We really appreciated the help of Stephan Klopper in the construction of our metabolic chambers. We would also like to acknowledge Martin Thompson at the Division of Research, University of New South Wales for his technical aid with our models. Finally, we thank David Mitchell and Tobias Uller insightful discussions and Rose O’Dea for her comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript.

# Data accessibility

Datasets and code used to generate results of this study will be made accessible via Open Science Framework via a public DOI link. For reviewing purposes, a ‘reviewer’s only’ DOI link has been generated

# References

Allen, A.P., Gillooly, J.F. & Brown, J.H. (2005) Linking the global carbon cycle to individual metabolism. *Functional Ecology*, **19**, 202–213.

Angilletta, M.J., Jr, Wilson, R.S., Navas, C.A. & James, R.S. (2003) Tradeoffs and the evolution of thermal reaction norms. *Trends Ecol Evol,* **18**, 234–240.

Araya-Ajoy, Y.G., Mathot, K.J. & Dingemanse, N.J. (2015) An approach to estimate short-term, long-term and reaction norm repeatability. *Journal of Animal Ecology,* **6**, 1462–1473.

Arnold, P. A., Kruuk, L. E. B., & Nicotra, A. B. (2019). How to analyse plant phenotypic plasticity in response to a changing climate. *New Phytologist*, 1–17.

Auer, S.K., Bassar, R.D., Salin, K. & Metcalfe, N.B. (2016) Repeatability of metabolic rate is lower for animals living under field versus laboratory conditions. *The Journal of Experimental biology*, **219**, 631–634.

Barneche, D.R. & Allen, A.P. (2018) The energetics of fish growth and how it constrains food-web trophic structure. *Ecol Lett*, **21**, 836–844.

Barneche, D.R., Kulbicki, M., Floeter, S.R., Friedlander, A.M., Maina, J. & Allen, A.P. (2014) Scaling metabolism from individuals to reef-fish communities at broad spatial scales. *Ecol Lett*, **17**, 1067–1076.

Barneche, D.R., White, C.R. & Marshall, D.J. (2016) Temperature effects on mass-scaling exponents in colonial animals: a manipulative test. *Ecology*, **98**, 103–111.

Biro, P.A. & Stamps, J.A. (2008) Are animal personality traits linked to life-history productivity? *Trends Ecol Evol*, **23**, 361–368.

Biro, P.A. & Stamps, J.A. (2010) Do consistent individual differences in metabolic rate promote consistent individual differences in behavior? *Trends Ecol Evol*, **25**, 653–659.

Boratyński, J.S., Jefimow, M. & Wojciechowski, M.S. (2017) Individual differences in the phenotypic flexibility of basal metabolic rate in Siberian Hamsters are consistent on short- and long-term timescales. *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology*, **90**, 139–152.

Briffa, M., Bridger, D. & Biro, P.A. (2013) How does temperature affect behaviour? Multilevel analysis of plasticity, personality and predictability in hermit crabs. *Animal Behaviour*, **86**, 47–54.

Briga, M. & Verhulst, S. (2017) Individual variation in metabolic reaction norms over ambient temperature causes low correlation between basal and standard metabolic rate. *The Journal of Experimental biology*, **220**, 3280–3289.

Brommer, J.E. (2013) Variation in plasticity of personality traits implies that the ranking of personality measures changes between environmental contexts: calculating the cross-environmental correlation. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, **67**, 1709–1718.

Brown, J.H., Gillooly, J.F., Allen, A.P., Savage, V.M. & West, G.B. (2004) Toward a Metabolic Theory of Ecology. *Ecology*, **85**, 1771–1789.

Burton, T., Killen, S.S., Armstrong, J.D. & Metcalfe, N.B. (2011) What causes intraspecific variation in resting metabolic rate and what are its ecological consequences? *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, **278**, 3465–3473.

Bürkner, P.C. (2017) brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *Journal of Statistical Software*, **80**.

Careau, V., Bininda-Emonds, O.R.P., Thomas, D.W., Réale, D. & Humphries, M.M. (2009) Exploration strategies map along fast–slow metabolic and life-history continua in muroid rodents. *Functional Ecology*, **23**, 150–156.

Careau, V., Biro, P.A., Bonneaud, C., Fokam, E.B. & Herrel, A. (2014a) Individual variation in thermal performance curves: swimming burst speed and jumping endurance in wild-caught tropical clawed frogs. *Oecologia*, **175**, 471–480.

Careau, V., Gifford, M.E. & Biro, P.A. (2014b) Individual (co)variation in thermal reaction norms of standard and maximal metabolic rates in wild-caught slimy salamanders (ed M Konarzewski). *Functional Ecology*, **28**, 1175–1186.

Clarke, A. (2004) Is there a Universal Temperature Dependence of metabolism? *Functional Ecology*, **18**, 252–256.

Cleasby, I.R., Nakagawa, S. & Schielzeth, H. (2014) Quantifying the predictability of behaviour: statistical approaches for the study of between-individual variation in the within-individual variance. *Methods in Ecology*, **6**, 27–37.

Core Team, R. (2013) Team (2012). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

De Jong, G. & Van Noordwijk, A.J. (1992) Acquisition and Allocation of Resources: Genetic (Co)variances, Selection, and Life Histories. *The American Naturalist*, **139**, 749–770.

Dingemanse, N.J., Kazem, A.J.N., Réale, D. & Wright, J. (2010) Behavioural reaction norms: animal personality meets individual plasticity. *Trends Ecol Evol*, **25**, 81–89.

Dingemanse, N. J., & Wolf, M. (2013). Between-individual differences in behavioural plasticity within populations: causes and consequences. *Animal Behaviour*, **85**, 1031–1039.

Doody, J.S. (2009) Superficial lizards in cold climates: Nest site choice along an elevational gradient. *Austral Ecology*, **34**, 773–779.

Dupouué, A. A., Brischoux, F., Lourdais, O., & Angelier, F. (2013). Influence of temperature on the corticosterone stress-response: An experiment in the Children’s python (*Antaresia childreni*). *General and Comparative Endocrinology*, **193**, 178–184.

Falconer, D.S. (1952) The Problem of Environment and Selection. *The American Naturalist*, **86**, 293–298.

Forster, J., Hirst, A.G. & Woodward, G. (2011) Growth and Development Rates Have Different Thermal Responses. *The American Naturalist*, **178**, 668–678.

Friesen, C.R., Johansson, R. & Olsson, M. (2017) Morph-specific metabolic rate and the timing of reproductive senescence in a color polymorphic dragon. *Journal of Experimental Zoology Part a-Ecological and Integrative Physiology*, **327**, 433–443.

Ghalambor, C.K., McKay, J.K., Carroll, S.P. & Reznick, D.N. (2007) Adaptive versus non‐adaptive phenotypic plasticity and the potential for contemporary adaptation in new environments. *Functional Ecology*, **21**, 394–407.

Gillooly, J.F., Brown, J.H., West, G.B., Van M Savage & Charnov, E.L. (2001) Effects of Size and Temperature on Metabolic Rate. *Science*, **293**, 2248–2251.

Glazier, D.S. (2005) Beyond the ‘3/4-power law’: variation in the intra- and interspecific scaling of metabolic rate in animals. *Biological Reviews*, **80**, 611–662.

Glazier, D.S. (2009) Ontogenetic body-mass scaling of resting metabolic rate covaries with species-specific metabolic level and body size in spiders and snakes. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology*, **153**, 403–407.

Glazier, D.S. (2015) Is metabolic rate a universal ‘pacemaker’ for biological processes? *Biological Reviews*, **90**, 377–407.

Goulet, C.T., Thompson, M.B. & Chapple, D.G. (2016) Repeatability and correlation of physiological traits: Do ectotherms have a ‘thermal type’? *Ecology and evolution*, **7**, 710–719.

Hadfield, J.D. (2010) MCMC methods for multi-response generalized linear mixed models: The MCMCglmm R package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, **33**, 1–22.

Hirst, A.G., Glazier, D.S. & Atkinson, D. (2014) Body shape shifting during growth permits tests that distinguish between competing geometric theories of metabolic scaling (ed D Marshall). *Ecol Lett*, **17**, 1274–1281.

Hulbert, A.J., Pamplona, R., Buffenstein, R. & Buttemer, W.A. (2007) Life and Death: Metabolic Rate, Membrane Composition, and Life Span of Animals. *Physiological Reviews*, **87**, 1175–1213.

Hunt, J. (2014) *Genotype-by-Environment Interactions and Sexual Selection*. Wiley Blackwell. West Sussex, UK.

Killen, S.S., Atkinson, D. & Glazier, D.S. (2010) The intraspecific scaling of metabolic rate with body mass in fishes depends on lifestyle and temperature. *Ecol Lett*, **13**, 184–193.

Lighton, J.R.B. (2008) *Measuring Metabolic Rates*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Dohm, M.R. (2002) Repeatability estimates do not always set an upper limit to heritability. *Functional Ecology*, **16**, 273–280.

Malishev, M., Bull, C.M. & Kearney, M.R. (2017) An individual-based model of ectotherm movement integrating metabolic and microclimatic constraints. *Methods in Ecology*, **9**, 472–489.

Merritt, L., Matthews, P.G.D. & White, C.R. (2013) Performance correlates of resting metabolic rate in garden skinks *Lampropholis delicata*. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B*, **183**, 663–673.

Metcalfe, N.B. (2005) Intraspecific variation in competitive ability and food intake in salmonids: consequences for energy budgets and growth rates. *Journal of Fish Biology*, **28,** 525–531.

Nakagawa, S. & Schielzeth, H. (2010) Repeatability for Gaussian and non-Gaussian data: a practical guide for biologists. *Biological Reviews*, **85**, 935–956.

Nakagawa, S., Poulin, R., Mengersen, K., Reinhold, K., Engqvist, L., Lagisz, M. & Senior, A.M. (2015) Meta-analysis of variation: ecological and evolutionary applications and beyond. *Methods in Ecology*, **6**, 143–152.

Nespolo, R.F. & Franco, M. (2007) Whole-animal metabolic rate is a repeatable trait: a meta-analysis. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, **210**, 3877–3878.

Norin, T. & Gamperl, A.K. (2018) Metabolic scaling of individuals vs. populations: Evidence for variation in scaling exponents at different hierarchical levels. *Functional Ecology*, **32**, 379–388.

Norin, T., Malte, H. & Clark, T.D. (2016) Differential plasticity of metabolic rate phenotypes in a tropical fish facing environmental change. *Functional Ecology*. **3,** 369–378.

O'Hara, R.B. (2009) How to make models add up — a primer on GLMMs. *Annales Zoologic Fennici*, **46**, 124–137.

Pettersen, A.K., White, C.R. & Marshall, D.J. (2016) Metabolic rate covaries with fitness and the pace of the life history in the field. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, **283**, 20160323

Powers, D.A. & Schulte, P.M. (1998) Evolutionary adaptations of gene structure and expression in natural populations in relation to a changing environment: A multidisciplinary approach to address the million‐year saga of a small fish. *Journal of Experimental Zoology*, **282**, 71–94.

Price, C.A., Weitz, J.S., Savage, V.M., Stegen, J., Clarke, A., Coomes, D.A., Dodds, P.S., Etienne, R.S., Kerkhoff, A.J., McCulloh, K., Niklas, K.J., Olff, H. & Swenson, N.G. (2012) Testing the metabolic theory of ecology. *Ecol Lett*, **15**, 1465–1474.

Réale, D., Garant, D., Humphries, M.M., Bergeron, P., Careau, V. & Montiglio, P.-O. (2010) Personality and the emergence of the pace-of-life syndrome concept at the population level. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, **365**, 4051–4063.

Ricklefs, R.E. & Wikelski, M. (2002) The physiology/life- history nexus. *Trends Ecol Evol*, 1–7.

Roff, D.A. (1995) The estimation of genetic correlations from phenotypic correlations: a test of Cheverud's conjecture. *Heredity*, **74**, 481–490.

Salin, K., Auer, S.K., Rey, B., Selman, C. & Metcalfe, N.B. (2015) Variation in the link between oxygen consumption and ATP production, and its relevance for animal performance. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, **282**, 20151028–9.

Salin, K., Auer, S.K., Rudolf, A.M., Anderson, G.J., Selman, C. & Metcalfe, N.B. (2016) Variation in Metabolic Rate among Individuals Is Related to Tissue-Specific Differences in Mitochondrial Leak Respiration. *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology*, **89**, 511–523.

Salin, K., Luquet, E., Rey, B., Roussel, D. & Voituron, Y. (2012) Alteration of mitochondrial efficiency affects oxidative balance, development and growth in frog (Rana temporaria*) tadpoles. The Journal of Experimental Eiology,* ***215****, 863–869.*

Seebacher, F., Brand, M.D., Else, P.L., Guderley, H., Hulbert, A.J. & Moyes, C.D. (2010) Plasticity of Oxidative Metabolism in Variable Climates: Molecular Mechanisms. *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology*, **83**, 721–732.

Singer, J.D. & Willett, J.B. (2003) *Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis: Modeling Change and Event Occurrence*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Somero, G.N. (1978) Temperature Adaptation of Enzymes: Biological Optimization Through Structure-Function Compromises. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 1–30.

Speakman, J.R., Talbot, D.A., Selman, C., Snart, S., McLaren, J.S., Redman, P., Krol, E., Jackson, D.M., Johnson, M.S. & Brand, M.D. (2004) Uncoupled and surviving: individual mice with high metabolism have greater mitochondrial uncoupling and live longer. *Aging Cell*, **3**, 87–95.

Steyermark, A.C. (2005) Physiological and morphological correlates of among-individual variation in standard metabolic rate in the leopard frog *Rana pipiens*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, **208**, 1201–1208.

Uyeda, J.C., Pennell, M.W., Miller, E.T., Maia, R. & McClain, C.R. (2017) The Evolution of Energetic Scaling across the Vertebrate Tree of Life. *The American Naturalist*, 000–000.

van de Pol, M. & Wright, J. (2009) A simple method for distinguishing within- versus between-subject effects using mixed models. *Animal Behaviour*, **77**, 753–758.

Via, S., Gomulkiewicz, R., De Jong, G., Scheiner, S.M., Schlichting, C.D. & Van Tienderen, P.H. (1995) Adaptive phenotypic plasticity: consensus and controversy. *Trends Ecol Evol*, **10**, 212–217.

Westneat, D.F., Stewart, I.R.K. & Hatch, M.I. (2009) Complex interactions among temporal variables affect the plasticity of clutch size in a multi-brooded bird. *Ecology*, **90**, 1162–1174.

Westneat, D.F., Wright, J. & Dingemanse, N.J. (2014) The biology hidden inside residual within-individual phenotypic variation. *Biological Reviews*, **90**, 729–743.

White, C.R. & Kearney, M.R. (2012) Determinants of inter-specific variation in basal metabolic rate. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B*, **183**, 1–26.

White, C.R., Schimpf, N.G. & Cassey, P. (2013) The repeatability of metabolic rate declines with time. *The Journal of experimental biology*, **216**, 1763–1765.

Wiersma, P., Munoz-Garcia, A., Walker, A. & Williams, J.B. (2007) Tropical birds have a slow pace of life. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **104**, 9340–9345.

Williams, J.B., Miller, R.A., Harper, J.M. & Wiersma, P. (2010) Functional Linkages for the Pace of Life, Life-history, and Environment in Birds. *Integrative and comparative biology*, **50**, 855–868.

Withers, P.C. (1992) *Comparative Animal Physiology*. Philadelphia: Saunders College Pub.

# Tables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1.** Adjusted repeatability of log metabolic rate and their 95% credible intervals, across six measurement temperature estimated by function-valued models. Rintercept is the repeatability at the intercept, Rshort is 'short-term' repeatability, Rlong is 'long-term' repeatability. See statistical analyses for more details on the technical differences of three estimates. N = 42, nobs = 2410. All estimates are significantly different from zero. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Rintercept | | | Rshort | | | Rlong | | |
| Temperature | Estimate | Lower | Upper | Estimate | Lower | Upper | Estimate | Lower | Upper |
| 22 | 0.76 | 0.59 | 1 | 0.15 | 0.1 | 0.22 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.18 |
| 24 | 0.46 | 0.3 | 0.62 | 0.36 | 0.28 | 0.43 | 0.16 | 0.09 | 0.24 |
| 26 | 0.53 | 0.38 | 0.69 | 0.33 | 0.26 | 0.41 | 0.18 | 0.1 | 0.27 |
| 28 | 0.61 | 0.47 | 0.75 | 0.32 | 0.25 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.12 | 0.28 |
| 30 | 0.68 | 0.53 | 0.82 | 0.33 | 0.24 | 0.42 | 0.22 | 0.14 | 0.32 |
| 32 | 0.72 | 0.55 | 0.89 | 0.35 | 0.25 | 0.45 | 0.25 | 0.16 | 0.36 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2.** Cross-temperature correlations of log metabolic rate (*R*2)and their 95% credible intervals, estimated using the **a)** function-valued approach, **b)** character-state approach at the among-individual and within-individual level. N = 42, nobs = 2410. Bolded estimates are signfiicantly different from zero. \* indicates that correlation estimate has been set to 1 because there were estimation issues in the function-value model where *R*2 exceeded 1. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **a)** Function-valued approach | | | | | | **b)** Character-state approach | | | | | | |
|  | Among-individual | | | Within-individual | | | Among-individual | | | | Within-individual | | |
| Pairwise comparison (*R*2) | Estimate | Lower | Upper | Estimate | Lower | Upper | Estimate | Lower | Upper | Estimate | | Lower | Upper |
| 22ºC – 24ºC | **0.98** | 0.95 | 1 | **0.99** | 0.98 | 1 | 0.43 | -0.04 | 0.80 | **0.23** | | 0.12 | 0.34 |
| 22ºC – 26ºC | **0.93** | 0.83 | 0.99 | **0.96** | 0.9 | 1 | 0.44 | -0.03 | 0.81 | 0.06 | | -0.06 | 0.17 |
| 22ºC – 28ºC | **0.86** | 0.67 | 0.98 | **0.9** | 0.72 | 1 | **0.56** | 0.13 | 0.87 | **0.2** | | 0.09 | 0.31 |
| 22ºC – 30ºC | **0.78** | 0.52 | 0.97 | **0.8** | 0.46 | 1 | **0.59** | 0.23 | 0.87 | 0.12 | | 0 | 0.23 |
| 22ºC – 32ºC | **0.71** | 0.39 | 0.97 | **0.67** | 0.21 | 1 | 0.37 | -0.04 | 0.72 | **0.19** | | 0.07 | 0.29 |
| 24ºC – 26ºC | 0.98 | 0.96 | 1 | **0.99** | 0.97 | 1 | **0.72** | 0.40 | 0.92 | **0.2** | | 0.09 | 0.31 |
| 24ºC – 28 | 0.93 | 0.79 | 1\* | 1\* | 1\* | 1\* | 0.38 | -0.05 | 0.76 | 0.02 | | -0.09 | 0.13 |
| 24ºC – 30 | 0.88 | 0.71 | 1\* | 1\* | 1\* | 1\* | 0.42 | 0.00 | 0.75 | **0.26** | | 0.14 | 0.36 |
| 24ºC – 32 | 0.82 | 0.63 | 1\* | 1\* | 1\* | 1\* | **0.66** | 0.30 | 0.91 | **0.29** | | 0.19 | 0.39 |
| 26ºC – 28 | **0.99** | 0.97 | 1 | **0.98** | 0.95 | 1 | **0.80** | 0.55 | 0.95 | **0.14** | | 0.03 | 0.25 |
| 26ºC – 30 | **0.96** | 0.9 | 1 | **0.93** | 0.8 | 1 | 0.24 | -0.18 | 0.65 | 0.04 | | -0.07 | 0.15 |
| 26ºC – 32 | **0.92** | 0.82 | 0.99 | **0.84** | 0.59 | 1 | **0.46** | 0.07 | 0.78 | **0.14** | | 0.03 | 0.25 |
| 28ºC – 30 | **0.99** | 0.98 | 1 | **0.98** | 0.94 | 1 | **0.72** | 0.41 | 0.93 | 0.08 | | -0.03 | 0.2 |
| 28ºC – 32 | **0.97** | 0.93 | 1 | **0.92** | 0.8 | 1 | **0.72** | 0.45 | 0.91 | **0.21** | | 0.1 | 0.31 |
| 30ºC – 32 | **0.94** | 0.89 | 0.99 | 1\* | 0.91 | 1\* | **0.81** | 0.55 | 0.95 | **0.21** | | 0.09 | 0.31 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.** Multilevel mass scaling exponents and their 95% credible intervals estimated at the among-individual and the within-individual level across six measurement temperatures. N = 42, nobs = 2410. Bolded estimates are significantly different from zero | | | | | | |
|  | Among-individual | | | Within-individual | | |
| Temperature | Estimate | Lower | Upper | Estimate | Lower | Upper |
| 22 | **1.09** | 0.49 | 1.68 | **1.86** | 1.13 | 2.62 |
| 24 | **0.62** | 0.04 | 1.2 | **2.71** | 1.93 | 3.46 |
| 26 | **0.76** | 0.15 | 1.31 | **1.74** | 1.06 | 2.53 |
| 28 | **0.69** | 0.08 | 1.26 | **1.89** | 1.16 | 2.68 |
| 30 | **1.1** | 0.5 | 1.67 | **1.8** | 1.08 | 2.52 |
| 32 | **0.91** | 0.25 | 1.44 | **1.73** | 1.06 | 2.47 |