

<sup>1</sup> Sex-dependent resource defense in a nectar-feeding bat

<sup>2</sup>  
<sup>3</sup> Sabine Wintergerst<sup>1,2</sup>, York Winter<sup>1\*§</sup>, Vladislav Nachev<sup>1\*§</sup>

<sup>4</sup> <sup>1</sup> Institut für Biologie, Humboldt Universität, Germany

<sup>5</sup> <sup>2</sup> Fairchild Tropical Botanic Garden, 10901 Old Cutler Rd, Miami, FL 33156, USA

<sup>6</sup> **\*For correspondence:** vladislav.nachev@hu-berlin.de, york.winter@charite.de

<sup>7</sup> **Present Address:** §Institut für Biologie, Humboldt Universität, 10099 Berlin, Germany

## **8 Abstract**

9 Aggressive resource defense spans from the transient monopolization of a resource up to the long-term  
10 maintenance of a territory. While such interference competition is common in nectar-feeding birds, reports in  
11 nectar-feeding bats are rare. *Glossophaga* bats have been observed to temporarily defend flowers but the  
12 extent of this monopolization, its effects on nectar intake, and underlying sexual differences remain unknown.  
13 We investigated resource defense behavior of *Glossophaga mutica* in the laboratory. We presented bats with  
14 two patches of computer-controlled artificial flowers and tracked individual nectar intake. Furthermore, we  
15 established an automated method for detecting aggressive interactions at the artificial flowers. Theoretical  
16 models of interference competition predict more aggressive interactions when resources are spatially more  
17 clumped. To test this, we varied resource distribution across two patches from clumped to dispersed and  
18 monitored bats' interactions in one male, one female, and four mixed-sex groups. Males engaged in aggressive  
19 interactions more often than females and in each group some individuals defended clumped artificial flowers  
20 against others. Subordinate males experienced a substantial decrease in nectar intake, while females were  
21 only marginally affected by male aggression. These results suggest that aggressive interactions and their effect  
22 on nectar intake are sex-dependent in *G. mutica*. Furthermore, aggressive interactions were more frequent  
23 and resource defense was only successful when resources were clumped. Our experimental set-up allowed  
24 us to perform an automated test of models of interference competition with a mammal under controlled  
25 laboratory conditions. This approach may pave the way for similar studies with other animals.

## **26 Lay summary**

27 Males bully other males to get more food, but only when food is easy to defend. When flowers are spread  
28 out nectar-feeding bats rarely engage in fights. However, when there are rich flowers in one spot and no  
29 flowers elsewhere, some males start attacking others, denying them access to the nectar. Females do not seem  
30 bothered by such male bullies, but when there are no males around, some females become bullies themselves.

## **31 Keywords:**

32 resource defense, economic defendability, bat, *Glossophaga*

## **33 1. Introduction**

34 Competition for limited resources like food or mates is a ubiquitous phenomenon in the animal kingdom.  
35 Such competition can be indirect by exploiting a common resource and preventing others from benefiting  
36 from it (Paton and Carpenter 1984); or it can be direct by aggressively defending a resource. The latter is  
37 known as interference competition (Amarasekare 2002). Aggressive resource defense by excluding competitors  
38 leads to priority of access to those resources and thus establishes dominance. One individual is dominant  
39 over another if it directs aggressive behavior towards it (chasing, threatening, biting, etc.) while receiving  
40 little or no aggression from the other (Chase et al. 2002). In the extreme, dominance behavior can lead to  
41 exclusive territoriality. Territoriality is a concept belonging to an indivisible continuum starting with the  
42 transient monopolization of a preferred feeding opportunity to the longer-term defense of an area as exclusive  
43 territory. The rules of economic defendability (Brown 1964) determine the adaptive compromise to which  
44 a species' dominance behavior will evolve and develop along this continuum. The establishment of feeding  
45 territories is well known for nectar-feeding birds (Boyden 1978; Carpenter and Macmillen 1976; Ewald and  
46 Carpenter 1978; Gill and Wolf 1975).

47 The cost of defense, a key parameter in the economic defendability equation, is likely much higher for a  
48 nocturnal, echolocating bat than for a diurnal, visually oriented bird. The successful resource defense is only  
49 possible after the competition is detected. Visual detection in the daylight works well over long distances.  
50 In contrast, for a nocturnal, echolocating bat, especially for phyllostomid bats that are able to echolocate  
51 with whispering calls (Howell 1974; Hörmann et al. 2020; Yoh et al. 2020), detecting intruders at a feeding  
52 territory's boundary would require expensive patrolling flights.

53 Within bats, the flower visitors have an advantage compared to insect-hunting bats if they are intimately  
54 familiar with their feeding area. Bats feeding on insects must continually scan for elusive prey by active  
55 echolocation, whereas flower visitors can approach a target with minimal echolocation when seeking specific  
56 flowers at known locations (Thiele and Winter 2005; Winter and Stich 2005; Gonzalez-Terrazas et al. 2016;  
57 Rose et al. 2016). Thus, it is not surprising that the longer-term defense of extensive feeding territories  
58 as commonly observed in nectar-feeding birds is not known for glossophagine, nectar-feeding bats (but see  
59 Watzke 2006 for nectar-feeding flying foxes). Nonetheless, several observations have documented aggressive  
60 food defense by glossophagine bats. The inflorescences of *Agave desmettiana* with their copious nectar  
61 (Lemke 1985) may be defended by males or females of *Glossophaga soricina* against conspecifics but only  
62 during some hours of the night (Lemke 1984, 1985). When left unguarded, intruders quickly exploited the  
63 opportunity to feed from the previously defended plants. The Costa Rican bat *Glossophaga commissarisi*  
64 occasionally defends and temporarily monopolizes single inflorescences of the understory palm *Calyptrogyne*  
65 *ghiesbreghtiana* against other hovering bats, perching bats and katydids (Tschapka 2003). A commonality in  
66 these reports was that the defense did not cover the area of a typical feeding range but was restricted to a  
67 single or a few flowering plants and was also limited to a small number of hours during the night. Still, these  
68 reports demonstrate that glossophagine bats can show aggressive resource defense.

69 In this study, we investigated for a nocturnal, nectar-feeding mammal, the flower-visiting bat *Glossophaga*  
70 (*mutica* (previously *G. soricina*, Calahorra-Oliart, Ospina-Garcés, and León-Paniagua (2021)), the role of  
71 aggressive interactions for gaining access to nectar food. We tested the predictions of models of resource  
72 defense (Grant et al. 2002) and interference competition (Grant 1993) using a naturalistic foraging paradigm  
73 in the laboratory. The occurrence of resource defense is predicted to be highest at intermediate levels of food  
74 abundance (Grant et al. 2002). In line with this prediction, the transient nature of nightly defense behavior  
75 observed in the field suggests that changes in food-abundance or food-requirements that occur within the  
76 night affected the strength of the observed behavior. To mimic the natural situation of chiropterophilous  
77 flowers which often replenish their nectar more or less continuously throughout a night (e.g. Tschapka and  
78 Helversen 2007) we programmed artificial flowers to provide nectar with a fixed interval reward schedule.  
79 Once a nectar reward had been taken by any bat, the fixed interval had to pass before the next reward was  
80 available at this flower. Theoretical models of interference competition predict that clumped resources lead to  
81 more agonistic behavior and resource defense than evenly dispersed resources (Grant 1993). To include a test  
82 of this prediction in our experimental design, we spatially subdivided our flower field into two patches and  
83 programmed them to automatically change the spatial distribution of available nectar resources during the  
84 night. We performed our study with 36 individuals of male and female *G. mutica*. By using artificial flowers  
85 in a closed environment, we could track all flower visits and total nectar consumption of every individual in  
86 the group. Each individual carried an electronic ID tag and flowers were equipped with ID sensors. This  
87 also enabled us to detect and quantify a typical class of aggressive interactions between pairs of individuals  
88 directly at the artificial flowers fully automatically.  
89 Our novel experimental set-up thus allowed us to perform a mostly automated experimental test of models  
90 of interference competition and resource defense with a mammal under the controlled conditions of the  
91 laboratory. This new approach may pave the way for further such studies with other groups of organisms.

## 92 2. Materials and methods

### 93 (a) Subjects and housing

94 Experiments were conducted with 54 (36 females and 18 males) individuals of the small, (9-10g) neotropical  
95 nectarivorous bat species formerly identified as *Glossophaga soricina* (Pallas's long-tongued bat). In view  
96 of the recent taxonomic revision of the *G. soricina* species complex (Calahorra-Oliart, Ospina-Garcés, and  
97 León-Paniagua 2021), it is relevant to note that the founders of our colony used in this and all our previous  
98 studies were caught at the Cueva de las Vegas, Municipio de Tenampulco, Mexico and transported to Germany  
99 in 1988 by Otto von Helversen. Thus they belong to the species *G. mutica*. Bats came from our captive colony  
100 and were older than one year as judged by finger joint ossification (Brunet-Rossini and Wilkinson 2009). They  
101 carried radio frequency identification (RFID) tags attached to cable tie collars (total weight of collar with  
102 tag = 0.2g, max. 2.4% of the body weight) that were removed after the experiment. Additionally, bats had  
103 numbered plastic split rings (A C Hughes Ltd., Middlesex, UK) around the forearm for visual identification.

104 Temperature in the experimental and colony room was kept at 20-25°C, air humidity at 65-75%, and light  
105 conditions were 12:12 LD (light off at 16h).

106 **(b) Experimental set-up**

107 In the experimental room ten artificial flowers with automated nectar delivery (Winter and Stich 2005) were  
108 mounted along a 4.2m bar at a height of 1.2m (Fig. 1). The distance between flowers was 0.4m. Flowers were  
109 divided into two groups of five to simulate two flower patches. Each patch was enclosed by a sheet-covered  
110 frame around the four sides and at the top to separate the groups of flowers spatially (Fig. 1). The only  
111 entrance to the patches was a 0.4m gap between the ground and the bottom end of this enclosure (Fig. 1,  
112 dashed line). From this entrance bats had to fly up vertically to reach the flowers, which increased the costs  
113 of moving between patches. A stepper-motor syringe pump delivered nectar via tubes and pinch valves to  
114 the artificial flowers. Nectar rewards were triggered by the interruption of an infrared light barrier at the  
115 flower opening. The RFID reader below the flower head identified a bat's ID code. Flower visits (infrared  
116 light barrier interruptions) and ID sensor events were recorded during every experimental night. The reward  
117 schedule was configured using PhenoSoft Control (Phenosys GmbH, Berlin, Germany). Every detected event  
118 at a flower (including date, time, individual ID, duration of the event and amount of nectar delivered) was  
119 recorded for data analysis.




Figure 1: Experimental set-up consisting of two spatially separated patches of five flowers each. (A) The ten flowers were mounted 1.2m above ground. They were divided into two patches, L and R. (B) During experiments the patches were separated by plastic sheets. To make it more demanding for bats to enter a patch, the only entrance was through a 0.4m gap above the ground. (C) Schematic drawing of the experimental set-up from above. The dashed line indicates the side with the patch entrance.

120 **(c) Experimental procedure**

121 Six bats were randomly selected from the colony (out of the total of ca. 150 individuals) and were tested  
122 simultaneously as a group. Four experimental groups consisted of three males together with three females  
123 (mixed groups), whereas one group consisted of six males, and four others of six females. No bats were re-used  
124 between experiments. We weighed all bats before the experiment.

125 During the nightly experiments, in addition to the nectar provided by artificial flowers, bats had access to  
126 pollen and water and to 6mL of additional food containing 1.2g NektarPlus (Nekton, Keltern, Germany)  
127 and 1.8g milk powder (Milasan Folgemilch 2, Sunval Baby Food GmbH, Mannheim, Germany) dissolved in  
128 water. Rewards at flowers consisted always of 30 $\mu$ L nectar (15% w/w sugar concentration, sucrose: fructose  
129 1:2). Before the experimental schedule started, individuals were allowed to familiarize themselves with the  
130 set-up and the artificial flowers. Since during this training phase the plastic cover was removed, the two  
131 flower patches were not spatially separated and every flower visit was rewarded. This phase lasted for one to  
132 four nights until each bat visited the flowers regularly. One female of the first mixed group did not visit any  
133 artificial flower during the first night and was replaced by another female.

134 During the experiment, the two flower patches were covered and spatially separated (Fig. 1. Experimental  
135 nights were divided into two phases. During the first phase of the night only one of the two flower patches was  
136 rewarding, and therefore the resources were spatially clumped at a single location. The fixed time interval  
137 between rewards at each flower was 60s. During the second phase of the night both patches gave rewards,  
138 resources were evenly dispersed across the two patches, and the fixed time interval between two rewards at a  
139 flower was increased to 120s. Therefore, the amount of food available per unit time did not change during  
140 the whole night; only the spatial distribution of food changed from the clumped resource treatment with one  
141 patch rewarding (five flowers) during the first phase of the night to the dispersed resource treatment with two  
142 patches rewarding (ten flowers) during the second phase of the night. With this experimental schedule,  
143 the maximal amount of nectar the bats could collect was 108mL, which corresponds to 18mL nectar per  
144 individual per night, roughly 150% of their daily requirement (Winter and Helversen 2001). The side of  
145 the rewarding patch during the first phase of the night was chosen pseudo-randomly and the same patch  
146 was never chosen in more than two consecutive nights. For the mixed groups, the duration of the clumped  
147 resource treatment was six hours and the experiment lasted nine nights (seven nights for the first mixed  
148 group). For the same-sex groups, the duration of the first part of the night was variable (range = 4-8h, mean  
149 = 6h) and the experiment lasted eight nights for the male group and seven nights for the female groups.

150 **(d) Chasing behavior**

151 We took the frequency of individuals chasing each other at the artificial flowers as an indicator of the intensity  
152 of aggressive interactions between group members. We developed a method to automatically detect and score  
153 chasing events using the computer-collected animal identification data from the RFID sensors and flower  
154 sensors. In a previous pilot study (Wintergerst 2018), three mixed groups of bats were video recorded for 24h  
155 over 14 nights, and the video data were synchronized to the computer-collected data. During this pilot study  
156 flowers were not covered by plastic sheets so that all flowers and the surrounding room were visible on video.  
157 From the analysis of the combined data we were able to identify the following pattern of visitation events  
158 that reliably indicated a chasing event between two identified individuals: (i) an identified bat visited a  
159 flower and (ii) its visit was instantaneously followed by the detection of a second bat, the chaser, that was  
160 detected very briefly (<200ms) and only by the ID sensor (detection range 5-7cm). Importantly, this second  
161 bat never attempted to drink and therefore did not insert its nose into the artificial flower and interrupt the  
162 light barrier inside the flower head. This distinguished such a chase from the occasional quick succession  
163 of two feeding visits by two bats at the same flower. This automated detection of chasing events not only  
164 saves considerable time for the experimenter, but also avoids human observer bias, a common drawback in  
165 video analysis. For the 24 hours of combined video data and automatically logged data, all 89 chasing events  
166 detected in the computer-logged data were confirmed by video (Wintergerst 2018). Therefore, we consider  
167 the algorithm for detecting chasing events in the logged data to be highly reliable. Of course, chases did  
168 not only occur at the artificial flowers. Thus, our chase numbers are only an indicator of chasing intensity  
169 between pairs of bats. For example, in one hour of video we observed 61 chasing events, but only five of  
170 those occurred during flower visits and were also automatically detected. However, since with our algorithm  
171 (see below) we detected a total of 2597 chasing events ( $35.8 \pm 16.6$  events per night during the experiment

172 and only  $4.1 \pm 2.8$  during the training nights, mean  $\pm$  SD) for the 36 participating bats, we considered the  
173 automated approach adequate for quantifying within-group dominance relationships. The total number of  
174 individual detections per night constrains the number of chasing opportunities detectable with our method.  
175 Therefore, we calculated a *chase score* and a *chased score* by dividing the number of observed chases (directed  
176 to others or received from others, respectively) for each bat by the total number of detections for that bat on  
177 each night.

178

### 179 (e) Statistical analysis

180 To investigate the difference in chasing behavior between males and females and between the resource  
181 treatments (one versus two rewarding patches) a Bayesian generalized linear mixed model (MCMCglmm,  
182 Hadfield 2010) with a binomial error structure and a parameter expanded prior was used. Body weight as an  
183 approximation of size and the full interaction between resource treatment and sex were included as fixed  
184 effects and the influence of these fixed effects on the proportion of chasing events was assessed. Experimental  
185 group and individual were included as random effects. The same model structure was used to address the  
186 question whether the proportion of visits on which the visitor was chased was influenced by these independent  
187 variables. If one or more individuals start to defend flowers and thus exclude others from drinking, nectar  
188 consumption should increasingly differ between individuals since the successful chaser should gain a higher  
189 nectar intake thus reducing the intake of the chased individuals. Therefore, the between-individual difference  
190 in nectar consumption over the course of the experiment was compared between experimental groups and  
191 resource treatments (clumped vs. dispersed). First, each individual's total nectar consumption standardized  
192 by the number of hours of foraging during the clumped (one rewarding patch) and dispersed (two rewarding  
193 patches) resource treatment was determined for each experimental night. Then these data were used to  
194 calculate group standard deviations, separately for the males and females of each group. In order to assess  
195 the influence of resource defense on the individual differences in nectar consumption (standard deviation  
196 of nectar intake) we fit a MCMCglmm model with a Gaussian error structure and the following fixed effects:  
197 sex, experimental night (centered), and resource treatment (clumped or dispersed), as well as all two-way  
198 interactions. Again, we included group and individual as random effects.

199 By plotting individual nectar consumption during the last two nights of the experiment against the chase  
200 scores, two non-overlapping groups of males were obtained, which were labeled dominant and subordinate  
201 males, respectively. Such a clear pattern was not observed in females. The identification of dominant  
202 individuals was also supported by calculating the individual Glicko ratings (Glickman 1999; So et al. 2015)  
203 from all chasing events over the last two experimental nights in each group. In the Glicko Rating algorithm  
204 individuals gain or lose ranking points based on their wins or losses and the rating of their opponent (Glickman  
205 1999; So et al. 2015). Glicko ratings were analyzed using the `PlayerRatings` package in R (Stephenson and  
206 Sonas 2020). Based on nectar consumption, the frequency of chasing events and the individual Glicko group  
207 ranks (from 1 to 6, with 1 corresponding to the highest Glicko rating), each group contained individuals  
208 belonging to one of three different types of social status: female, dominant male, and subordinate male. To  
209 address the question whether nectar consumption varied depending on social status during the early and  
210 late stages of the experiment we used Welch's tests and adjusted the p values using the Holms method for  
211 multiple comparisons.

212 All statistical analyses were conducted using R (Team 2021).

## 213 3. Results

### 214 (a) Behavioral observations

215 The goal of our experiment was to investigate the sex-specific effects of resource defense in *Glossophaga*  
216 *mutica*, in addition to the potential influence of interference competition on individual nectar intake.  
217 Qualitative behavioral observations of four hours of video recordings revealed several behaviors that seem to  
218 be characteristic for some males, which according to further analyses (see below) we designated as dominant  
219 males. Instead of just visiting the flowers and leaving the patch as the other individuals did, dominant males  
220 remained hanging between the flowers within the patch for a significant amount of time (Fig. S1). When

221 other individuals came close due to visits of directly adjacent flowers, dominant males often spread one wing  
222 in the direction of the other individual which could be interpreted as a threatening posture. Some individuals  
223 were attacked and chased away by dominant males while visiting artificial flowers. In this case, dominant  
224 males mostly attacked from above with their mouth wide open, and followed the intruder for a short distance.  
225 Sometimes the chasing escalated into fighting with both bats tumbling towards the ground and resuming  
226 their flight only shortly above the floor. In rare cases, these fights might have led to small injuries. One  
227 subordinate male had several fresh scratches on its wing that were not present before the experiment and  
228 that were possibly caused by bites (Fig. S2). After a successful flower defense, the dominant male normally  
229 visited most of the five flowers within the patch before returning to its hanging position between the flowers.

230 **(b) Example of nectar intake in one experimental group**

231 One of the first striking observation we made was the uneven distribution of nectar consumed between the  
232 sexes and individuals. For example, in the first mixed group of bats tested, after only two nights the nectar  
233 consumption of two males was nearly reduced to zero, whereas the third male increased its consumption  
234 substantially (Fig. 2A). However, this pattern occurred mostly for males during the clumped resource  
235 treatment (Fig. @ref(fig: overview)). Nectar consumption of females was rarely as divergent as in males,  
236 especially in the mixed groups (Fig. @ref(fig: overview)). Later on the same nights when resources were  
237 dispersed over two patches, nectar consumption of males and females generally converged by the end of the  
238 experiment (Fig. 2B, Fig. @ref(fig: overview)).

239 **(c) Differences between sexes in frequency of chasing (chase score) and being  
240 chased (chased score)**

241 In all mixed groups males chased other bats in front of flowers significantly more often than females did  
242 (Fig. 3A, Table 1). Notably, the frequency of females as active chasers in female-only groups was higher  
243 than chasing by females in the mixed groups (Fig. 3A). Although the rate of nectar availability remained  
244 constant throughout the night and only the spatial distribution of the resources changed, chase frequencies  
245 were significantly lower during the dispersed resource treatment when rewards were available at both patches  
246 (Table 1). There was no significant difference between the sexes in how often a bat was chased by another  
247 individual (Fig. 3B) but individuals were chased less during the dispersed resource treatment (Table 1).  
248 Weight as an indicator of size had no significant effect on either the chase score or the chased score (Table 1).




Figure 2: Change of individual nectar consumption from the clumped treatment (A) to the dispersed treatment (B) during an experiment of one mixed group (3 males, 3 females, symbols show different individuals). (A). During the clumped resource treatment (first part of the experimental night) rewards were only available at one patch. The nectar consumption of two subordinate males approached zero after only two nights, whereas the third, dominant, male greatly increased nectar intake during the experiment (males filled symbols). Females (open symbols) on the other hand maintained a stable level of nectar intake. (B) During the dispersed resource treatment (second part of the experimental night) rewards were available at both patches. Under this treatment, individuals nearly equalized their level of nectar intake over the course of the experiment. The second part of night 4 was excluded due to technical problems.




Figure 3: Sexes differed in the frequency of chasing or being chased during the clumped resource treatment. (A) Males (dark symbols) chased others significantly more than females did (light symbols, Table 1). Shown are the individual proportions of chasing events (chase scores) over the whole experiment. Notably, in the females-only groups some females chased more than any female in the mixed groups. (B) Being chased by other bats did not differ significantly between sexes (Table 1).

Table 1: Summary of fixed effects from generalized linear mixed-effects models of chasing frequency and the frequency of being chased.

Model	term	estimate	95% credible interval	pMCMC
Chase score				
	(Intercept)	-5.20	(-11.54, 0.64)	0.0970
	sex (female)	<b>-1.33</b>	( <b>-2.53</b> , <b>-0.2</b> )	<b>0.0290</b>
	phase	<b>-0.46</b>	( <b>-0.76</b> , <b>-0.17</b> )	<b>0.0050</b>
	weight	-0.11	(-0.75, 0.5)	0.7470
	sex (female):phase	-0.06	(-0.46, 0.34)	0.7490
Chased score				
	(Intercept)	<b>-5.24</b>	( <b>-10.06</b> , <b>-0.41</b> )	<b>0.0300</b>
	sex (female)	0.72	(-0.12, 1.62)	0.1060
	phase	<b>-0.95</b>	( <b>-1.22</b> , <b>-0.67</b> )	<b>0.0005</b>
	weight	-0.07	(-0.58, 0.41)	0.7810
	sex (female):phase	-0.11	(-0.44, 0.21)	0.5340

Note: Fixed estimates whose credible intervals do not span zero are shown in bold. pMCMC = posterior probability

#### 249 (d) Differences in nectar intake over time and between sexes and treatments

250 Resource defense should lead to a larger between-individual difference in nectar consumption (Brown 1964).  
 251 Differences in nectar consumption were quantified as the standard deviation of nectar intake in each group,  
 252 separately for males and females. During the clumped resource treatment, the standard deviation was higher  
 253 for males than for females (Table 2, Fig. S24) and increased significantly over time for males but not for  
 254 females (Table 2, Fig. S24). For females in the clumped resource treatment the increase in standard deviation  
 255 was significantly smaller than in males (significant interaction between sex and night, Table 2), and was not  
 256 itself significant (estimate = 0.02, 95% CI = 0, 0.06). Compared to the clumped resource treatment, in the  
 257 dispersed resource treatment the effect of experimental night was significantly lower for males (interaction  
 258 between treatment and night, Table 2), but not for females (estimate = 0, 95% CI = -0.02, 0.02). Moreover,  
 259 in the dispersed resource treatment there was no significant increase in standard deviation over the course of  
 260 the experiment in males (estimate = 0.02, 95% CI = -0.01, 0.05) nor in females (estimate = 0.03, 95% CI =  
 261 0, 0.06). Overall, for both males (significant effect of treatment) and females (estimate = -0.11, 95% CI =  
 262 -0.16, -0.06) the standard deviations were generally higher in the clumped than in the dispersed resource  
 263 treatments.

Table 2: Summary of fixed effects from a generalized linear mixed-effects model of the standard deviation of nectar intake over time.

term	estimate	95% credible interval	pMCMC
(Intercept)	<b>0.55</b>	(0.45, 0.65)	<b>0.000</b>
sex (female)	<b>-0.17</b>	(-0.24, -0.12)	<b>0.000</b>
treatment (dispersed)	<b>-0.22</b>	(-0.28, -0.16)	<b>0.000</b>
night	<b>0.06</b>	(0.03, 0.1)	<b>0.001</b>
sex (female):treatment (dispersed)	<b>0.11</b>	(0.04, 0.19)	<b>0.004</b>
sex (female):night	<b>-0.03</b>	(-0.06, -0.01)	<b>0.007</b>
treatment (dispersed):night	<b>-0.04</b>	(-0.07, -0.02)	<b>0.001</b>
sex (female):treatment (dispersed):night	<b>0.05</b>	(0.01, 0.08)	<b>0.006</b>

Note: Fixed estimates whose credible intervals do not span zero are shown in bold. pMCMC = posterior probability

#### 264 (e) Social status and its effects on nectar intake

265 When plotting chasing events against nectar consumption the data for males fell into two non-overlapping  
 266 groups. The males of one cluster (Fig. 4A, inside dashed oval) chased other individuals and consumed more  
 267 nectar than the other males. This cluster included only one male from each of the four mixed groups but  
 268 two males from the single males-only group. These six males were categorized as “dominant”. The second  
 269 cluster of males (Fig. 4A, outside and below dashed oval) was characterized by a low frequency of chasing  
 270 and low nectar consumption. These males were categorized as “subordinate”. In females such a pattern  
 271 did not emerge (Fig. 4B). This classification was also supported by the highest social dominance scores as  
 272 estimated by Glicko ratings in each group (Figs. S25, S26) and the observation that there was generally an  
 273 inverse relationship between the frequency of chasing and the frequency of being chased (Fig. S27). While in  
 274 the females-only groups some females chased other females more frequently, only three of these females (one  
 275 in group 1 and two in group 4) would be classified as dominant using the same cut-off criteria we used for the  
 276 males (Fig. 4B). While in females-only group 4 the two females were the individuals with the highest Glicko  
 277 ratings, in females-only group 1 the female with the highest nectar consumption and chase score did not have  
 278 the highest Glicko rating (Figs. S25, S26). During the last two nights of the experiment in the clumped  
 279 resource treatment, the highest nectar intake was observed in dominant males, with an intermediate intake  
 280 in females, and lowest nectar intake in subordinate males (Fig. 5). In contrast, in the dispersed resource  
 281 treatment there were no detectable differences between the nectar intake of dominant and subordinate males  
 282 at any stage of the experiment (Fig. 5), while the subordinate males had a significantly lower nectar intake  
 283 than females in the first two, but not in the last two experimental nights (Fig. 5). Finally, the subordinate  
 284 males increased their nectar intake from the clumped to the dispersed treatment, but the difference was  
 285 only significant for the last two experimental nights (Fig. 5). While there was a correspondent decrease in  
 286 the nectar intake of dominant males, it was not significant, most likely due to the small sample size ( $n = 6$ ,  
 287 Fig. 5). In females there were no significant differences in nectar intake from the clumped to the dispersed  
 288 resource treatment at any stage of the experiment (Fig. 5)




Figure 4: Influence of chasing frequency (chase score) on nectar intake in the clumped resource treatment during the last two nights of the experiment. (A) Males that more often chased other males also consumed more nectar. Males were divided into two non-overlapping groups by considering the chasing frequency and the amount of nectar an individual received during the clumped resource treatment at the end of the experiment. Dominant males (inside dashed line oval) met two criteria: they chased other individuals at flowers more frequently ( $>0.003$ ) and received more nectar ( $>0.75mL\ h^{-1}$ ) during the clumped resource treatment. Individuals outside the dashed line oval were categorized as subordinate males. (B) Nectar consumption of females did not generally depend on the chase score during the clumped resource treatment and non-overlapping groups did not emerge.




Figure 5: Comparison of nectar intake during the first and last two nights of the experiment depending on sex and social status. During the clumped resource distribution (left in each panel), already at the beginning of the experiment (left panel) subordinate males collected significantly less nectar than dominant males and females. At the end of the experiment (right panel), females, dominant and subordinate males differed in their nectar consumption, but only during the clumped and not during the dispersed treatment. During the dispersed resource treatment at the beginning of the experiment subordinate males received less nectar than females, but this difference disappeared by the end of the experiment. Numbers above brackets are the p values from unequal variance T tests (Welch's tests), adjusted for multiple comparisons using the Holms method. Contrasts between treatments were from paired Welch's tests. For clarity, only p values smaller than 0.1 are shown. Each status group represents data from the same individuals. For clarity, only the lines connecting the same dominant males are shown.

## 289 4. Discussion

290 Similar to observations in free-living *Glossophaga* populations (Lemke 1984; Tschapka 2003), in this experiment  
 291 *G. mutica* competed for nectar not only by exploitation but also by interference competition. However, the  
 292 results show that the predisposition to defend resources and the influence of interference competition on  
 293 individual nectar intake differed significantly between the sexes. Only a subset of individuals, most notably  
 294 males in the mixed-sex groups, successfully defended flower patches. Dominant individuals were characterized  
 295 by the highest frequency of chasing other individuals away from profitable flowers (chase scores), by the  
 296 highest Glicko ratings, and by a substantial increase in nectar intake during the time periods of active defense  
 297 by the end of the experimental run. Although the dominant males in the mixed groups chased females and  
 298 other males about equally often, only the nectar intake of subordinate males but not of the females was  
 299 affected by this behavior. Thus, male-initiated interference competition increased the difference in nectar  
 300 intake between males but did not affect females. The frequency of aggressive interactions was higher, and  
 301 males only defended resources successfully when the available nectar was concentrated at only one flower  
 302 patch. This supports the hypothesis that clumped resources favor an increase in aggressive interactions  
 303 (Grant 1993).

### 304 (a) Sex-dependent resource defense and its differential effect on nectar intake, 305 depending on social status

306 To our knowledge, this study is the first report of sex-dependent differences in resource defense behavior of  
 307 neotropical nectar-feeding bats. In mixed sex groups, females seemed to be much less affected by the behavior  
 308 of dominant males whereas subordinate males were excluded at least partially from the defended flower patch.

309 This finding is consistent with observations of free-flying *G. commissarisi*, in which males visited on average  
310 a smaller number of artificial flowers than females did (Nachev and Winter 2019), presumably because of  
311 interactions with other males. There are two possible explanations for this differential effect on subordinate  
312 males and females. On the one hand, dominant males might just not be capable of excluding females. On  
313 the other hand, dominant males could tolerate females in their defended patch because they might receive  
314 additional benefits, for example tolerating females could lead to an increase in (future) mating opportunities.  
315 Similar social dynamics have been described in the insectivorous bat species *Myotis daubentonii* (Senior,  
316 Butlin, and Altringham 2005). Dominant males of this species temporarily exclude other males from profitable  
317 habitats whereas females are tolerated and in addition to securing access to resources, the successful exclusion  
318 of other males has been shown to increase the reproductive success of dominant males (Senior, Butlin, and  
319 Altringham 2005). Similarly, it has been observed that male purple-throated carib hummingbirds (*Eulampis*  
320 *jugularis*), which successfully defend highly profitable feeding-territories against other males while sharing the  
321 available resources with females, experienced an increase in their mating success (Temeles and Kress 2010).  
322 However, in our experiment dominant males chased females about as often or slightly more often as they  
323 chased subordinate males (Table 1, Fig. S22). If females were able to feed in the defended patch because  
324 dominant males tolerated them due to potential additional benefits, it could be that the detected chasing  
325 events by dominant males differed in quality depending on the sex of the intruder. This was not further  
326 quantified in the current study but could potentially be investigated using audio recordings (Knörnschild,  
327 Glöckner, and Helversen 2010). We extracted the frequency of chasing events from data automatically  
328 recorded at artificial flowers (successive detection of two different IDs while and after the first was feeding at  
329 the flower). Therefore, it was not possible to determine if males showed behavioral differences when chasing  
330 other males in comparison to chasing females. The recorded video revealed that individuals chased each  
331 other not only directly at the artificial flowers but also in other areas of the flower patch. Since individuals  
332 could only be identified by their ID tags directly at the ID reader attached to artificial flowers the sex of  
333 individuals chasing each other in other areas of the experimental room remained unknown. However, after  
334 the experiment some subordinate individuals showed marks from small injuries at their wings (see example  
335 in Fig. S2) and such marks were only observed in males. This could be an indication that dominant males  
336 directed more aggression (biting) towards subordinate males than towards females. Such sexual dimorphism  
337 in aggressive resource defense is also known from other nectar-feeding vertebrates, like hummingbirds. The  
338 beaks of the males of some territorial hummingbirds seem to be specifically adapted as intrasexually selected  
339 weapons (Rico-Guevara et al. 2019).

#### 340 (b) Some observations from the single-sex groups

341 Generally, females showed lower chasing frequencies, but, surprisingly, some females in the females-only  
342 group showed an increased nectar consumption and chasing frequency, compared to the females in the mixed  
343 groups (Figs. 4B, S25, S26). This observation prompted us to contrast the behavior of females in the two  
344 different group types (single-sex versus mixed-sex). Females in the single-sex groups had higher chase scores  
345 compared to females in mixed groups (Table S1). In single-sex groups, but not in mixed groups there was a  
346 higher frequency of chases in the clumped than in the dispersed resource treatment (Table S1). The chased  
347 score was only affected by treatment but not by group type and was higher in the clumped than in the  
348 dispersed resource treatment (Table S1). Over the course of the experiment, the standard deviations in  
349 nectar intake increased for females in the single-sex, but not in the mixed groups (Table S2). This increase  
350 was only significant in the clumped, but not in the dispersed resource treatment (Table S2). The standard  
351 deviations were higher in the single-sex groups than in the mixed groups, both in the clumped (group type  
352 effect in Table S2) and in the dispersed resource treatments (estimate = -0.06, 95% CI = -0.12, -0.01). Thus,  
353 it appears that in the absence of male individuals, some females exerted dominant behavior over the other  
354 females, similar to males. These findings are similar to the social structure of resource defense found in some  
355 nectar-feeding bird species. For example, in free-living ruby-throated hummingbirds females also have lower  
356 levels of defense (Rousseau, Charette, and Bélisle 2014). Moreover, although both male and female *Eulampis*  
357 *jugularis* hummingbirds defend feeding territories during the non-breeding season, males are always dominant  
358 over females (Wolf and Hainsworth 1971; Temeles, Goldman, and Kudla 2005). It would be interesting to  
359 better understand why females were less affected by the aggressive resource defense behavior of dominant  
360 males compared to subordinate males and why females themselves did not consistently monopolize the

361 profitable patch against other females, not even in the females-only groups. One possibility is that females do  
362 not need to defend flowers when a dominant male is already reducing the number of flower visitors and thus  
363 increasing the amount of food available.

364 In all mixed sex groups, only one male per group became dominant and successfully defended flowers, whereas  
365 in the males-only group two males exhibited dominant behavior (Fig. 4A). A closer look at the nectar  
366 consumption at each flower revealed that on the last night of the experiment these two males had nearly  
367 monopolized different flowers within the same patch rather than sharing access to the same flowers (Fig.  
368 S28). Such flower or patch partitioning was also observed in the females-only groups (Figs. S33-S36), but  
369 rarely seen in the mixed groups (Figs. S29-S32). The successful resource defense by two individuals in the  
370 male-only group showed that resource defense can occur independent of the presence of females, but, this was  
371 only based on a single observation.

### 372 (c) Social status and social hierarchy

373 Although the position of the rewarding patch during the clumped resource treatment changed between the  
374 nights between the left and right, usually the same male continued to successfully defend the patch, especially  
375 in the mixed-sex groups (Figs. S28-S32). This means that males defended the resources themselves and not a  
376 particular location. Furthermore, this shows that even after changing the location of the defended patch  
377 the same individuals were usually able to succeed in re-establishing their dominance against other males,  
378 indicating a stable hierarchy at least for the duration of the experiment. The flower utilization pattern in  
379 females-only groups was not as consistent (Figs. S33-S36).

380 The ability of an individual to successfully defend and monopolize resources is often correlated with distinct  
381 physical characteristics such as body size (Searcy 1979). However, in our results weight as an approximation  
382 of size did not correlate significantly with the chase score of individuals (Table 1) and therefore did not  
383 predict which male succeeded in defending a flower patch. Another factor that could influence the success  
384 in defending flowers is age and therefore experience (Arcese 1987; Yasukawa 1979). Since we could only  
385 discriminate between young and adult animals, we cannot dismiss age and experience as a predictor of  
386 successful flower defense.

387 In this study, subordinate males received considerably less nectar than dominant males and females (Fig. 5).  
388 However, except in mixed group 1, subordinate males were rarely completely excluded from the flower patch  
389 and their average nectar intake during the clumped resource treatment was still  $0.3 \pm 0.18 \text{ mL h}^{-1}$  (mean  $\pm$   
390 SD). This result is in accordance with observations of free-living *G. soricina* in Colombia. There, subordinate  
391 bats exploited the flowers defended by other individuals as soon as the dominant bat temporarily ceased  
392 defending (Lemke 1984). Furthermore, in our study the frequency of chasing events decreased significantly  
393 during the dispersed resource treatment in the second part of the night (Table 1). This supports the theoretical  
394 prediction that aggressive defense behavior increases when resources are spatially concentrated (Grant and  
395 Guha 1993). However, since the sequence of treatments was not controlled in this experiment, other factors  
396 (e.g., time) cannot be ruled out. With the current data we cannot answer whether the dominant males would  
397 successfully defend a patch if the treatment changed from dispersed to clumped, but we believe this is a  
398 different question that should be addressed separately. Resource defense should only occur when the energy  
399 gain outweighs the cost of aggressive interactions (Brown 1964). Thus, our results could be explained by the  
400 decrease in quality of the defended patch once its nectar supply rate dropped to half. This is also supported  
401 by the very low number of chases observed during training when the flowers gave unrestricted rewards and  
402 were not separated in discrete patches. Together, these results suggest that along the different degrees of  
403 territorial behavior, resource defense observed in *Glossophaga* seems to represent a transient monopolization  
404 of resources instead of a longer-term permanent exclusion of intruders.

### 405 (d) Conclusion

406 Although flower defense behavior of *G. mutica* was investigated in a laboratory setting, we observed similar  
407 behavior as described in free-living *Glossophaga* populations. Our results revealed a sexual dimorphism in  
408 flower defense behavior in mixed-sex groups. Only males successfully defended flower patches and excluded  
409 other males from their defended resource, whereas females remained unaffected by this male behavior and  
410 continued to visit the flowers guarded by a male. In the absence of males females also defended flowers,

<sup>411</sup> but not as consistently as males. This observed pattern is similar to resource defense behavior observed in  
<sup>412</sup> other nectar-feeding vertebrates. Furthermore, we could show that the frequency of aggressive interactions  
<sup>413</sup> was, as predicted, higher when resources were clumped in one patch and transient. Future studies with  
<sup>414</sup> free-living populations have to be conducted to assess how frequent and important resource defense in these  
<sup>415</sup> nectar-feeding bats is and if males that are successful in defending resources have additional fitness advantages.

416 **Supplementary material**

417 **Video analysis**

418 There were 89 chase occurrences observed (f->f 4 times, f->m 2 times, m->f 59 times, m->m 24 times).  
419 Every time the algorithm marked an event as a chase event, there were two individuals following each other.  
420 Some chase sequences did not get detected. The individual that chased never drank immediately after the  
421 chase at the same flower location where the chase occurred. There were 16 incidences that were difficult to  
422 classify by observation or did not appear to be aggressive interactions.

423

424 f->f appear to be less aggressive

425 f->m appear aggressive

426 m->f appear aggressive

427 m->m appear aggressive

428

429 **Supplementary figures**




Figure S1: Video of the dominant male in mixed group 3 chasing all bats approaching the rewarding flowers in the rewarding patch during the clumped resource treatment.




Figure S2: Wing images of a subordinate male from mixed group 4. The same individual was photographed before (**A**) and after the experiment (**B**). The black arrow points to the scarred location due to wing injuries, purportedly caused by the dominant male.




Figure S3: Change of individual nectar consumption from the clumped treatment (left) to the dispersed treatment (right) for all experimental groups (rows).  $^{18}\text{Males}$  are shown with filled symbols and females with open symbols. Small symbols indicate dominant individuals, according to proportion of chasing and nectar intake during the last two nights of the experiment.




Figure S4: Raw number of detections for all bats in mixed group 1. Dotted bars represent subordinate males, striped bars represent dominant males and unhatched bars - females.




Figure S5: Raw number of detections for all bats in mixed group 2. Same notation as in Fig. S4, but the colors correspond to different individuals.




Figure S6: Raw number of detections for all bats in mixed group 3. Same notation as in Fig. S4, but the colors correspond to different individuals.




Figure S7: Raw number of detections for all bats in mixed group 4. Same notation as in Fig. S4, but the colors correspond to different individuals.




Figure S8: Raw number of detections for all bats in males-only group. Same notation as in Fig. S4, but the colors correspond to different individuals.




Figure S9: Raw number of detections for all bats in females-only group 1.




Figure S10: Raw number of detections for all bats in females-only group 2.




Figure S11: Raw number of detections for all bats in females-only group 3.




Figure S12: Raw number of detections for all bats in females-only group 4.




Figure S13: Raw number of chase events for all bats in mixed group 1. Same notation as in Fig. S4, but the colors correspond to different individuals.




Figure S14: Raw number of chase events for all bats in mixed group 2. Same notation as in Fig. S4, but the colors correspond to different individuals.




Figure S15: Raw number of chase events for all bats in mixed group 3. Same notation as in Fig. S4, but the colors correspond to different individuals.




Figure S16: Raw number of chase events for all bats in mixed group 4. Same notation as in Fig. S4, but the colors correspond to different individuals.




Figure S17: Raw number of chase events for all bats in males-only group. Same notation as in Fig. S4, but the colors correspond to different individuals.




Figure S18: Raw number of chase events for all bats in females-only group 1.




Figure S19: Raw number of chase events for all bats in females-only group 2.




Figure S20: Raw number of chase events for all bats in females-only group 3.




Figure S21: Raw number of chase events for all bats in females-only group 4.




Figure S22: Frequency of chase events directed to bats of either sex. **(A, B)** Colored bars give the frequency of chase events per night (total chases divided by number of nights) over the main experiment by each individual from each group (abscissa) towards male (**A**) and female (**B**) bats. The dominant males are shown with stripes and the subordinate males are shown with dots. **(C)** Relative frequency of chase events directed towards male bats for male (purple) and female (yellow) bats from all mixed experimental groups (abscissa). The size of the dots represents the mean frequency of chase events per night.




Figure S23: Number of rewarded visits per night (mean  $\pm$  SE) during the clumped and dispersed reward treatments for male (purple) and female (yellow) bats in each experimental group (panels). Data from the same individuals are connected with lines. Individuals classified as “dominant” are connected with dashed lines.




Figure S24: The standard deviation of group nectar consumption was used to measure the between-individual differences in nectar intake. It was calculated for the clumped (left panel) and the dispersed (right panel) resource treatments, separately for males (dashed lines) and females (continuous lines) from each experimental group (different colors). For visualization only, lines give the corresponding fits based on locally weighted scatterplot smoothing (loess). The statistical analysis was based on linear regression (see Methods).




Figure S25: Glicko ratings within the six experimental groups. Over the last two experimental nights, the males (closed symbols) with the highest chase scores were also the individuals with the highest Glicko rating in each group (panels) during the clumped resource treatment. In female-only groups this correspondence was found only in group 2. Numbers at symbols give the Glicko rating in thousands.




Figure S26: Male bats or female bats in the single-sex groups with the highest Glicko ratings had the highest nectar intake rates during the clumped, but generally not during the dispersed resource treatment.




Figure S27: The relationship between chase score and chase score (proportion of chases versus the proportion of being chased out of all detections) for female (right) and male (left) individuals in all experimental groups (different colors). Mixed groups are shown with circles and single-sex groups, with triangles.

Table S1: Summary of fixed effects from generalized linear mixed-effects models of chasing frequency and the frequency of being chased for female bats only.

Model	term	estimate	95% credible interval	pMCMC
Chase score				
	(Intercept)	-5.74	(-13.88, 1.93)	0.1540
	group type (mixed)	<b>-1.59</b>	( <b>-2.9</b> , <b>-0.21</b> )	<b>0.0340</b>
	treatment (dispersed)	<b>-0.66</b>	( <b>-0.99</b> , <b>-0.34</b> )	<b>0.0005</b>
	weight	-0.19	(-0.99, 0.59)	0.6310
	group type (mixed):treatment (dispersed)	0.58	(-0.08, 1.24)	0.0880
Chased score				
	(Intercept)	<b>-8.34</b>	( <b>-13.02</b> , <b>-3.16</b> )	<b>0.0010</b>
	group type (mixed)	0.27	(-0.6, 1.26)	0.5250
	treatment (dispersed)	<b>-1.14</b>	( <b>-1.39</b> , <b>-0.92</b> )	<b>0.0005</b>
	weight	0.19	(-0.31, 0.65)	0.3990
	group type (mixed):treatment (dispersed)	0.21	(-0.15, 0.55)	0.2470

Note: Fixed estimates whose credible intervals do not span zero are shown in bold. pMCMC = posterior probability

Table S2: Summary of fixed effects from a generalized linear mixed-effects model of the standard deviation of nectar intake over time for female bats only.

term	estimate	95% credible interval	pMCMC
(Intercept)	<b>0.50</b>	( <b>0.41</b> , <b>0.6</b> )	<b>0.000</b>
group type (mixed)	<b>-0.27</b>	( <b>-0.4</b> , <b>-0.14</b> )	<b>0.003</b>
treatment (dispersed)	<b>-0.18</b>	( <b>-0.24</b> , <b>-0.11</b> )	<b>0.000</b>
night	<b>0.05</b>	( <b>0.01</b> , <b>0.1</b> )	<b>0.030</b>
group type (mixed):treatment (dispersed)	<b>0.12</b>	( <b>0.04</b> , <b>0.2</b> )	<b>0.007</b>
group type (mixed):night	-0.05	(-0.11, 0.01)	0.116
treatment (dispersed):night	-0.01	(-0.04, 0.02)	0.573
group type (mixed):treatment (dispersed):night	0.01	(-0.03, 0.05)	0.648

Note: Fixed estimates whose credible intervals do not span zero are shown in bold. pMCMC = posterior probability




Figure S28: Distribution of rewarded visits across flowers for the six bats in the males-only group. The colored bars give the number of rewarded visits of each individual at the ten flowers during the clumped (top) and dispersed (bottom) resource treatments for each experimental night (columns). The dominant males are shown with stripes and the subordinate males are shown with dots. This was the only group with two males behaving as dominant. On the last night, rather than sharing all flowers within the defended patch, the dominant males partitioned the patch into two subpatches, with each bat defending its own partition.




Figure S29: Distribution of rewarded visits across flowers for the six bats in mixed group 1. The colored bars give the number of rewarded visits of each individual at the ten flowers during the clumped (top) and dispersed (bottom) resource treatments for each experimental night (columns). The dominant male is shown with stripes, the subordinate males are shown with dots, and the females are shown with solid bars. Due to a technical malfunction on night 4, there were no rewards delivered in the dispersed resource treatment and the data were excluded from analysis.




Figure S30: Distribution of rewarded visits across flowers for the six bats in mixed group 2. Same notation as in Fig. S29, but the colors correspond to different individuals.




Figure S31: Distribution of rewarded visits across flowers for the six bats in mixed group 3. Same notation as in Fig. S29, but the colors correspond to different individuals. Due to a technical malfunction on night 9, there were no rewards delivered in the dispersed resource treatment and the data were excluded from analysis.




Figure S32: Distribution of rewarded visits across flowers for the six bats in mixed group 4. Same notation as in Fig. S29, but the colors correspond to different individuals.




Figure S33: Distribution of rewarded visits across flowers for the six bats in the females-only group 1. Same notation as in Fig. S29, but the colors correspond to different individuals.




Figure S34: Distribution of rewarded visits across flowers for the six bats in the females-only group 2. Same notation as in Fig. S29, but the colors correspond to different individuals.




Figure S35: Distribution of rewarded visits across flowers for the six bats in the females-only group 3. Same notation as in Fig. S29, but the colors correspond to different individuals.




Figure S36: Distribution of rewarded visits across flowers for the six bats in the females-only group 4. Same notation as in Fig. S29, but the colors correspond to different individuals.

<sup>430</sup> **Authors' contributions**

<sup>431</sup> S.W. Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Data collection, Formal Analysis, Video Analysis, Writing—  
<sup>432</sup> original draft. V.N. Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Formal Analysis, Data curation, Writing—  
<sup>433</sup> review and editing, Visualization, Supervision, Project Administration.  
<sup>434</sup> Y.W. Conceptualization, Resources, Methodology, Software (data acquisition), Writing—review and editing,  
<sup>435</sup> Supervision, Funding.

<sup>436</sup> **Competing interests**

<sup>437</sup> We declare we have no competing interests.

<sup>438</sup> **Funding**

<sup>439</sup> S.W. was supported by an Elsa-Neumann-Stipendium des Landes Berlin.

<sup>440</sup> **Acknowledgements**

<sup>441</sup> We thank Katja Frei and Peggy Hoffmann for assistance with the main experiments and animal keeping,  
<sup>442</sup> Alexej Schatz for programming of the control software, and Peter Spende, Francesco Bagorda, and Waldemar  
<sup>443</sup> Krzok for help with the experimental hardware. We also thank Marion Rivalan and Lucille Alonso for a  
<sup>444</sup> fruitful discussion on the analysis of social behavior.

<sup>445</sup> **Data Availability**

<sup>446</sup> All data and code are available in the Zenodo repository: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5205511>.

## 447 References

- 448 Amarasekare, Priyanga. 2002. "Interference Competition and Species Coexistence." *Proceedings of the Royal  
449 Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* 269 (1509): 2541–50. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2002.2181>.
- 450 Arcese, Peter. 1987. "Age, Intrusion Pressure and Defence Against Floaters by Territorial Male Song Sparrows." *Animal Behaviour* 35 (3): 773–84. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472\(87\)80114-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(87)80114-8).
- 451 Boyden, Thomas C. 1978. "Territorial Defense Against Hummingbirds and Insects by Tropical Hummingbirds." *The Condor* 80 (2): 216–21. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1367921>.
- 452 Brown, Jerram L. 1964. "The Evolution of Diversity in Avian Territorial Systems." *The Wilson Bulletin* 76 (2): 160–69. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4159278>.
- 453 Brunet-Rossini, Anja K., and Gerald S. Wilkinson. 2009. "Methods for Age Estimation and the Study of Senescence in Bats." In *Ecological and Behavioral Methods for the Study of Bats.*, 2nd. ed, 315–25. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- 454 Calahorra-Oliart, Adriana, Sandra M Ospina-Garcés, and Livia León-Paniagua. 2021. "Cryptic Species in *Glossophaga Soricina* (Chiroptera: Phyllostomidae): Do Morphological Data Support Molecular Evidence?" *Journal of Mammalogy* 102 (1): 54–68. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jmammal/gyaal16>.
- 455 Carpenter, F. L., and R. E. Macmillen. 1976. "Threshold Model of Feeding Territoriality and Test with a Hawaiian Honeycreeper." *Science (New York, N.Y.)* 194 (4265): 639–42. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.194.4265.639>.
- 456 Chase, Ivan D., Craig Tovey, Debra Spangler-Martin, and Michael Manfredonia. 2002. "Individual Differences Versus Social Dynamics in the Formation of Animal Dominance Hierarchies." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 99 (8): 5744–49. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.082104199>.
- 457 Ewald, Paul W., and F. Lynn Carpenter. 1978. "Territorial Responses to Energy Manipulations in the Anna Hummingbird." *Oecologia* 31 (3): 277–92. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00346248>.
- 458 Gill, Frank B., and Larry L. Wolf. 1975. "Economics of Feeding Territoriality in the Golden-Winged Sunbird." *Ecology* 56 (2): 333–45. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/1934964>.
- 459 Glickman, Mark E. 1999. "Parameter Estimation in Large Dynamic Paired Comparison Experiments." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)* 48 (3): 377–94. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9876.00159>.
- 460 Gonzalez-Terrazas, Tania P., Carlos Martel, Paulo Milet-Pinheiro, Manfred Ayasse, Elisabeth K. V. Kalko, and Marco Tschapka. 2016. "Finding Flowers in the Dark: Nectar-Feeding Bats Integrate Olfaction and Echolocation While Foraging for Nectar." *Royal Society Open Science* 3 (8): 160199. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.160199>.
- 461 Grant, James W. A. 1993. "Whether or Not to Defend? The Influence of Resource Distribution." *Marine Behaviour and Physiology* 23 (1-4): 137–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10236249309378862>.
- 462 Grant, James W. A., Isabelle L. Girard, Cindy Breau, and Laura K. Weir. 2002. "Influence of Food Abundance on Competitive Aggression in Juvenile Convict Cichlids." *Animal Behaviour* 63 (2): 323–30. <https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.2001.1891>.
- 463 Grant, James W. A., and Rabi T. Guha. 1993. "Spatial Clumping of Food Increases Its Monopolization and Defense by Convict Cichlids, *Cichlasoma Nigrofasciatum*." *Behavioral Ecology* 4 (4): 293–96. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/4.4.293>.
- 464 Hadfield, Jarrod D. 2010. "MCMC Methods for Multi-Response Generalized Linear Mixed Models: The MCMCglmm R Package." *Journal of Statistical Software* 33 (2): 1–25.
- 465 Hörmann, David, Marco Tschapka, Andreas Rose, and Mirjam Knörnschild. 2020. "Distress Calls of Nectarivorous Bats (*Glossophaga Soricina*) Encode Individual and Species Identity." *Bioacoustics* 0 (0): 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09524622.2020.1720815>.
- 466 Howell, D. J. 1974. "Acoustic Behavior and Feeding in Glossophagine Bats." *Journal of Mammalogy* 55 (2): 293–308. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1378999>.
- 467 Knörnschild, Mirjam, Volker Glöckner, and Otto von Helversen. 2010. "The Vocal Repertoire of Two Sympatric Species of Nectar-Feeding Bats (*Glossophaga Soricina* and *G. Commissarisi*).". *Acta Chiropterologica* 12 (1): 205–15. <https://doi.org/10.3161/150811010X504707>.
- 468 Lemke, Thomas O. 1984. "Foraging Ecology of the Long-Nosed Bat, *Glossophaga Soricina*, With Respect to Resource Availability." *Ecology* 65 (2): 538–48. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1941416>.
- 469 ———. 1985. "Pollen Carrying by the Nectar-Feeding Bat *Glossophaga Soricina* in a Suburban Environment."

- 501      *Biotropica* 17 (2): 107–11. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2388502>.
- 502      Nachev, Vladislav, and York Winter. 2019. “Behavioral Repeatability and Choice Performance in Wild  
503      Free-Flying Nectarivorous Bats (*Glossophaga Commissarisi*).” *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 73 (2):  
504      24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-019-2637-4>.
- 505      Paton, David C., and F. Lynn Carpenter. 1984. “Peripheral Foraging by Territorial Rufous Hummingbirds:  
506      Defense by Exploitation.” *Ecology* 65 (6): 1808–19. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1937777>.
- 507      Rico-Guevara, A, M A Rubega, K J Hurme, and R Dudley. 2019. “Shifting Paradigms in the Mechanics  
508      of Nectar Extraction and Hummingbird Bill Morphology.” *Integrative Organismal Biology* 1 (oby006).  
509      <https://doi.org/10.1093/iob/oby006>.
- 510      Rose, Andreas, Miriam Kolar, Marco Tschapka, and Mirjam Knörnschild. 2016. “Learning Where to Feed:  
511      The Use of Social Information in Flower-Visiting Pallas’ Long-Tongued Bats (*Glossophaga Soricina*).”  
512      *Animal Cognition* 19 (2): 251–62. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-015-0930-9>.
- 513      Rousseau, François, Yanick Charette, and Marc Bélisle. 2014. “Resource Defense and Monopolization in a  
514      Marked Population of Ruby-Throated Hummingbirds (*Archilochus Colubris*).” *Ecology and Evolution* 4  
515      (6): 776–93. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.972](https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.972).
- 516      Searcy, William A. 1979. “Morphological Correlates of Dominance in Captive Male Red-Winged Blackbirds.”  
517      *Condor* 81 (4): 417–20.
- 518      Senior, Paula, Roger K Butlin, and John D Altringham. 2005. “Sex and Segregation in Temperate Bats.”  
519      *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 272 (1580): 2467–73. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsb.2005.3237>.
- 520      So, Nina, Becca Franks, Sean Lim, and James P. Curley. 2015. “A Social Network Approach Reveals  
521      Associations Between Mouse Social Dominance and Brain Gene Expression.” *PLOS ONE* 10 (7): e0134509.  
522      <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0134509>.
- 523      Stephenson, Alec, and Jeff Sonas. 2020. “PlayerRatings: Dynamic Updating Methods for Player Ratings  
524      Estimation.” <https://rdrr.io/cran/PlayerRatings/>.
- 525      Team, R Core. 2021. “R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.” Vienna, Austria: R  
526      Foundation for Statistical Computing. <http://www.R-project.org>.
- 527      Temeles, Ethan J., Robin S. Goldman, and Alexei U. Kudla. 2005. “Foraging and Territory Economics of  
528      Sexually Dimorphic Purple-Throated Caribs (*Eulampis Jugularis*) on Three Heliconia Morphs.” *The Auk*  
529      122 (1): 187–204. <https://doi.org/10.1093/auk/122.1.187>.
- 530      Temeles, Ethan J., and W. John Kress. 2010. “Mate Choice and Mate Competition by a Tropical Hummingbird  
531      at a Floral Resource.” *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 277 (1687): 1607–13.  
532      <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2009.2188>.
- 533      Thiele, Johannes, and York Winter. 2005. “Hierarchical Strategy for Relocating Food Targets in Flower Bats:  
534      Spatial Memory Versus Cue-Directed Search.” *Animal Behaviour* 69 (2): 315–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2004.05.012>.
- 535      Tschapka, Marco. 2003. “Pollination of the Understorey Palm *Calyptrogyne Ghiesbreghtiana* by Hovering and  
536      Perching Bats.” *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 80 (2): 281–88. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1095-8312.2003.00235.x>.
- 537      Tschapka, Marco, and Otto von Helversen. 2007. “Phenology, Nectar Production and Visitation Behaviour  
538      of Bats on the Flowers of the Bromeliad *Werauhia Gladioliflora* in a Costa Rican Lowland Rain Forest.”  
539      *Journal of Tropical Ecology* 23 (04): 385–95. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266467407004129>.
- 540      Watzke, Steffen. 2006. “Nahrung Und Paarung – Vom „Kleinen“ Unterschied Der Ressourcennutzung  
541      Des Flughundes *Macroglossus Minimus* – Sind Blüten Mehr Als Nur Eine Nahrungsquelle?” In  
542      *Ressourcennutzung Und Paarungssystem Der Nektarivoren Flughundart Macroglossus Minimus*  
543      (*Pteropodidae: Macroglossinae*) in West-Malaysia, 82–171. Munich, Germany: Ludwig-Maximilians-  
544      Universität München. <https://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/6174/>.
- 545      Winter, York, and Otto von Helversen. 2001. “Bats as Pollinators: Foraging Energetics and Floral  
546      Adaptations.” In *Cognitive Ecology of Pollination: Animal Behaviour and Floral Evolution*, edited  
547      by James D. Thomson and Lars Chittka, 148–70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511542268.009>.
- 548      Winter, York, and Kai Petra Stich. 2005. “Foraging in a Complex Naturalistic Environment: Capacity of  
549      Spatial Working Memory in Flower Bats.” *The Journal of Experimental Biology* 208 (Pt 3): 539–48.  
550      <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.01416>.

- 555 Wintergerst, Sabine. 2018. "Modulators of Foraging Behavior by Nectar-Feeding Bats (Glossophaginae),"  
556 January. <https://doi.org/10.18452/18673>.
- 557 Wolf, Larry L., and F. Reed Hainsworth. 1971. "Time and Energy Budgets of Territorial Hummingbirds."  
558 *Ecology* 52 (6): 980–88. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1933803>.
- 559 Yasukawa, Ken. 1979. "Territory Establishment in Red-Winged Blackbirds: Importance of Aggressive  
560 Behavior and Experience." *The Condor* 81 (3): 258–64. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1367628>.
- 561 Yoh, Natalie, Peter Syme, Ricardo Rocha, Christoph F. J. Meyer, and Adrià López-Baucells. 2020.  
562 "Echolocation of Central Amazonian 'Whispering' Phyllostomid Bats: Call Design and Interspecific  
563 Variation." *Mammal Research* 65 (3): 583–97. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13364-020-00503-0>.