# When David Beats Goliath: The Advantage of Large Size in Interspecific Aggressive Contests Declines over Evolutionary Time



## Paul R. Martin<sup>1</sup>\*, Cameron K. Ghalambor<sup>2</sup>

1 Department of Biology, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, 2 Department of Biology and Graduate Degree Program in Ecology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, United States of America

## Abstract

Body size has long been recognized to play a key role in shaping species interactions. For example, while small species thrive in a diversity of environments, they typically lose aggressive contests for resources with larger species. However, numerous examples exist of smaller species dominating larger species during aggressive interactions, suggesting that the evolution of traits can allow species to overcome the competitive disadvantage of small size. If these traits accumulate as lineages diverge, then the advantage of large size in interspecific aggressive interactions should decline with increased evolutionary distance. We tested this hypothesis using data on the outcomes of 23,362 aggressive interactions among 246 bird species pairs involving vultures at carcasses, hummingbirds at nectar sources, and antbirds and woodcreepers at army ant swarms. We found the advantage of large size declined as species became more evolutionarily divergent, and smaller species were more likely to dominate aggressive contests when interacting with more distantly-related species. These results appear to be caused by both the evolution of traits in smaller species that enhanced their abilities in aggressive contests, and the evolution of traits in larger species that were adaptive for other functions, but compromised their abilities to compete aggressively. Specific traits that may provide advantages to small species in aggressive interactions included well-developed leg musculature and talons, enhanced flight acceleration and maneuverability, novel fighting behaviors, and traits associated with aggression, such as testosterone and muscle development. Traits that may have hindered larger species in aggressive interactions included the evolution of morphologies for tree trunk foraging that compromised performance in aggressive contests away from trunks, and the evolution of migration. Overall, our results suggest that fundamental trade-offs, such as those associated with body size, are more likely to break down over evolutionary time, changing the rules that govern species interactions and structure ecological communities.

Citation: Martin PR, Ghalambor CK (2014) When David Beats Goliath: The Advantage of Large Size in Interspecific Aggressive Contests Declines over Evolutionary Time. PLoS ONE 9(9): e108741. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0108741

Editor: James A. R. Marshall, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom

Received February 1, 2014; Accepted September 2, 2014; Published September 24, 2014

**Copyright:** © 2014 Martin, Ghalambor. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

**Funding:** The authors' work was funded by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (Discovery Grant RGPIN/355519-2008; www.nserccrsng.gc.ca), a Baillie Family Chair Endowment, and a Good Family Fellowship. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Competing Interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

\* Email: pm45@queensu.ca

## Introduction

Phylogenetic perspectives have changed the way we view ecological communities by incorporating evolutionary history into explanations of patterns of coexistence and resource use [1,2]. Because closely-related species are more likely to share traits and be ecologically similar due to recent, shared ancestry, phylogenetic relationships may influence the degree to which species can coexist [1,2]. One particular way that evolutionary relatedness can influence community structure is by altering the trade-offs that constrain species interactions and distributions [3,4]. For example, small-sized animals benefit from reduced energetic and water requirements for survival and reproduction, reduced developmental times, reduced costs of locomotion, greater ability to quickly shed or absorb heat, greater maneuverability, and faster response time [5,6]. However, small-sized animals typically lose aggressive contests for resources because larger animals generate greater force for a given acceleration, require a greater opposing force to overcome their inertia or change their momentum, and have

greater muscle mass and strength, stronger defensive coverings, and larger and stronger traits used as weapons (e.g., teeth, bills, claws) [5,7,8]. Yet, the dominance of larger body size is not universal. Smaller species can overcome the advantages of large size in aggressive contests with the evolution of novel traits or trait values (e.g., weapons, enhanced maneuverability, or social behavior) that offset the disadvantage of small size (e.g., [9–11]). Such novel traits should accumulate over evolutionary time [3,12], leading to the hypothesis that the advantage of large size in aggressive interactions should decline with evolutionary distance among the species.

Here, we test this hypothesis using data from 23,362 interactions among 246 species pairs, representing three phylogenetically and ecologically distinct groups of birds that have been studied extensively with respect to aggressive contests for shared food resources. These three groups are: 1) New World vultures (Accipitriformes: Cathartidae) and Old World vultures (Accipitriformes: Accipitridae) interacting at carcasses, 2) hummingbirds (Apodiformes: Trochilidae) interacting at nectar sources, and 3)



## Interactions involving New or Old World vultures

Figure 1. An interaction web for aggressive interactions involving New World vultures (Cathartidae) or Old World vultures (Accipitridae) at a carrion food source. Lines connect species pairs for which we include data on aggressive interactions in this study. Dominant species (left column) were defined as species winning the majority of aggressive interactions with the subordinate species (right column). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0108741.g001

antbirds (Passeriformes: Thamnophilidae) and woodcreepers (Passeriformes: Dendrocolaptidae) competing for invertebrates and small vertebrates fleeing from army ant swarms (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) [13].

## **Materials and Methods**

#### Aggressive Interactions

We compiled published quantitative data on aggressive interactions between our focal species (vultures, hummingbirds, and woodcreepers and antbirds) and any other species of bird, but restricted our analysis to pairs of species with at least 6 interactions where each interaction was won by one of the two species (Figures 1–3; Tables S1, S2). We compiled data on aggressive interactions that were associated with a shared resource (following [14]), including (a) chases, where one species actively pursued the other species, (b) supplants and displacements, where one species actively flew at, lunged, pecked, or otherwise aggressively engaged another species, causing the other species to retreat, and (c) physical attacks, where one species fought with another species (e.g., pecking, grabbing, hitting with wings, pinning to ground), resulting in the losing species retreating from the altercation [14]. We included only observations where one species was a clear winner over the other, as described in the original reference. We excluded observations that could be viewed as defense of eggs, young, or nests because these interactions did not involve a shared resource, and because the fitness costs of losing offspring are higher for the parent species. We excluded interactions that

Panterpe.insignis Lampornis.clemenciae Selasphorus.platycercus Archilochus.alexandri Amazilia.beryllina Eugenes.tulgens Selasphorus.calliope Archilochus.alexandri Calypte.anna Colibri.coruscans Basilinna.leucotis Selasphorus.calliope Archilochus.alexandri Calypte.anna Colibri.coruscans Basilinna.leucotis Amazilia.rutila Eupherusa.eximia Colibri.thalassinus Selasphorus.platycercus Selasph	Dominant species		Subordinate species
Lampornis.clemenciae Selasphorus.platycercus Archilochus.alexandri Galypte.ana Calypte.ana Colibri.corus.cans Basilinna.leucotis Selasphorus.culliope Archilochus.alexandri Calypte.costae Cynanthus.latirostris Amazilia.rutia Colibri.thalassinus Selasphorus.platycercus Se	Panterpe.insignis		Diglossa.plumbea
Selasphorus. platycercus Archilochus. alexandri Archilochus. alexandri Calipte. ana Calipte. ana Colibri. coruscans Basilinna. leucotis Calipte. ana Colibri. coruscans Basilinna. leucotis Calipte. ana Colibri. coruscans Basilinna. leucotis Amazilia. beryllina Colibri. thalassinus Selasphorus. platycercus Selasphorus. colubris Elvira. cupreiceps Hylocharis. eliciae Colibri. thalassinus Lampornis. calolaemus Heliodoxa. rubinoides Coeligena. torquata Heliangelus. exortis Boissonneaua. flavescens Coeligena. torquata Heliangelus. exortis Boissonneaua. matthewsii Heliodoxa. imperatrix Heliodoxa. jacula Anthracothorax. virgificitis Phaethornis. chrysura Eulampis. holoserioeus Coereba. flaveola Chiorestes. notata Anthracothorax. nigricollis Anthracothorax. nigricollis Anthracothorax. nigricollis Chiorestes. notata Anthracothorax. nigricollis Chiorestes. notata Anthracothoras. singula carte Colibri. uncidus Colibri. corrisatus Chiorestes. notata Anthracothoras. singularis Phaethornis. lorginostris Phaethornis. lorginostris	Lampornis.clemenciae		Fugenes fulgens
Collapide in the intervention of the interventing of the interventing of the interventing of the intervent	Selasphorus platycercus		Lampornis amethystinus
Amazilia.beryllina Eugenes.fulgens Selasphorus.calliope Archilochus.alexandri Calipte.costae Calipte.ana Colibri.coruscans Basilinna.leucotis Amazilia.saucerrottei Hylocharis.eliciae Colibri.thalassinus Lampornis.calolaemus Heliodoxa.rubinoides Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.exortis Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.mathewsii Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.imperatrix Coreatus.underwoodii Discosura.conversii Anthracothorax.viidis Heliodorax.imgircollis Coreatus.underwoodii Discosura.conversii Anthracothorax.viidis Boissonneaua.flavescens Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.exortis Discosura.conversii Anthracothorax.viidis Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Amazilia.tacata Anthracothorax.viidis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Boi	Archilochus alexandri		Basilinna leucotis
Eugenes. fulgens Selasphorus.rufus Calypte.costae Cynanthus.latirostris Amazilia.costae Cynanthus.latirostris Amazilia.beryllina Colibri.thalassinus Selasphorus.rufus Eupherusa.eximia Amazilia.saucerrottei Hylocharis.eliciae Colibri.thalassinus Lampornis.calolaemus Heliodoxa.rubinoides Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.clarisse Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.clarisse Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.clarisse Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.clarisse Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.clarisse Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.clarisse Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaethorris.gucia Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaethorris.gucia Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaethorris.gucia Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaethorris.gucia Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaethorris.gucia Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaethorris.gucia Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaethorris.gucia Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaethorris.gucia Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaethorris.gucia Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaethorris.gucia Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaethorris.gucia Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaethorris.gucia Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaethorris.gucia Boissonneaua.flavescens Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaethorris.gucia Boissonneaua.flavescens Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaethorris.gucia Boissonneaua.flavescens Boissonneaua.flavesc	Amazilia beryllina		Selasphorus callione
Selasphorus.rufus Calypte.anna Colibri.coruscans Basilima.leucotis Amazilia.rufus Eupherusa.eximia Amazilia.saucerrottei Hylocharis.eliciae Colibri.thalassinus Lampornis.calolaemus Heliodoxa.rubinoides Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.mathewsii Boissonneaua.mathewsii Heliodoxa.rubinoides Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.mathewsii Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.ingricollis Coereba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.vigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tacata Anthracothorax.rugricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tacata Anthracothorax.rugricollis Coeligena.exitis Boissonneaua.mathewsii Boissonneaua.	Furner as fullerer		Archilochus aloxandri
Selasphorus.rufus Calypte.anna Colibri.coruscans Basilinna.leucotis Amazilia.rutila Eupherusa.eximia Amazilia.rutila Eupherusa.eximia Colibri.thalassinus Selasphorus.rufus Elvira.cupreiceps Hylocharis.eliciae Archilochus.colubris Eupherusa.eximia Colibri.thalassinus Lampornis.calolaemus Heliodoxa.rubinoides Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.clarisse Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacatl Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Coeligena.torquata Adelomyia.melanogenys Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Coeligena.torquata Adelonyia.melanogenys Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Coeligena.torquata Anthracothorax.nirdicolis Phaethorris.paraqui Anthracothorax.nirdicolis Coreba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nirdicolis Golibri.corxa.nirdicolis Coreba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nirdicolis Colibri.serrirostris Eupatemena.macroura Amazilia.tacati Phaethorris.guy Amazilia.taceta Arthracothorax.nirdicolis Coreba.flaveola Chlorestibon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Florisuga.mellivora Chlorestibon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Florisuga.mellivora Chlorestibon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Florisuga.mellivora Chlorestibon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Florisuga.altersenayi Hylocharis.chrysura Eutoxeres.aquila Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Eugenes.tuigens		Calvote costae
Calipte. anna Colibri.coruscans Basilina.leucotia Lupherusa.eximia Colibri.thalassinus Selasphorus.rufus Elvira.cupreiceps Hylocharis.eliciae Archilochus.colubris Elvira.cupreiceps Hylocharis.eliciae Colibri.thalassinus Lampornis.calolaemus Heliodoxa.rubinoides Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.exortis Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacati Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.ingircollis Cohoreste.notata Anthracothorax.viridis Hylocharis.eliciae Coeligena.torquata Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.nigricollis Coreatus.underwoodii Discosura.conversii Anthracothorax.nigricollis Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestibon.lucidus Chiorestes.notata Chiorestibon.lucidus Chiorestes.notata Chiorestibon.lucidus Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestibon.lucidus Chiorestes.notata Chiore	Selasphorus.rufus		Cynanthus.latirostris
Colibri. corruscans Basilina. leucotis Amazilia. rutia Eupherusa. eximia Amazilia. saucerrottei Hylocharis. eliciae Archilochus. colubris Eupherusa. eximia Colibri. thalassinus Selasphorus. platycercus Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. plates Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. plates Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. platycen Selasphorus. platycen Selaspha	Calypte.anna		Amazilia.beryllina
Basilinna.leucotis Amazilia.rutila Eupherusa.eximia Amazilia.saucerrottei Hylocharis.eliciae Colibri.thalassinus Lampornis.calolaemus Heliodoxa.rubinoides Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.clarisse Coeligena.torquata Mazilia.tacatt Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneau.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacatt Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacatt Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneau.matthewsii Coeligena.torquata Amazilia.tzacatt Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacatt Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacatt Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Coereba.flaveola Chorosetes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tractat Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.longirostris	Colibri.coruscans		Colibri.thalassinus
Amazilia.rutila Eupherusa.eximia Amazilia.rutila Eupherusa.eximia Amazilia.saucerrottei Hylocharis.eliciae Colibri.thalassinus Lampornis.calolaemus Heliodoxa.rubinoides Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.clarisse Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.clarisse Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneau.a.mathewsii Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.viridis Hylocharis.chrysura Eulampis.holosericeus Coereba.flaveola Chorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nirgicollis Phaethornis.gup Amazilia.taceta Chorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nirgicollis Chorestes.notata Chorestes.notata Antaria.turcata Antaria.turcata Anthracothorax.nirgicollis Chorestes.notata Chorestes.n	Basilinna.leucotis		Selasphorus platycercus
Eupherusa.eximia Amazilia.saucerrottei Hylocharis.eliciae Colibri.thalassinus Lampornis.calolaemus Heliodoxa.rubinoides Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.clarisse Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacati Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperat	Amazilia.rutila		
Amazilia.saucerrottei Hylocharis.eliciae Colibri.thalassinus Lampornis.calolaemus Heliodoxa.rubinoides Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.etarisse Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacati Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.taceta Colibri.serrirostris Eupetomena.macroura Thalurania.furcata Antariaetotorax.nigricollis Chrysolampis.mosquitus Eutoxeres.aquila Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.gup Amazilia.tracetaa Anthracothorax.nigricollis Colibri.serrirostris Eutoxeres.aquila Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris	Eupherusa.eximia		Elvira euproicons
Hylocharis.eliciae Colibri.thalassinus Lampornis.calolaemus Heliodoxa.rubinoides Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.clarisse Coeligena.torquata Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Coeligena.torquata Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.viridis Hylocharis.chrysura Eulampis.holosericeus Coereba.flaveola Chrysolampis.mosquitus Florisuga.melivorax Chrysolampis.mosquitus Antazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.cupripennis Chorostilbon.lucidus Eutoxeres.aquila Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Amazilia.saucerrottei		Hylocharis.eliciae
Colibri.thalassinus Lampornis.calolaemus Heliodoxa.rubinoides Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.clarisse Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacati Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.viridis Hylocharis.chrysura Eulampis.holosericeus Coereba.flaveola Chlorostibon.lucidus Antazilia.taceta Antaracia.tanyi Antaracita.taceta Chorostibon.lucidus Euspenena.macroura Thalurania.lactea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Florisuga.mellivora Coreba.flaveola Chorostibon.lucidus Eutoxeres.aquila Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris	Hylocharis eliciae		Archilochus.colubris
Collipri.thalassinus Lampornis.calolaemus Heliodoxa.rubinoides Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.strophianus Heliodoxa.imperatrix Coeligena.torquata Adelomyia.melanogenys Heliodoxa.rubinoides Coeligena.torquata Adelomyia.melanogenys Heliodoxa.rubinoides Coeligena.torquata Adelomyia.melanogenys Heliodoxa.rubinoides Coeligena.torquata Mazilia.tzacati Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.viridis Hylocharis.chrysical Coereba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tacea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Colipri.serrirostris Eupetomena.macroura Thalurania.furcata Antazilia.tacea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Colipri.serrirostris Eupetomena.macroura Thalurania.furcata Antazilia.tacea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chorestibon.lucidus Eutoxeres.aquila Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Tytoonano.onolao		Eupherusa.eximia
Lampornis.calolaemus Heliodoxa.rubinoides Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.clarisse Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacatl Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.viridis Hylocharis.chrysura Eulampis.holosericeus Coerieba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.latocata Anthracothoras.nigricollis Chlorestes.notata Chlorestes.nota	Colibri.thalassinus		Calliphlox.bryantae
Heliodoxa.rubinoides       Aglaiocercus.coelestis         Boissonneaua.flavescens       Amazilia.saucerrottei         Phaeochroa.cuvierii       Heliangelus.clarisse         Coeligena.torquata       Adelomyia.melanogenys         Heliodoxa.imperatrix       Urosticie.benjamini         Adelomyia.melanogenys       Heliodoxa.rubinoides         Coeligena.torquata       Adelomyia.melanogenys         Heliodoxa.imperatrix       Heliodoxa.imperatrix         Thalurania.fannyi       Adaglaiocercus.kingi         Coeligena.coeligena       Coeligena.torquata         Metallura.tyrianthina       Aglaiocercus.kingi         Coeligena.torquata       Metallura.tyrianthina         Aglaiocercus.kingi       Coeligena         Heliodoxa.ipacula       Anthracothorax.viridis         Anthracothorax.viridis       Heliangelus.exortis         Coereba.flaveola       Cherestes.notata         Anthracothorax.nigricollis       Orthortyncus.cristatus         Chrysolampis.mosquitus       Chlorestes.notata         Anazilia.lactae       Chlorestes.notata         Anthracothorax.nigricollis       Chrysolampis.mosquitus         Chlorestes.notata       Chlorestes.notata         Anthracothorax.nigricollis       Chlorestes.notata         Anazilia.lactae       Chlo	Lampornis.calolaemus		Coeligena.wilsoni
Boissonneaua.flavescens Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.clarisse Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacatt Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.viridis Hylocharis.chrysura Eulampis.holosericeus Coereba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.gug Amazilia.totoat Phaethornis.gug Antazothorax.dominicus Anthracothorax.domi	Heliodoxa.rubinoides		Aglaiocercus.coelestis
Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.clarisse Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacati Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.rubinoides Coeligena.torquata Amazilia.tzacati Heliodoxa.imperatrix Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.viridis Hylocharis.chrysura Eulampis.holosericeus Coereba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.lactea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Eupetomena.macroura Thalurania.furcata Amazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.gug Amazilia.tobaci Phaethornis.curysura Eluampis.chrysura Chlorestes.notata Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Phaethornis.curysura Florisuga.melivora Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Boissonneaua flavescens		Amazilia.saucerrottei
Phaeochroa.cuvierii Heliangelus.clarisse Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacatl Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.viridis Hylocharis.chrysura Eulampis.holosericeus Coereba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.lactea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Eupetomena.macroura Thalurania.furcata Amazilia.tobaci Phaetoornis.chrysura Eulampis.holosericeus Coereba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Chlorestes.notata Chlorestibon.lucidus Chlorestibon.lucidus Chlorestibon.lucidus Chlorestibon.lucidus Chlorestibon.lucidus Phaethornis.chrysura Phaethornis.ongirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Boissonneada.navescens		Heliangelus.strophianus
Heliangelus.clarisse Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacati Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.viridis Hylocharis.chrysura Eulampis.holosericeus Coereba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.lactea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosqu	Phaeochroa.cuvierii	-41 M M	Urosticte.beniamini
Coeligena.torquata Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacatl Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.viridis Hylocharis.chrysura Eulampis.holosericeus Coereba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.lactea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chorostilbon.lucidus Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.notata Chiorestilbon.lucidus Chiorestes.notata Chiorestilbon.lucidus Chiorestes.notata Chiorostilbon.lucidus Chiorestes.notata Chiorestilbon.lucidus Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.not	Heliangelus.clarisse		Amazilia.rutila
Heliangelus.exortis Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacati Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.viridis Hylocharis.chrysura Eulampis.holosericeus Coereba.flaveola Chorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.lactea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chiorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Discosura.conversii Amazilia.tzacatl Phaethornis.yaruqui Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.lactea Chiorestes.notata Chiorestes.not	Coeligena.torquata		Adelomyia.melanogenys
Boissonneaua.matthewsii Amazilia.tzacati Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.viridis Hylocharis.chrysura Eulampis.holosericeus Coereba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.lactea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chlorestes.notata Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chlorestilbon.lucidus Amazilia.tobaci Patagona.gigas Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Eutoxeres.aquila Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Heliangelus.exortis		Heliodoxa.rubinoides
Amazilia.tzacati Heliodoxa.imperatrix Thalurania.fannyi Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.viridis Hylocharis.chrysura Eulampis.holosericeus Coereba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.lactea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Eulaptis.enosquitus Chirosstibon.lucidus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Eulangis.tuceta Anthracothorax.nigricollis Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chrysura Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Boissonneaua.matthewsii		Coeligena.torguata
Heliodoxa.imperatrix       Agiaocercus.kingi         Thalurania.fannyi       Coeligena.coeligena         Heliodoxa.jacula       Heliangelus.exortis         Anthracothorax.viridis       Ocreatus.underwoodii         Hylocharis.chrysura       Discosura.conversii         Eulampis.holosericeus       Amazilia.franciae         Coereba.flaveola       Thalurania.fannyi         Anthracothorax.nigricollis       Amazilia.tzacatl         Phaethornis.guy       Anthracothorax.nigricollis         Phaethornis.guy       Orthorhyncus.cristatus         Chrysolampis.mosquitus       Chrysolampis.mosquitus         Eupetomena.macroura       Florisuga.mellivora         Chlorostilbon.lucidus       Chlorostilbon.lucidus         Patagona.gigas       Aglaeactis.cupripennis         Aglaeactis.cupripennis       Eutoxeres.aquila         Glaucis.aeneus       Phaethornis.longirostris         Phaethornis.longirostris       Phaethornis.longirostris	Amazilia.tzacatl		Metallura.tyrianthina
Theliodoxa.imperiative Thalurania.fannyi Heliaqelus.exortis Ocreatus.underwoodii Discosura.conversii Amazilia.franciae Thalurania.fannyi Amazilia.franciae Thalurania.fannyi Amazilia.tzacatl Phaethornis.yaruqui Anthracothorax.nigricollis Ochorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.lactea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Colibri.serrirostris Eupetomena.macroura Thalurania.furcata Amazilia.tacea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Heliodoxa imperatrix		Agialocercus.kingi
Heliodoxa.jacula Anthracothorax.viridis Hylocharis.chrysura Eulampis.holosericeus Coereba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.lactea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Colibri.serrirostris Eupetomena.macroura Thalurania.furcata Antazilia.tactea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chorestes.notata Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chorestes.notata Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chorestes.notata Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Chorestes.notata Chorostilbon.lucidus Chrysoronia.cenone Amazilia.totaci Patagona.gigas Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Eutoxeres.aquila Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris			Heliangelus exortis
<ul> <li>Heliodoxa.Jacula</li> <li>Anthracothorax.viridis</li> <li>Hylocharis.chrysura</li> <li>Eulampis.holosericeus</li> <li>Coereba.flaveola</li> <li>Chlorestes.notata</li> <li>Anthracothorax.nigricollis</li> <li>Phaethornis.gruqui</li> <li>Anthracothorax.nigricollis</li> <li>Phaethornis.gruqui</li> <li>Anthracothorax.nigricollis</li> <li>Chrysolampis.mosquitus</li> <li>Chrysolampis.mosquitus</li> <li>Colibri.serrirostris</li> <li>Eupetomena.macroura</li> <li>Thalurania.furcata</li> <li>Amazilia.totaci</li> <li>Patagona.gigas</li> <li>Aglaeactis.cupripennis</li> <li>Chlorostilbon.lucidus</li> <li>Chlorostilbon.lucidus</li> <li>Chlorostilbon.lucidus</li> <li>Chlorostilbon.lucidus</li> <li>Chlorostilbon.lucidus</li> <li>Chlorostilbon.lucidus</li> <li>Phaethornis.longirostris</li> <li>Phaethornis.longirostris</li> <li>Phaethornis.longirostris</li> </ul>			Ocreatus.underwoodii
Anthracothorax.Viridis Hylocharis.chrysura Eulampis.holosericeus Coereba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.gruqui Anthracothorax.adominicus Anthracothorax.adominicus Anthracothorax.adominicus Anthracothorax.adominicus Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.gruqui Anthracothorax.adominicus Anthracothorax.nigricollis Orthorhyncus.cristatus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Florisuga.mellivora Chlorostilbon.lucidus Antazilia.tobaci Patagona.gigas Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chorostilbon.lucidus Chorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Heliodoxa.jacula		Discosura.conversii
Hylochanis.chrysura       Thalurania.fannyi         Eulampis.holosericeus       Amazilia.tzacatl         Coereba.flaveola       Phaethornis.yaruqui         Anthracothorax.nigricollis       Anthracothorax.dominicus         Anthracothorax.nigricollis       Anthracothorax.nigricollis         Phaethornis.guy       Anthracothorax.nigricollis         Chrysolampis.mosquitus       Chrysolampis.mosquitus         Colibri.serrirostris       Eupetomena.macroura         Thalurania.furcata       Chlorostilbon.lucidus         Aglaeactis.cupripennis       Chlorostilbon.lucidus         Chlorostilbon.lucidus       Eutresnaya.lafresnayi         Hylocharis.chrysura       Phaethornis.longirostris         Phaethoris.longirostris       Phaethornis.longirostris	Anthracothorax.viridis		Amazilia.franciae
Amazilia.tzacatí Coereba.flaveola Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tactea Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tactea Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.tactea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Colibri.serrirostris Eupetomena.macroura Thalurania.furcata Amazilia.tobaci Patagona.gigas Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.striigularis Chlorostilbon.striigularis Chlorostilbon.striigularis Chlorostilbon.striigularis Chlorostilbon.lucidus	Hylocharis.chrysura		Thalurania.fannyi
Chlorestes.notata Anthracothorax.nigricollis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.lactea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Colibri.serrirostris Eupetomena.macroura Amazilia.tobaci Patagona.gigas Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Amazilia.tobaci Patagona.gigas Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus	Eulampis.noiosenceus		Amazilia.tzacatl
Anthracothorax.dominicus Chrysolampis.mosquitus Florisuga.mellivora Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Eutoxeres.aquila Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Chlorestes notata		Phaethornis.yaruqui
Antariacontonax.nightconis Phaethornis.guy Amazilia.lactea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Colibri.serrirostris Eupetomena.macroura Antarila.tobaci Patagona.gigas Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chorsuronia.oenone Coereba.flaveola Colibri.coruscans Diglossa.cyanea Latresnayi Hylocharis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Anthracothorax nigricollis		Anthracothorax.dominicus
Amazilia.lactea Chrysolampis.mosquitus Colibri.serrirostris Eupetomena.macroura Thalurania.furcata Amazilia.tobaci Patagona.gigas Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Chrysuronia.oenone Coereba.flaveola Colibri.coruscans Diglossa.cyanea Lafresnayi Hylocharis.chrysura Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris			Orthorhyncus cristatus
Chrysolampis.mosquitus Colibri.serrirostris Eupetomena.macroura Amazilia.tobaci Patagona.gigas Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Aglaeactis.cupripennis Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Amazilia lactea		Chrysolampis mosquitus
Colibri.serrirostris Eupetomena.macroura Thalurania.furcata Amazilia.tobaci Patagona.gigas Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Eutoxeres.aquila Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Chrysolampis mosquitus		Florisuga.mellivora
Eupetomena.macroura Thalurania.furcata Amazilia.tobaci Patagona.gigas Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Eutoxeres.aquila Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Threnetes.ruckeri	Colibri.serrirostris		Chlorestes.notata
Thalurania.furcata Amazilia.tobaci Patagona.gigas Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Eupetomena.macroura		Chlorostilbon.lucidus
Amazilia.tobaci Patagona.gigas Aglaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Eutoxeres.aquila Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Thalurania.furcata		Chrysuronia.oenone
Patagona.gigas Colibri.coruscans Aglaeactis.cupripennis Diglossa.cyanea Lafresnaya.lafresnayi Hylocharis.chrysura Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Amazilia.tobaci		Coereba.flaveola
Agiaeactis.cupripennis Chlorostilbon.lucidus Eutoxeres.aquila Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Patagona.gigas		Didossa cyanea
Chiorostibon.lucious Hylocharis.chrysura Eutoxeres.aquila Phaethornis.longirostris Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.striigularis Phaethornis.longirostris	Agiaeactis.cupripennis		Lafresnaya.lafresnavi
Glaucis.aeneus Phaethornis.longirostris Phaethornis.longirostris	Chiorostilbon.lucidus		Hylocharis.chrysura
Phaethornis.longirostris	Glaucie appeue		Phaethornis.longirostris
	Phaethornis Iongirostris		Phaethornis.striigularis

## Interactions involving hummingbirds

**Figure 2.** An interaction web for aggressive interactions involving hummingbirds (Trochilidae) at a nectar food source. Lines connect species pairs for which we include data on aggressive interactions in this study. Dominant species (left column) were defined as species winning the majority of aggressive interactions with the subordinate species (right column). One species pair (*Hylocharis chrysura — Thalurania furcata*) was omitted from this figure because each species won the same number of interactions with the other. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0108741.g002

involved more than one individual of each of two species. When possible, we excluded interactions involving young birds; however, details of age were often unavailable. We supplemented our interaction dataset with our own unpublished natural history observations of hummingbirds interacting at feeders in South America.

Overall, we compiled data on 23,362 aggressive interactions among 246 species pairs (Tables S1, S2). In total, 145 different species were represented in our dataset, including 99 species as dominant (i.e., winning the majority of aggressive interactions with another species) and 99 species as subordinate (i.e., losing the majority of aggressive interactions with another species) (Figures 1–3). Twenty-seven pairs of interacting species were in the same genus, 157 pairs were in different genera but in the same family, and 62 pairs represented different taxonomic families. On average, each of the 145 species was represented in 3.4 pairwise interactions (range 1–18).

#### **Body Mass**

Whenever possible, we obtained average adult mass for each species in our study from the same studies that provided the interaction data. Otherwise, we obtained adult mass data from

## Interactions involving woodcreepers or antbirds

#### Dominant species Subordinate species Baryphthengus.martii Phaenostictus.mcleannani Myrmeciza.exsul Dendrocincla.homochroa Thamnophilus.atrinucha Dendrocincla.anabatina Phaenostictus.mcleannani Xiphorhynchus.lachrymosus Hylophylax.naevioides Dendrocolaptes.sanctithomae Myrmeciza.exsul Gymnopithys.leucaspis Thamnophilus.atrinucha Xiphorhvnchus.susurrans Eucometis.penicillata Dendrocincla.homochroa Catharus.minimus Malacoptila.panamensis Catharus.ustulatus Piaya.cayana Eucometis.penicillata Xiphorhynchus.lachrymosus Xiphorhynchus.susurrans Gymnopithys.leucaspis Dendrocincla.fuliginosa Pyriglena.leuconota Formicarius analis Tachyphonus.rufus Rhegmatorhina.hoffmannsi Phlegopsis.borbae Attila.spadiceus Dendrocincla.fuliginosa Phlegopsis.nigromaculata Gymnopithys.lunulatus Phlegopsis.erythroptera Mvrmeciza.fortis Myrmeciza.fortis Rhegmatorhina.melanosticta Dendrocolaptes.certhia Gymnopithys.salvini Xiphorhynchus.pardalotus Xiphorhynchus.spixii Dendrocincla.merula Dendrocincla.merula Rhegmatorhina.melanosticta Rhegmatorhina.hoffmannsi Gymnopithys.rufigula Dendrocolaptes.picumnus Xiphorhynchus.pardalotus Dendrocolaptes.certhia Hylexetastes.perrotii Pithys.albifrons Percnostola.rufifrons Xiphorhynchus.guttatus Dendrocolaptes.picumnus Nasica.longirostris Percnostola.rufifrons Gymnopithys.rufigula Xiphorhynchus.ocellatus Xiphorhynchus.elegans Xiphorhynchus.obsoletus Gymnopithys.lunulatus Willisornis.poecilinotus Pithys.albifrons Geothlypis.formosa Hylophylax.naevioides Trichothraupis.melanops Pyriglena.leucoptera

Figure 3. An interaction web for aggressive interactions involving antbirds (Thamnophilidae) or woodcreepers (Dendrocolaptidae) at army ant swarms, where they feed on prey flushed by the ants. Lines connect species pairs for which we include data on aggressive interactions in this study. Dominant species (left column) were defined as species winning the majority of aggressive interactions with the subordinate species (right column). One species pair (*Pyriglena leucoptera* — *Tachyphonus coronatus*) was omitted from this figure because each species won the same number of interactions with the other. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0108741.g003

areas as geographically close as possible to the populations where the interaction data originated. We calculated the mean mass of each species as the mean of males (mean male mass) and females (mean female mass), if males and females had different masses. We provide the sources for mass data for each species pair in Table S2.

Taraba.major

## Genetic Distance

We compiled mitochondrial genetic sequence data from Genbank (accession numbers are provided in Text S1). Once aligned, we measured genetic distance between the sequences of focal species pairs using MEGA version 5.0 [15]. We calculated between-group mean Tamura-Nei genetic distances because this measure corrects for multiple substitutions at one site, incorporates differences in substitution rates between nucleotides, and does not assume equal nucleotide frequencies [16]. Species interactions lacking relevant genetic sequence data were excluded from our analysis.

Tachyphonus.rufus

We preferentially used the mitochondrial gene cytochrome b (cytb) to estimate genetic distance between pairs of interacting species because this gene appears to evolve in a clock-like fashion in birds [17]. However, too few hummingbird species had cytb sequences available, so we examined the mitochondrial gene

Dominant species	Subordinate species
Buteo.jamaicensis	Cathartes.aura
	Coragyps.atratus
	Gyps.africanus
	Aglaiocercus.coelestis
	Coeligena.wilsoni
	Amazilia franciae
Hylocharis.chrysura	Anthracothorax.nigricollis
Selasphorus.rufus	Archilochus.alexandri
Chrvsolampis.mosquitus	Selasphorus.platycercus
Chlorestes.notata	Chiorostilibon.lucidus
Amazilia.tobaci	Coereba flaveola
Amazilia.saucerrottei	Colibri.thalassinus
Aglaeactis.cupripennis	Diglossa.cyanea
Panterpe.insignis	Diglossa.plumbea
	Eugenes.fulgens
Anthracothorax nigricollis	Eupherusa.eximia
Boissonneaua.flavescens	Heliodoxa imperatrix
Chlorostilbon.lucidus	Hylocharis.chrysura
Glaucis.aeneus	Phaethornis.longirostris
Gymnopithys.leucaspis	Catharus.ustulatus
Attila spadiceus	Gymnopithys.lunulatus
Xiphorhynchus.pardalotus	
Xiphorbypchus auttatus	Dendrocincia.tuilginosa
Myrmeciza fortis	Dendrocolaptes.certhia
Phleoopsis pigromaculata	Dendrocolaptes.picumnus
Bhegmatorbina hoffmannsi	Dendrocincla.merula
Rhegmatorhina.melanosticta	Myrmeciza.fortis
Eucometis.penicillata	Pyriglena.leuconota
Trichothraupis.melanops	Pyriglena.leucoptera
Interactions involving	New or Old World Vultures
	Hummingbirds
	Woodcreepers or Antbirds

## Interactions where the smaller species was dominant

Figure 4. An interaction web for aggressive interactions where the smaller (lighter) species was dominant to the heavier species. Each interacting species pair where the smaller species was dominant is connected by a line (n = 43 species pairs). Dominant species (left column) were defined as species winning the majority of aggressive interactions with the subordinate species (right column). Species pairs that include a vulture are indicated by a green box (top), hummingbird by a red box (middle), and antbird or woodcreeper by a blue box (bottom). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0108741.g004

NADH dehydrogenase subunit 2 (ND2) for hummingbirds. We aligned sequences of each gene with the same gene from the chicken (*Gallus gallus*) [18] using Clustal X [19], visually inspected the sequences using MacClade version 4.08 [20], and removed sequences that did not align with the chicken sequence. We included transitions and transversions, all codon positions, assumed uniform rates among sites and homogeneous patterns among lineages, and used pairwise deletion to address gaps or missing data [15]. We calculated genetic distances for each pair of interacting species when species were in the same taxonomic family. For species representing different families, we calculated the genetic distances incorporating all sequences of species in those families that were included in our study to improve the accuracy of our longer distance estimates.

## Statistical Tests

We conducted all of our statistical tests in R [21]. We tested the hypothesis that the importance of large size in determining the outcome of aggressive contests declined with genetic distance between interacting species using a linear mixed-effects model with  $qrt{ln[(wins by dominant species+1)/(wins by subordinate species+1)]} as the response variable, {(mass of dominant species-mass of subordinate species)/[(mass of dominant species+mass of subordinate species)/2]} and genetic distance as predictors within a saturated model, and group (vultures, hummingbirds, or antbirds/woodcreepers) as a random factor, with a Gaussian distribution using the R package nlme [22]. The dominant species was defined as the species that won the majority of aggressive contests. We also tested if smaller bird species were more likely to be dominant when interacting with a more distantly-related$ 



Figure 5. Relatively heavier bird species were more likely to win aggressive contests for resources (positive slope), but the advantage of large size in aggressive contests declined with genetic distance (shallower slope for high genetic distance). Dominance asymmetry (y-axis) = sqrt {In ((wins by dominant species+1))/ (wins by subordinate species+1))}. Difference in mass (x-axis) = (mass of dominant species-mass of subordinate species)/(average mass of dominant and subordinate species). Genetic distance groups are split by the midpoint value for the dataset (low = 0.006-0.179; high = 0.180-0.352).

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0108741.g005

species using a generalized linear mixed model with the response variable equal to 0 if the larger species was dominant, and 1 if the smaller species was dominant, genetic distance and number of interactions between species as predictors in a saturated model, and group (vultures, hummingbirds, or antbirds/woodcreepers) as a random factor, with a binomial distribution using the R package lme4 [23]. In our generalized linear model, we standardized both genetic distance and the number of interactions between species prior to analysis by subtracting the mean and dividing by 2 standard deviations, using the *rescale* command in the R package *arm* [24]. Two species comparisons were excluded from analyses because each species won the same number of aggressive encounters, and thus we could not designate a dominant and subordinate species.

We used a mixed models approach with group (vultures, hummingbirds, woodcreepers/antbirds) as a random factor because interactions between species within vultures, hummingbirds, and woodcreepers/antbirds often lacked independence (e.g., one species interacted with more than one other species; Figures 1–3). In contrast, we had no overlap of species across our three groups. We also ran our analyses including either the dominant species or the subordinate species as a random factor, nested within group, to ensure that our results were not influenced by one or a few species that were small and dominant or large and subordinate. We did not run our analysis with both dominant and subordinate species as random factors because each interaction among species pairs was unique.

We first ran the saturated model with different random slopes and intercepts and chose the best model as the model with the lowest Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) value [25]. We then checked the fit of the best saturated model following [25]. If saturated models did not adequately fit the data (e.g., residuals were significantly different from normal for linear mixed-effects models), we either modeled heterogeneity and assessed new model performance using AIC values and improved model fit [25], or transformed dependent or independent variables to improve model fit. We then ran models that incorporated all possible combinations of predictor variables using the R package MuMIn [26], and compared the fit among models using AIC values adjusted for small sample sizes (AICc). We identified the best-fit model as the model with the lowest AICc score. We ran our generalized linear mixed models using both the R packages lme4 [23] and MASS [27] to ensure that our results were consistent across packages [25].

We ran two additional generalized linear models to test our hypothesis, with the same predictor and response variables as in the saturated linear mixed-effects and generalized linear mixed models, but with group (vultures, hummingbirds, antbirds/ woodcreepers) entered as a predictor variable in a saturated model (without random effects). This model allowed us to test for variation in the effects of genetic distance and body mass on the outcome of aggressive interactions between our 3 focal groups. The model, however, assumes that interactions among species are independent — an assumption that was violated by some species interacting with multiple species within groups. We ran models incorporating all possible combinations of predictor variables and checked the fit of our models as in our previous models.

#### Number of Interactions among Species Pairs

The number of aggressive interactions over shared resources are expected to decline as species diverge over evolutionary time because more distantly-related species, on average, are ecologically more distinct [8,28]. Small species could win more interactions

Model ranking	Intercept <sup>1</sup>	Difference in mass	Genetic distance	Interaction between difference in mass and genetic distance	df	logLik	AICc	delta AICc	weight
1	1.17	0.84	0.91	-2.46	6	-120.5	253.3	0.00	0.882
2	1.35	0.37	_	_	4	-124.9	258.0	4.72	0.083
3	1.31	0.37	0.24	—	5	-124.8	259.8	6.49	0.034
4	1.47	<sup>2</sup>	_	—	3	-140.5	287.1	33.85	0.000
5	1.45	_	0.14	-	4	-140.5	289.1	35.83	0.000

**Table 1.** Comparison of model fit for different linear mixed-effects models that include all possible combinations of predictor variables.

Models tested the prediction that the advantage of large size in aggressive contests for resources declines with genetic distance among interacting bird species (*n* = 244 species pairs).

<sup>1</sup> numbers for predictor variables are effect sizes.

<sup>2</sup> long dash (—) indicates that the predictor variable was absent from the model.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0108741.t001

**Table 2.** Results from the best-fit (lowest AICc) linear mixed-effects model testing the prediction that the advantage of large size in aggressive contests for resources declines with genetic distance among interacting bird species (n = 244 species pairs).

Fixed effects <sup>1</sup>	Estimate	SE	t	df	Ρ
Intercept	1.17	0.10	11.91	238	<0.0001
Difference in mass <sup>2</sup>	0.84	0.17	4.91	238	<0.0001
Genetic distance	0.91	0.48	1.89	238	0.0598
Difference in mass <sup>2</sup> ×Genetic distance	-2.46	0.84	-2.94	238	0.0036

<sup>1</sup> dependent = sqrt{ln[(wins by dominant species+1)/(wins by subordinate species+1)]}; taxonomic group included as a random effect.

<sup>2</sup> (mass of dominant species-mass of subordinate species)/(average mass of dominant and subordinate species).

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0108741.t002

with larger species when interactions are rare if they can bluff or if species are more inclined to back down when the other species is poorly known. We did not include the number of interactions among species pairs in our main linear mixed-effects model because the number of interactions was already incorporated into the dependent variable. We did, however, include the total number of interactions among species pairs in our generalized linear mixed model.

The total number of interactions in our generalized linear mixed model may be biased by the inclusion of different studies with different effort and sample sizes. Thus, we ran the analysis again including each study as a random factor nested within group (vultures, hummingbirds, woodcreepers/antbirds). By including study as a random factor, we could address if the number of interactions among species pairs within studies influenced our main results. We included only studies that had at least 2 species pairs, and included only species pairs with at least 6 interactions within a study. We again included the number of interactions and genetic distance as predictors in a saturated model, with the response variable equal to 0 if the larger species was dominant, and 1 if the smaller species was dominant, and a binomial distribution using the R package lme4 [23]. For all analyses, the number of interactions was transformed to improve model fit, as:  $n = ((\log(\log(number of interactions)))^{0.1}).$ 

## Results

The larger species won the majority of aggressive interactions with the smaller species (i.e., was behaviorally dominant) in 201 of 246 species pairs (81.7%). Smaller species were behaviorally dominant in 43 species pairs (17.5%) involving 32 different small, dominant species, and 33 different large, subordinate species (Figure 4). Wins and losses were equal in only two species pairs. In some cases where smaller species were behaviorally dominant, differences in weight were small and perhaps insignificant. In 32 species pairs, however, the larger species was>5% heavier than the smaller, dominant species, while 25 species pairs involved larger species that were>10% heavier than the smaller, dominant species.

The advantage of large size in aggressive contests was greatest among closely-related species and declined with increasing genetic distance (Figure 5; Tables 1,2; see Figure S1 for a 3-dimensional plot that includes difference in mass, genetic distance and dominance asymmetry). Similarly, smaller species were more likely to be dominant in aggressive interactions with distantlyrelated species (Figure 6; Tables 3,4). For example, among interacting species in the same genus, the smaller species was dominant in only 2 of 27 species pairs (7.4%), whereas among interacting species in different taxonomic families, the smaller species was dominant in 18 of 62 species pairs (29.0%). The decline in the importance of large size in aggressive interactions with increased genetic distance was evident in each of the three independent groups and did not differ significantly between them (Tables 5,6).

The decline in the advantage of large size with increased genetic distance was not caused by variation in the number of interactions among species pairs (overall number of interactions: Tables 3,4; number of interactions within a study: Tables S3,S4). The number of interactions among species (overall, or within a study) also did not predict when small bird species would be dominant in aggressive interactions (overall number of interactions: Tables 3,4; number of interactions (overall number of interactions: Tables 3,4; number of interactions (overall number of interactions: Tables 3,4; number of interactions within a study: Tables S3,S4).

Including species (either the dominant species, or the subordinate species) as a random factor, nested within group, yielded similar results for both linear mixed-effects models (Table S5) and generalized linear mixed models (Table S6), with the interaction between genetic distance and body mass significant in all analyses. We also found similar results in linear mixed-effects models with interactions between *Gyps fulvus* and *Pica pica* (an outlier point) excluded from the dataset (interaction between genetic distance and body mass in our best-fit model, estimate =  $-2.21\pm0.86$ SE, t = -2.58 df = 237, p = 0.011; Figure S2).

## Discussion

Small animals flourish in many ecological settings, but they often suffer the recurrent cost of losing aggressive contests for resources with larger animals [5–8]. At the same time, numerous examples exist of smaller species dominating larger species (e.g., [9-11]), but the conditions leading to small species dominating larger species are poorly understood. Here we tested the



Figure 6. Smaller (lighter) bird species were more likely to be dominant (i.e., win the majority of aggressive contests for resources) when interacting with a more distantly-related species (greater genetic distance between species). Data are from aggressive interactions involving vultures at carcasses, hummingbirds at nectar sources, and woodcreepers and antbirds at army ant swarms.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0108741.g006

of interactions df	loaLik			
c		AICc	delta AICc	weight
ũ	-110.1	226.4	0.00	0.587
4	-110.1	228.4	2.02	0.213
5	-109.6	229.4	3.03	0.129
2	-113.6	231.3	4.88	0.051
£	-113.6	233.2	6.84	0.019
	4 0.76 5 2 3 aggressive contests for resources when interacting with a m		-     4     -110.1     228.4       0.76     5     -109.6     229.4       -     2     -113.6     231.3       -     3     -113.6     233.2       aqoressive contests for resources when interacting with a more distantly-related species (n = 244 specie	-     4     -110.1     228.4     2.02       0.76     5     -109.6     229.4     3.03       -     2     -113.6     231.3     4.88       -     3     -113.6     233.2     6.84       adgressive contests for resources when interacting with a more distantly-related species (n = 244 species pairs).

prior to analysis by subtracting the mean and dividing by 2 standard deviations <sup>1</sup> numbers for predictor variables are effect sizes; genetic distance and number of interactions were standardized | <sup>2</sup> long dash (—) indicates that the predictor variable was absent from the model. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0108741.t003

Body Size and the Outcome of Aggressive Contests among Species

hypothesis that the disadvantage of being small in aggressive interactions could be overcome over evolutionary time through the accumulation of novel traits that can counteract the advantages of being large. We found support for this hypothesis: larger species were dominant over smaller species during aggressive interactions for shared resources, but the advantage of a larger body size declined with increased evolutionary distance in vultures, hummingbirds, and antbirds/woodcreepers (Figure 5; Tables 1,2). Similarly, small species were more likely to win the majority of aggressive contests when they interacted with more distantlyrelated species (Figure 6; Tables 3,4). These results suggest that body size and phylogenetic distance jointly shape the outcome of aggressive interactions in birds, which in turn may influence the structure of bird communities.

While our results are consistent with the predictions of our hypothesis, our results are also consistent with three alternative hypotheses. Distantly-related species are, on average, less likely to share preferred resources [8,28], which could explain the patterns observed here, if (i) large species were less willing to invest in aggressive encounters over less preferred resources with distantlyrelated smaller species, (ii) if the costs of losing an aggressive encounter are lower over less preferred resources, or (iii) if the context of aggressive interactions (e.g., age, experience, condition, hunger level, time of arrival or colonization) shift as resource preferences diverge, allowing some distantly-related species to win interactions that they would normally lose (e.g., [29-31]). If ecological similarity declines with genetic distance [8,28], then these alternatives predict that behaviorally dominant species should lose a larger proportion of interactions with distantlyrelated subordinates, independent of differences in size. Our results did not support this prediction: while genetic distance was an important predictor of the outcome of aggressive interactions outside of its interaction with body size (Tables 1,2,5,6), dominant species won a greater proportion of their interactions with more distantly-related subordinate species, opposite to the predicted pattern. Detailed data on resource use also suggests that larger species did not lose aggressive contests over less preferred food (Text S2, Table S7), contrary to the predictions of (i) and (ii). While our data do not rule out the contribution of these alternative hypotheses to the decline in the importance of size in aggressive encounters among more distantly-related species, they suggest that these alternative hypotheses cannot explain the pattern by themselves.

## What traits offset the importance of size in aggressive interactions?

No study to date has quantified a general set of traits which predictably offset the advantages of large size in aggressive interactions. However, upon reviewing the focal studies used to generate the data in this study (Text S3), in addition to other studies, we find a diverse set of traits that play a key role in offsetting the importance of size in aggressive interactions among birds. These traits include the evolution of well-developed leg musculature and talons (raptors [32]), adaptations that enhance flight acceleration (hummingbirds [33,34]) and maneuverability (hummingbirds [33-37], woodcreepers [38-40]), novel fighting behaviors (woodcreepers [38-40], grouse [41]), and traits directly associated with aggression, such as testosterone and muscle development (hummingbirds [29,42,43], woodcreepers [44], blackbirds [45,46]), The evolution of social behavior, where smaller individuals perform coordinated attacks on individuals of larger species, may shift the outcomes of aggressive interactions among species (e.g., mammalian carnivores [8]), although we excluded interactions involving multiple individuals of each species

**Table 4.** Results from the best-fit (lowest AICc) generalized linear mixed model (binomial distribution) testing the prediction that smaller bird species were more likely to win aggressive contests for resources when interacting with a more distantly-related species (n = 244 species pairs).

Fixed effects <sup>1</sup>	Estimate	SE	z	Ρ
Intercept	-1.60	0.18	-9.08	<0.0001
Genetic distance <sup>2</sup>	0.89	0.35	2.59	0.0098

<sup>1</sup>dependent=0 if larger species was dominant, 1 if smaller species was dominant; taxonomic group included as a random effect.

<sup>2</sup>standardized prior to analysis by subtracting the mean and dividing by 2 standard deviations.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0108741.t004

in our study. In addition, intraspecific clustering, leading to high densities of subordinate species, can overwhelm individuals of dominant species, leading to dominants reducing their territory size or abandoning resources altogether (vultures [47,48], hummingbirds [29,49], blackbirds [45,46]). In these cases, social coordination among individuals is unnecessary — simply a high density of subordinate relative to dominant individuals may increase the costs of aggressive defense of a resource for dominants. In all of these cases, the evolution of novel traits (or trait values) in smaller species were thought to allow them to overcome the costs of small size in aggressive contests with larger species.

Focal studies of species interactions also revealed cases where adaptations for other functions compromised the ability of large species to compete aggressively with smaller species — a mechanism that we did not predict. Traits that may have hindered larger species in aggressive interactions included the evolution of specialized morphologies for tree trunk foraging in woodcreepers [50] that in turn compromised their performance in aggressive contests away from trunks [44,51], and the evolution of migratory behavior, that compromised performance in aggressive contests with resident species. In the case of woodcreepers, the specialized adaptations for tree climbing [50] enhanced their performance in aggressive contests with some woodcreeper species on tree trunks [38-40], but compromised their performance in aggressive interactions with antbirds, which typically occur on small saplings and branches [44,50-52]. In the case of migration, a fundamental trade-off appears to constrain the ability of species to excel at both migration and performance in aggressive interactions simultaneously (Text S3), resulting in smaller resident species dominating larger migrant species across many different environments [14,53-55]

Overall, observations of smaller species dominating larger species suggest that diverse adaptations in both the smaller and larger species may offset the disadvantage of small size in aggressive contests among species. While the evolution of novel traits in small species could lead to counter-adaptations in large species, and thus an evolutionary arms race, subordinate species (large or small) may reduce costs of aggressive interactions from dominant species in a myriad of ways, such as by using alternative resources (e.g., [47]), shifting resource use in space and time (e.g., [13,56]), or even by mimicking dangerous species (e.g., mimicry of bumblebees by some subordinate hummingbirds; [33,42]). Tradeoffs and other evolutionary constraints are also likely to limit evolutionary arms races - most traits involved in interspecific aggression are used for other functions as well, and changes to these traits could influence organismal performance in many different ways. Most of our focal species also interacted with many species simultaneously (e.g., [43,56]), creating diverse sources of

selection that can influence patterns of co-evolution among species [57].

## Overcoming trade-offs over evolutionary time

Overall, our results suggest that the phylogenetic relationships among species can influence the rules that govern their interactions. Closely-related species typically share more traits in common [28], intensifying the importance of fundamental tradeoffs that constrain their interactions and relative distributions. Thus, any advantages to being small must be balanced against the fitness cost of coexisting with larger, closely-related species [7,58]. Over evolutionary time, however, novel traits may significantly alter the costs associated with trade-offs [3], creating new ecological opportunities and different patterns of community organization. Thus, a phylogenetic perspective of community ecology is important, not just for understanding causal processes or rules that structure communities [1,2], but also for understanding when and how these rules can be broken over evolutionary time. These dynamic interactions provide an example of why phylogenetic perspectives are invaluable for our understanding of the structure and function of ecological communities [1,2].

## **Supporting Information**

Figure S1 A 3-dimensional plot illustrating the relationships between dominance asymmetry, difference in mass, and genetic distance among the focal species pairs in our study. Dominance asymmetry = sqrt {ln ((wins by dominant species+1)/(wins by subordinate species+1))}. Difference in mass = (mass of dominant species-mass of subordinate species)/(average mass of dominant and subordinate species). Genetic distance is the Tamura-Nei genetic distance between interacting species for mtDNA.

Figure S2 Relatively heavier bird species were more likely to win aggressive contests for resources (positive slope), but the advantage of large size in aggressive contests declined with genetic distance (shallower slope for high genetic distance). Dominance asymmetry (y-axis) = sqrt {ln ((wins by dominant species+1)/(wins by subordinate species+1))}. Difference in mass (x-axis) = (mass of dominant species-mass of subordinate species)/(average mass of dominant and subordinate species). Genetic distance groups are split by the midpoint value for the dataset (low = 0.006-0.179; high = 0.180-0.352). Figure S2 is identical to Figure 5, except that an outlier point (interaction between *Gyps fulvus* and *Pica pica*) has been removed.

(TIF)

<sup>(</sup>TIF)

**Table 5.** Comparison of model fit for different generalized linear models, with taxonomic group entered as a predictor that include all possible combinations of predictor variables.

Model ranking	Intercept <sup>1</sup>	Taxonomic group	Difference in mass	Genetic distance	Interaction between group and difference in mass	Interaction between group and genetic distance	Interaction between difference in mass and genetic distance	Interaction between group, genetic distance and mass d		ogLik	AICc	delta AlCo	weight
1	1.08	+2	0.85	0.85	I	I	-2.53			- 117.2	249.0	0.00	0.387
2	0.79	+	0.93	3.26		+	-2.92	- 9	-	- 115.3	249.3	0.35	0.325
e	1.11	+	0.78	0.93	+		-2.88	6		- 116.4	251.6	2.65	0.103
4	0.82	+	0.87	3.35	+	+	-3.32		-	-114.5	252.1	3.11	0.082
5	1.27	+	0.37	Ι			I	- 5		- 121.9	254.0	5.07	0.031
6	1.17	°"	0.85	0.93			-2.44	- 5		- 122.1	254.5	5.59	0.024
7	0.65	+	1.19	4.51	+	+	-5.35	+	en en	- 113.6	254.8	5.87	0.021
8	1.25	+	0.37	0.19		I		9		- 121.8	255.9	6.99	0.012
6	1.28	+	0.32	Ι	+		I			- 121.4	257.3	8.34	0.006
10	1.10	+	0.37	1.50		+	I		1	- 120.8	258.3	9.31	0.004
11	1.35		0.39	Ι		I	I	е 		- 126.4	259.0	10.03	0.003
12	1.26	+	0.33	0.17	+		I	8	1	- 121.3	259.3	10.32	0.002
13	1.31		0.39	0.23			I	4		- 126.3	260.7	11.79	0.001
14	1.12	+	0.34	1.46	+	+	I		- 0	- 120.4	261.7	12.76	0.001
15	1.41	+	I	Ι		I	I	4		- 137.2	282.5	33.59	0.000
16	1.40	+	I	0.12			I	- 5	1	- 137.2	284.6	35.62	0.000
17	1.29	+	I	1.09		+	I			- 136.6	287.8	38.81	0.000
18	1.48	I	I	I		I	I	- 2		- 143.5	291.1	42.19	0.000
19	1.47	I	I	0.09	I	I	I	ю 		- 143.5	293.2	44.20	0.000
Models test <sup>1</sup> numbers 1 <sup>2</sup> plus sign <sup>3</sup> long dash doi:10.1371/	ed the prediction or predictor varia (+) indicates that (—) indicates tha (journal.pone.0108	that the advantag bles are effect size the predictor varia it the predictor var 3741.t005	ge of large size in ss. ible (factor) was ir riable was absent	aggressive cont ncluded in the r from the mode	tests for resources nodel. I.	declines with gen	etic distance amon	ig interacting bird sp	becies (n = 2	244 species põ	airs).		

**Table 6.** Results from the best-fit (lowest AICc) generalized linear model, with taxonomic group included as a predictor variable, testing the prediction that the advantage of large size in aggressive contests for resources declines with genetic distance among interacting bird species (n = 244 species pairs).

Fixed effects <sup>1</sup>	Estimate	SE	t	df	Р
Intercept <sup>2</sup>	1.08	0.11	9.70	243,238	<0.0001
Taxonomic group (hummingbirds)	0.05	0.09	0.58	243,238	0.56
Taxonomic group (antbirds/woodcreepers)	0.20	0.09	2.21	243,238	0.028
Difference in mass <sup>3</sup>	0.85	0.17	4.93	243,238	<0.0001
Genetic distance	0.85	0.49	1.76	243,238	0.08
Difference in mass <sup>3</sup> ×Genetic distance	-2.53	0.84	-3.01	243,238	0.0029

<sup>1</sup> dependent = sqrt{ln[(wins by dominant species+1)/(wins by subordinate species+1)]}.

<sup>2</sup> intercept value for taxonomic group = vultures.

<sup>3</sup> (mass of dominant species-mass of subordinate species)/(average mass of dominant and subordinate species).

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0108741.t006

Table S1Description of variables for our dataset (Table<br/>S2).

(TXT)

Table S2Dataset used in our study.(TXT)

Table S3 Comparison of model fit for different generalized linear mixed models (binomial distribution) that include all possible combinations of predictor variables, controlling for variation in sample sizes of interactions across studies. Models tested the prediction that smaller bird species were more likely to win aggressive contests for resources when interacting with a more distantly-related species. (CSV)

Table S4 Results from the best-fit (lowest AICc) generalized linear mixed model (binomial distribution), controlling for variation in sample sizes of interactions across studies. The model tests the prediction that smaller bird species were more likely to win aggressive contests for resources when interacting with a more distantly-related species. (CSV)

Table S5 Results from the best-fit (lowest AICc) linear mixed-effects model, with dominant or subordinate species included as a random effect. The model tested the prediction that the advantage of large size in aggressive contests for resources declines with genetic distance among interacting bird species (n = 244 species pairs). (CSV)

Table S6 Results from the best-fit (lowest AICc) generalized linear mixed model (binomial distribution), with dominant or subordinate species included as a random effect. The model tested the prediction that smaller bird species were more likely to win aggressive contests for resources when

#### References

- Web CO, Ackerly DD, McPeek MA, Donoghue MJ (2002) Phylogenies and community ecology. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 33: 475–505.
- Cavender-Bares J, Kozak KH, Fine PVA, Kembel SW (2009) The merging of community ecology and phylogenetic biology. Ecology Letters 12: 693–715.
- Lenski RE (1988) Experimental studies of pleiotropy and epistasis in *Escherichia coli*. II. Compensation for maladaptive effects associated with resistance to virus T4. Evolution 42: 433–440.
- Martin PR (2014) Trade-offs and biological diversity: integrative answers to ecological questions. In Integrative organismal biology (eds. Martin LB,

interacting with a more distantly-related species (n = 244 species pairs).

 $(\mathbf{CSV})$ 

Table S7 Relative diet specialization among species pairs where the smaller species was dominant (i.e., won the majority of aggressive interactions). Focal diets were the food source over which aggressive interactions occurred: carrion for interactions involving vultures, nectar for interactions involving hummingbirds, and prey flushed by army ant swarms for interactions involving woodcreepers and antbirds. (CSV)

Text S1 Genbank accession numbers for genetic sequences used in our study. (DOCX)

Text S2 Patterns of resource use and preference in cases where small species dominated large species in aggressive contests.

(DOCX)

Text S3 A review of traits that have been proposed to explain why small species dominate large species of birds, focusing on specific cases in all three of our taxonomic groups.

(DOCX)

#### Acknowledgments

We thank F. Bonier and an anonymous reviewer for helpful comments on earlier drafts of this manuscript.

## **Author Contributions**

Conceived and designed the experiments: PRM CKG. Performed the experiments: PRM. Analyzed the data: PRM. Contributed reagents/ materials/analysis tools: PRM CKG. Wrote the paper: PRM CKG.

Ghalambor CK, Woods HA), pp. 291–308. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, New York, USA.

- Peters RH (1983) The ecological implications of body size. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- 6. Bonner JT (2006) Why size matters. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, USA.
- Morse DH (1974) Niche breadth as a function of social dominance. American Naturalist 108: 818–830.
- Donadio E, Buskirk SW (2006) Diet, morphology, and interspecific killing in Carnivora. American Naturalist 167: 524–536.

- Burger J (1978) Competition between Cattle Egrets and native North American herons, egrets, and ibises. Condor 80: 15–23.
- Gill FB, Mack AL, Ray RT (1982) Competition between hermit hummingbirds Phaethorninae and insects for nectar in a Costa Rican rain forest. Ibis 124: 44– 49.
- Hino T (2005) Resident males of small species dominate immigrants of large species in heterospecific, winter bird flocks. Ornithological Science 4: 89–94.
- 12. Harvey PH, Pagel MD (1991) The comparative method in evolutionary biology. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Willis EO, Oniki Y (1978) Birds and army ants. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 9: 243–263.
- Freshwater C, Ghalambor CK, Martin PR (2014) Repeated patterns of trait divergence between closely related dominant and subordinate bird species. Ecology 95: 2334–2345.
- Tamura K, Peterson D, Peterson N, Stecher G, Nei M, et al. (2011) MEGA5: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis using maximum likelihood, evolutionary distance, and maximum parsimony methods. Molecular Biology and Evolution 28: 2731–2739.
- Tamura K, Nei M (1993) Estimation of the number of nucleotide substitutions in the control region of mitochondrial DNA in humans and chimpanzees. Molecular Biology and Evolution 10: 512–526.
- Weir JT, Schluter D (2008) Calibrating the avian molecular clock. Molecular Ecology 17: 2321–2328.
- Desjardins P, Morais R (1990) Sequence and gene organization of the chicken mitochondrial genome. Journal of Molecular Biology 212: 599–634.
- Larkin MA, Blackshields G, Brown NP, Chenna R, McGettigan PA, et al. (2007) Clustal W and Clustal X version 2.0. Bioinformatics 23: 2947–2948.
- 20. Maddison DR, Maddison WP (2005) MacClade, version 4.08. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts, USA.
- R Core Team 2014 R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria; http://www.R-project.org/. Accessed 2014.
- Pinheiro J, Bates D, DebRoy S, Sarkar D, R Development Core Team (2012) nlme: linear and nonlinear mixed effects models. R package version 3.1-103.
- Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B (2011) lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using S4 classes. R package version 0.999375-42.
- Gelman A, Su Y-S, Yajima M, Hill J, Pittau MG, et al. (2014) arm: Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical models. R package version 1.7-03.
- Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Walker NJ, Saveliev AA, Smith GM (2009) Mixed effects models and extensions in ecology with R. Springer, New York, New York, USA.
   Bartoń K (2013) MuMIn: Multi-model inference. B package version 1.9.5
- Bartoń K (2013) MuMIn: Multi-model inference. R package version 1.9.5.
   Ripley B, Hornik K, Gebhardt A, Firth D (2012) Support functions and datasets
- Kiptey B, Hornik K, Geonardt A, Finn D (2012) Support functions and datasets to support Venables and Ripley's 'Modern applied statistics with S' (4th edition, 2002). R package version 7.3.18.
- Violle C, Nemergut DR, Pu Z, Jiang L (2011) Phylogenetic limiting similarity and competitive exclusion. Ecology Letters 14: 782–787.
- Stiles FG (1973) Food supply and the annual cycle of the Anna Hummingbird. University of California Publications in Zoology 97: 1–109.
- Cole BJ (1983) Assembly of mangrove ant communities: patterns of geographical distribution. Journal of Animal Ecology 52: 339–347.
- Tanner CJ, Adler FR (2009) To fight or not to fight: context-dependent interspecific aggression in competing ants. Animal Behaviour 77: 297–305.
- del Hoyo J, Elliott A, Sargatal J, eds. (1994) Handbook of the birds of the world. Volume 2. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, Spain.
- Feinsinger P, Chaplin SB (1975) On the relationship between wing disc loading and foraging strategy in hummingbirds. American Naturalist 109: 217–224.
- Altshuler DL (2006) Flight performance and competitive displacement of hummingbirds across elevational gradients. American Naturalist 167: 216–229.

- Feinsinger P, Colwell RK, Terborgh J, Chaplin SB (1979) Elevation and the morphology, flight energetics, and foraging ecology of tropical hummingbirds. American Naturalist 113: 481–497.
- Kodric-Brown A, Brown JH (1978) Influence of economics, interspecific competition, and sexual dimorphism on territoriality of migrant Rufous Hummingbirds. Ecology 59: 285–296.
- del Hoyo J, Elliott A, Sargatal J, eds. (1999) Handbook of the birds of the world. Volume 5. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, Spain.
- Willis EO (1982) The behavior of Black-banded Woodcreepers (Dendocolaptes picumnus). Condor 84: 272–285.
- Willis EO (1983) Cis-Andean Xiphorhynchus and relatives (Aves, Dendrocolaptidae) as army ant followers. Revista Brasileira de Biologia 43: 133–142.
- Willis EO (1992) Comportamento e ecologia do arapaçu-barrado Dendrocolaptes certhia (Aves, Dendrocolaptidae). Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi, Série Zoologia 8: 151–216.
- Sharp WM (1957) Social and range dominance in gallinaceous birds pheasants and prairie grouse. Journal of Wildlife Management 21: 242–244.
- Feinsinger P, Colwell RK (1978) Community organization among neotropical nectar-feeding birds. American Zoologist 18: 779–795.
- Feinsinger P, Swarm LA, Wolfe JA (1985) Nectar-feeding birds on Trinidad and Tobago: comparison of diverse and depauperate guilds. Ecological Monographs 55: 1–28.
- Willis EO (1972) The behavior of Plain-brown Woodcreepers, *Dendrocincla fuliginosa*. Wilson Bulletin 84: 377–420.
- Orians GH (1961) The ecology of blackbird (*Agelaius*) social systems. Ecological Monographs 31: 285–312.
- Orians GH, Collier G (1963) Competition and blackbird social systems. Evolution 17: 449–459.
- König C (1983) Interspecific and intraspecific competition for food among Old World vultures. In Vulture biology and management (Wilbur SR, Jackson JA, eds.), pp. 153–171. University of California Press, Berkeley, California, USA.
- Wallace MP, Temple SA (1987) Competitive interactions within and between species in a guild of avian scavengers. Auk 104: 290–295.
- Lyon DL (1976) A montane hummingbird territorial system in Oaxaca, Mexico. Wilson Bulletin 88: 280–299.
- del Hoyo J, Elliott A, Christie DA, eds. (2003) Handbook of the birds of the world. Volume 8. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, Spain.
- Willis EO (1979) Behavior and ecology of two forms of White-chinned Woodcreepers (*Dendrocincla merula*, Dendrocolaptidae) in Amazonia. Papéis Avulsos de Zoologia 33: 27–66.
- Willis EO (1967) The behavior of Bicolored Antbirds. University of California Publications in Zoology 79: 1–132.
- Willis EO (1966) The role of migrant birds at swarms of army ants. Living Bird 5: 187–231.
- DesGranges J-L, Grant PR (1980) Migrant hummingbirds' accommodation into tropical communities. In Migrant birds in the Neotropics: ecology, behavior, distribution, and conservation (eds. Keast A, Morton ES), pp. 395–409. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, USA.
- Leisler B (1992) Habitat selection and coexistence of migrants and Afrotropical residents. Ibis 134: S77–S82.
- Feinsinger P (1976) Organization of a tropical guild of nectarivorous birds. Ecological Monographs 46: 257–291.
- Thompson JN (2005) The geographic mosaic of coevolution. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, USA.
- Brown JH, Maurer BA (1986) Body size, ecological dominance and Cope's rule. Nature 324: 248–250.