

1 **Title: Vocal performance increases rapidly during the dawn chorus in Adelaide's warbler**

2 *(Setophaga adelaidae)*

3 **Abbreviated title: Vocal warm-up during the dawn chorus**

4 Juleyska Vazquez-Cardona¹, Tyler R. Bonnell¹, Peter C. Mower¹, Orlando J. Medina², Hester
5 Jiskoot³, and David M. Logue^{1,4}

6 1. Department of Psychology, University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, AB, Canada;

7 2. United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Cabo Rojo National Wildlife Refuge, PR, USA;

8 3. Department of Geography and Environment, University of Lethbridge, AB, Canada;

9 4. Departamento de Biología, Universidad de Puerto Rico, Mayagüez, PR, USA

10

11 **Abstract**

12 Many songbirds sing intensely during the early morning, resulting in a phenomenon known as the
13 dawn chorus. We tested the hypothesis that male Adelaide's warblers (*Setophaga adelaidae*) warm
14 up their voices during the dawn chorus. If warming up the voice is one of the functions of the dawn
15 chorus, we predicted that vocal performance would increase more rapidly during the dawn chorus
16 compared to the rest of the morning and that high song rates during the dawn chorus period
17 contribute to the increase in vocal performance. The performance metrics *recovery time*, *voiced*
18 *frequency modulation*, and *unvoiced frequency modulation* were low when birds first began singing,
19 increased rapidly during the dawn chorus, and then leveled off or gradually diminished after dawn.
20 These changes are attributable to increasing performance within song types. Reduction in the
21 duration of the silent gap between notes is the primary driver of improved performance during the
22 dawn chorus. Simulations indicated that singing at a high rate during the dawn chorus period
23 increases performance in two of the three performance measures (*recovery time* and *unvoiced*

24 *frequency modulation*) relative to singing at a low rate during this period. These findings are
25 consistent with the hypothesis that vocal warm-up is one benefit of participation in the dawn chorus.

26 **Keywords**

27 bird song, dawn chorus, practice, vocal performance, warming up

28

30 Many songbirds sing at elevated rates early in the morning. Several hypotheses attempt to explain
31 the adaptive function of the “dawn chorus” (Staicer et al. 1996, Gil and Llusia 2020). For example,
32 birds may sing vigorously at dawn because (1) sound propagates further at dawn, (2) foraging is not
33 profitable at dawn, (3) song re-establishes territorial claims at dawn, (4) females prospect for mates
34 at dawn, or (5) they have extra energy they did not spend the night before (Staicer et al. 1996, Gil
35 and Llusia 2020). It is possible that the dawn chorus serves multiple functions, within and among
36 species. In the present study, we test Schraft et al.’s (2017) hypothesis that participation in the dawn
37 chorus plays an important role in “warming up” the vocal apparatus.

38 We use the term “warm-up” to describe improvement in performance due to recent practice (Schraft
39 et al. 2017, Déaux et al. 2020, Dinh et al. 2020). Various physiological process(es) might cause
40 such a change in performance. For example, physical warming might underlie behavioral warm-up
41 by increasing the speed of nerve conduction or metabolic reactions (Tan and Knight 2018, Bishop
42 2003a, Bishop 2003b). A prediction of that hypothesis is that performance will be lower at low
43 temperature.

44 We define performance as an adaptive approach to a behavioral limit (Podos 1997). Studies show
45 that warm-up improves performance in human (*Homo sapiens*) singers and athletes (Amir et al.
46 2005, Fradkin et al. 2010). Recent evidence suggests that singing birds’ vocal performance also
47 improves after warming up (Schraft et al. 2017, Dinh et al. 2020). The need to warm up the voice
48 may be an important constraint on vocal signaling in birds because vocal performance influences
49 responses from both male and female signal receivers (Podos and Sung 2020). According to the
50 warm-up hypothesis, ancestral birds that warmed up their voices in the morning by singing at high
51 rates had a competitive advantage over those that did not, sparking an evolutionary arms race that
52 drove elaboration of the dawn chorus (Schraft et al. 2017).

53 The first study to link the dawn chorus to improvements in vocal performance showed that
54 Frequency Excursion (*FEX*) – which measures the speed of frequency modulation in both notes and
55 silent gaps within songs (Podos et al. 2016) – increases with the cumulative number of songs that a
56 male Adelaide’s warbler (*Setophaga adelaidae*) sings over the course of the morning (Schraft et al.
57 2017). That study relied on a linear model, so it did not provide a detailed description of changes in
58 vocal performance over the course of the morning. If the dawn chorus functions as a warm-up
59 period, we expect that performance will be low when birds first start singing, increase rapidly
60 during the dawn chorus, and level off after the end of the dawn chorus. In the present study, we
61 replaced the wholistic performance metric *FEX* with three fine-grained performance metrics (*voiced*
62 *frequency modulation*, *unvoiced frequency modulation*, and *recovery time*), each of which attempts
63 to describe the performance of a particular class of vocal gestures (Goller 2022).

64 Constrained relationships between the acoustic properties of vocal signals can reveal the axes of
65 vocal performance. Singing requires rapid, precise changes in the syrinx, respiratory system, and
66 upper vocal tract (Nowicki et al. 1992, Catchpole and Slater 2003, Podos and Nowicki 2004).
67 Constraints on the speed, precision, or coordination of these physiological changes set limits on
68 song structure (Hoese et al. 2000, Podos and Nowicki 2004, Plummer and Goller 2008). Logue et
69 al. (2020) described performance constraints in Adelaide’s warbler at the note level, where notes are
70 uninterrupted sound units.

71 The following example illustrates how acoustic trade-offs can provide evidence of note-level
72 performance constraints. If there is a constraint on the speed that an Adelaide’s warbler can
73 modulate the fundamental frequency of a note, then at the limit of performance, notes with large
74 frequency bandwidths will be longer in duration than notes with small frequency bandwidths
75 (Logue et al. 2020). A scatterplot of duration versus frequency bandwidth would reveal a roughly
76 triangular distribution in which the hypotenuse represents the constrained edge of the distribution

77 (Podos 1997). Quantile regression can be used to estimate the performance limit (the solid line in
78 Fig. 1), making it possible to calculate the orthogonal distance (“deviation score”) between a sound
79 and the performance limit in acoustic space (Fig 1; Podos 2001, Wilson et al. 2014). Deviation
80 scores are inverse measures of performance, so low scores indicate high performance and *vice versa*
81 (Podos 2001).

82

83 Logue et al. (2020) used note-level acoustic constraints to calculate three axes of vocal performance
84 in Adelaide’s warblers’ songs: *recovery time*, voiced frequency modulation (*voiced FM*), and
85 unvoiced frequency modulation (*unvoiced FM*). *Recovery time* is the deviation score from a plot of
86 *note duration* versus the duration of the subsequent silent gap (*gap duration*). At the limit of
87 performance, longer notes require longer subsequent gaps, presumably because birds require long
88 mini-breaths to replenish the air that they exhaled singing a long note (Hartley and Suthers 1989,
89 Suthers and Zollinger 2004, Cardoso et al. 2007). *Recovery time* is strongly correlated with the
90 song-level performance metric “percent of sound” (a.k.a., “acoustic density;” Cardoso et al. 2009,
91 Logue et al. 2020). The performance axis *voiced FM* describes the speed with which birds can
92 change frequency while voicing a note. It is the deviation score from a comparison of frequency
93 bandwidth (*note BW*) and duration (*note duration*; Logue et al. 2020). Similarly, the metric
94 *unvoiced FM* describes the speed with which birds can change frequency while they are not voicing
95 a note. It is the deviation from a plot of the frequency bandwidth of silent gaps (*gap BW*) versus the
96 *gap duration* (Geberzahn and Aubin, 2014). *Voiced* and *unvoiced FM* are constrained because birds
97 require more time to make large frequency jumps than small ones, indicating a limit to the speed of
98 frequency modulation. In the present study, we use these three metrics and the simple acoustic
99 variables that underlie them to characterize changes in vocal performance during morning singing.

100 Our study tests the hypothesis that the dawn chorus functions to warm up the voice. Relative to the
101 previous study of vocal warm-up in Adelaide’s warbler (Schraft et al. 2017), we used a larger
102 dataset, more granular measures of performance (Logue et al. 2020), and a modeling approach that
103 reveals fine-scale changes in performance over time. If participation in the dawn chorus functions to
104 warm up the voice, we predict that (1) vocal performance will increase more rapidly during the
105 dawn chorus compared to later in the morning, and (2) singing at a high rate during the dawn chorus
106 period will lead to higher vocal performance after dawn.

107

108 **Methods**

109 **Study species**

110 Adelaide’s warbler is a tropical, year-round territorial, socially monogamous New World warbler
111 (family: Parulidae), endemic to Puerto Rico and nearby islands (Toms 2020). Males sing repertoires
112 of 22.6 ± 2.6 song types, all of which are frequency modulated trills (Fig. 2; Staicer 1992). Each
113 song comprises 23.8 ± 4.7 notes (unpublished analysis from Logue et al. 2020).

114

115 **Recording and annotation**

116 We studied a population of Adelaide’s warblers at the Cabo Rojo National Wildlife Refuge (U.S.
117 Fish and Wildlife Service; 17.98° N, 67.17° W) in western Puerto Rico from March 3 – June 19,
118 2012, and April 13 – May 6, 2017. These dates are within the population’s breeding season (Staicer
119 1992). Birds were captured with acoustic lures and mist nets and fitted with unique combinations of
120 plastic colored leg bands and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service metal leg bands for identification.
121 Recordings were made with Marantz PMD-661 digital recorders and Sennheisser ME67 “shotgun”

122 microphones (file format = wav, sampling rate = 44.1KHz, bit depth = 16 bits). Observers
123 continuously recorded mated males from 45 minutes before sunrise until approximately 2.5 hours
124 after sunrise (n = 9499 songs from 9 males in 2012 and n = 16381 songs from 18 males in 2017).
125 The recordist visually confirmed the identity of the focal male by the end of each recording session.
126 Trained observers annotated the field recordings. Annotators visualized the recordings from 2012 in
127 Syrinx PC v.2.6 (Burt 1995-2006) and entered data into a spreadsheet. Data included all songs from
128 the focal birds, and the song type (*ST*) to which they belonged. Annotators scored *ST* by comparing
129 each song spectrogram to spectrograms of the known repertoire of the focal bird. After all scoring
130 was complete, one observer (author D.M.L.) reviewed all song types. It is straightforward to assign
131 songs to *STs* within an individual's repertoire, and all our analyses treat *ST* as a within-individual
132 variable. Data from the 2012 recordings were used previously in Schraft et al. (2017), Hedley et al.
133 (2018), Kaluthota et al. (2019), and Logue et al. (2020). The recordings from 2017, which are
134 unique to this study, were annotated in Raven Pro 1.6.1 (Center for Conservation Bioacoustics
135 2019). The initial round of *ST* scoring followed the 2012 protocol. After scoring was complete, one
136 observer (author P.C.M.) reviewed all song types. Annotators scored the time of song delivery in
137 five second increments (e.g., 05:36:00, 05:36:05, etc.) for the 2012 recordings, but they scored
138 exact times for the 2017 recordings. We standardized temporal precision across recording years by
139 binning the 2017 dataset into five-second intervals.

140 This study adheres to the guidelines from the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee at the
141 University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez (September 17, 2010) and the Animal Welfare Committee at
142 the University of Lethbridge (protocol #1605). It also follows the ASAB/ABS Guidelines for the
143 use of animals in research. Field work was conducted with permission from the U.S. Fish and
144 Wildlife Service (permits 2012-01, 41521-2016-11) and the Departamento de Recursos Naturales y

145 Ambientales (permit 2016-IC-068-1). Bird handling was conducted under D.M.L.'s master bird
146 banding license (no. 2399).

147 **Acoustic analysis**

148 We acoustically analyzed a subset of songs from the recordings. For the 2012 recordings, we
149 analyzed all songs with sufficiently high signal-to-noise ratios ($n = 2879$ songs). For the 2017
150 recordings, we attempted to randomly select ten songs from each hour of recording. For both years,
151 our threshold for selection was that no other loud sounds overlapped the song, and that the notes of
152 the song were sufficiently loud relative to the background noise that Luscinia could detect them. For
153 hours that did not include ten song recordings with sufficiently high signal-to-noise ratios, we
154 sampled as many as were available ($n = 888$ songs sampled).

155 We conducted acoustic analysis in Luscinia v.2.14(Lachlan 2007; Settings: max. freq. = 10 kHz,
156 frame length = 5 ms, time step = 1 ms, dynamic range = 35 dB, dynamic equalization = 100 ms, de-
157 reverberation = 100%, de-reverberation range = 100 ms, high pass threshold = 1.0 kHz, noise
158 removal = 10 dB). Luscinia applies de-reverberation and noise removal algorithms to the sound
159 prior to note identification (personal comment R. Lachlan). We chose conservative de-reverberation
160 and noise removal parameters that appeared to reduce reverberation and noise without affecting the
161 notes. Trained scorers used a stylus and a touchscreen monitor to highlight all visible notes on a
162 spectrogram. Luscinia's algorithm then searched within the highlighted area for pixels that exceed
163 an amplitude threshold, which is defined by the dynamic range parameter (35 dB in the present
164 analysis). The algorithm then adds neighboring pixels to the growing note until it encounters either
165 the edge of the highlighted area, or the amplitude falls below the cutoff.

166 We extracted the following metrics at the note level: maximum peak frequency (highest peak
167 frequency in the note), minimum peak frequency (lowest peak frequency in the note), note start

168 time, note end time, peak frequency at the beginning of the note, and peak frequency at the end of
169 the note. Peak frequency is the frequency with the highest amplitude in the sample window. In
170 Adelaide’s warbler songs, the peak frequency is the fundamental frequency.

171 Note start and end times were used to calculate the duration of the notes (*note duration*) and the
172 silent gaps after each note (*gap duration*). We calculated the frequency bandwidth of the notes (*note*
173 *BW*) as the ratio of the maximum and minimum peak frequency of the note (Cardoso 2013, Logue
174 et al. 2020). Similarly, we calculated *gap BW* as the ratio of the peak frequency at the end of one
175 note and the beginning of the next note, with the larger value in the numerator (Logue et al. 2020).
176 We excluded the final note of each song from the analysis because it lacks a *gap BW* and *gap*
177 *duration*.

178 **Variables**

179 We calculated deviation scores for three performance metrics. We first generated three scatterplots
180 with all data from 2012 and 2017 (*note duration* vs. *gap duration*, *note BW* vs. *note duration*, and
181 *gap BW* vs. *gap duration*) and ran mixed quantile regressions with *Bird ID* as a random term
182 (Logue et al. 2020). Quantile regression estimates a quantile (specified by the parameter *tau*) of *y*
183 conditional on *x*. The goal of this analysis is to produce a regression line that parallels the
184 constrained edge of the distribution, and the value of *tau* that best achieves this goal depends on the
185 shape of the data cloud. Previous work on this population set *tau* = 0.10 (Logue et al. 2020), but we
186 set *tau* = 0.05 to better fit the data. The resulting quantile regression lines that represent the
187 performance limits are described in the Electronic Supplementary Materials (Table S1, Fig. S1).
188 Quantile regression can produce imprecise estimates of performance limits (Cardoso 2019, Logue et
189 al. 2020). Our data were not amenable to analysis with double quantile regression (Cardoso 2019;
190 see “On Double Quantile Regression” in Electronic Supplementary Materials).

191 We calculated the deviation score for a given note as the orthogonal distance between the note and
192 the performance limit, so lower deviation scores indicate higher performance (Fig. 1; Podos 2001).
193 We averaged the deviation scores over the notes within a song because we were interested in how
194 performance changes at the level of the whole song. For the sake of clarity, we refer to songs that
195 closely approach the performance limit (i.e., songs with low deviation scores) as “high
196 performance” songs. We also multiplied the Y-axes by -1 on the figures so that higher values
197 indicate higher performance. We measured Pearson’s correlation for each deviation score and the
198 acoustic variables that contribute to it. We tested whether simple acoustic variables might be better
199 metrics of performance than deviation scores, by examining correlations among acoustic variables
200 and testing their skewness, which can indicate constraint (Cardoso 2017, Logue et al. 2020).

201 We used time relative to sunrise (*Time*) to test predictions of the hypothesis that male Adelaide’s
202 warblers warm up their voices during the dawn chorus. We calculated time relative to sunrise as the
203 difference between the time of the song and the time of sunrise. Sunrise times were obtained from
204 *timeanddate* (Thorsen 1995-2022). We included the cumulative number of songs that a bird had
205 sung over the course of the morning (*Order*) in our models to account for variation in song rate
206 (Schraft et al. 2017). We used air temperature (*Ta*) and relative humidity (*RH*) as covariates because
207 these variables affect thermoregulation in endotherms and may affect warm-up (McKechnie and
208 Wolf 2019, Levesque and Marshall 2021). Our weather data came from the *University of Utah’s*
209 MesoWest weather station at our field site (17.97 ° N, 67.16 ° W; The University of Utah). The
210 weather station reports *Ta* and *RH* data once per hour to an accuracy of +/- 0.6 °C and 0-80% - +/-
211 2.00% at 25°C. We weight-smoothed these parameters to interpolate between hourly records. We
212 used the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) weather station data in Lajas,
213 Puerto Rico (18.10 ° N, 67.10° W) to validate the data from the MesoWest station (Vazquez-
214 Cardona 2021). Finally, we used the ordinal number of the day in the year (*OD*) as a covariate.

215 **Statistical analysis**

216 Our statistical analysis follows the approach described by McElreath (McElreath 2020). All
217 analyses were conducted in R x64 4.1.0. (R Core Team 2018). Descriptive data are summarized in
218 Table S2.

219 Model construction occurred in two steps. First, we used networks of causal inference known as
220 directed acyclic graphs (*DAG's*; Fig. S2) to choose predictor variables that isolate the direct effects
221 of interest and avoid confounds (Westreich and Greenland 2013; McElreath 2020). Nodes in this
222 network represent variables and their directed edges (arrows) represent causal influence (McElreath
223 2020). *DAG's* are useful because they make causal hypotheses explicit and reveal hidden
224 confounds. The use of *DAG's* in model construction is unlike some popular model selection
225 procedures (e.g., stepwise, information-based), because the main effects to include in the model are
226 chosen *a priori* by the investigator, rather than by an algorithm. The goal of our analysis is to
227 characterize the causal relationship between the dawn chorus (represented by *Time*) and vocal
228 performance, while controlling for weather, the number of songs sung, and day of year. We applied
229 the *adjustmentSets* function from the R package *DAGitty* (Textor et al. 2016), to confirm that our
230 models can characterize the direct effect of *Time* on performance without confounds.

231 We then used information-based model selection to choose from a set of biologically plausible
232 interaction terms. We began by considering all possible two and three-way interactions and
233 identifying those that we deemed biologically plausible. We determined there were four
234 biologically plausible two-way interactions (*Ta * RH*, *Time * Order*, *Ta * Time*, and *Ta * Order*)
235 and one plausible three-way interaction (*Ta * Time * Order*). We considered these interactions
236 plausible because (1) *Ta* and *RH* may interact to affect thermoregulation with consequences for
237 vocal performance, (2) *Time* and *Order* may interact if song rate (songs / time) influences
238 performance, (3) *Ta* and *Time* may interact if the effect of temperature on performance varies over

239 the course of the morning (e.g., if high temperature influences performance more strongly early in
240 the day), (4) *Ta* and *Order* may interact if the effect of temperature depends on how many songs the
241 bird has sung, and (5) *Ta*, *Time*, and *Order*, may interact if the effect of temperature on performance
242 depends on song rate (the interaction of *Time* and *Order*). For each dependent variable, we ran
243 models with all combinations of the five biologically plausible interactions. We interpreted and
244 visualized results for the converging models with the lowest Watanabe-Akaike information criterion
245 (*WAIC*), and also considered any other models with $WAIC \leq 2.0$ (Table S3).

246 We used the *brms* package to build hierarchical Bayesian models with Gaussian distributions
247 (Bürkner 2018). All independent variables were fitted as splines to permit non-linear relationships.
248 Examination of variance inflation factors revealed no evidence of strong multicollinearity (Kutner
249 et al. 2005; Table S4). We standardized all predictor variables: *Ta*, *RH*, *Time*, *Order*, and *OD* prior
250 to analysis. We also standardized the dependent variables (performance metrics and simple acoustic
251 traits) to facilitate comparison among them. We included *Year* and *ST* nested within individual
252 (*Bird ID*) as random effects to control for the non-independence of performance within year, song
253 type, and individual. The inclusion of *ST* as a random variable means that any observed trend in
254 performance should be interpreted as variation within, rather than among, song types. Since each
255 song type in a male's repertoire belongs to a single song category, the random term *ST* also controls
256 for variation attributable to song categories (Staicer 1992, Kaluthota et al. 2019). Our Markov
257 Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) conditioning engine used 4 chains and 3,500 iterations to estimate
258 posterior distributions. We used priors centered on 0, which set the models' initial state to assume
259 the independent variables have no effect on the dependent variable (McElreath 2020). We validated
260 model fits with posterior predictive checks and R-hat values (see Fig. S3 and R-hat in Electronic
261 Supplementary Materials; Gelman and Hill 2006, Gelman and Shirley 2011).

262 For all three dependent variables, we interpreted model variant #16, which included the interaction
263 terms *Ta * Time*, *Ta * RH*, and *Time * Order* and the main effect *OD* (Table S3). Nine out of the 60
264 models (15%) did not converge. Of the models that did converge, model variant #16 had the lowest
265 WAIC for *recovery time* and *voiced FM*. An otherwise-identical model (#17) that combined *Ta*,
266 *Time*, and *Order* in a three-way interaction, had a slightly lower WAIC value ($\Delta\text{WAIC} = -0.8$) for
267 *unvoiced FM*, but the results were qualitatively identical to those of model #16. Similarly, model
268 #12 for *voiced FM* ($\Delta\text{WAIC} = 1.9$) had qualitatively identical results to model #16. For the sake of
269 simplicity, we interpreted model variant #16 for all three dependent variables and the simple
270 acoustic traits that comprise them.

271 We visualized the results in several ways. Plots of the conditional effects of *Time* on performance
272 allowed us to visualize variation in performance over time in a way that accounts for the effects of
273 covariates and random terms. To check the robustness of our findings, we used the *geom_smooth*
274 function from the *ggplot2* package (Wickham 2016) to plot generalized additive models with cubic
275 splines that estimate mean performance over *Time* without accounting for covariates or random
276 terms. Certain conditional effects can be difficult to interpret in models that incorporate splines and
277 interactions (McElreath 2020). For these effects, model predictions often paint a clearer picture of
278 the consequences of varying the independent variables. We therefore entered simulated data into the
279 conditioned models and visualized the output to characterize the effects of song rate on vocal
280 performance. Specifically, we compared a simulated bird that sings at the average post-dawn rate
281 (avg. based on full dataset = 0.6 songs / min.) throughout the whole morning to a simulated bird that
282 sings at the average dawn chorus rate (4.8 songs / min.) before dawn, then switches to the average
283 post-dawn rate 7 min. after dawn, when the dawn chorus typically ends (Kaluthota et al. 2019).

284

285 **Results**

286 The conditional effects of time on performance showed that male Adelaide's warblers' vocal
287 performance was at its lowest when they first began to sing and increased during the dawn chorus
288 (blue lines in Fig. 3). *Recovery time* and *unvoiced FM* increased rapidly during pre-dawn singing
289 and then gradually decreased after sunrise (Fig. 3a, c). The conditional effect of *Time* on *Voiced FM*
290 increased during pre-dawn singing, held steady after sunrise, and began to increase again at 80
291 minutes after sunrise (Fig. 3b). The conditional effects of *Time* on *recovery time* and *voiced FM*
292 include strong slopes near the end of the sampling period (Fig. 3a, b). We have low confidence in
293 the veracity of these terminal slopes because data are sparse and credible intervals are wide near the
294 end of the sampling period, and because the terminal slopes are not present in the estimates of
295 performance based on time alone. A comparison of the conditional deviation scores from the
296 beginning of the dawn chorus (41 min before sunrise) to those at the end of the dawn chorus (7 min
297 after sunrise), reveals a large change in *recovery time* (59.5% reduction in deviation score) and
298 *unvoiced FM* (56.6%), and a moderate change in *voiced FM* (29.4%). Like the conditional effects,
299 the curves based on performance data alone show that performance begins low, increases rapidly
300 during the dawn chorus, and levels out after dawn (orange lines in Fig. 3). In theory, an increase in
301 singing amplitude alone could produce spurious evidence of improving performance. We tested this
302 hypothesis and concluded that it cannot explain the patterns in our data ("On Amplitude" in
303 Supplementary Materials).

304

305 The simulations predicted that singing at an elevated rate would cause a 37.5% improvement in
306 *recovery time*, a 4.0% reduction in *voiced FM*, and a 20.2% improvement in *unvoiced FM* over the
307 course of the dawn chorus period (Fig. 4).

308

309 There was evidence that *Ta* had a small effect on performance. *Recovery time* and *unvoiced FM*
310 peaked at intermediate *Ta*'s (Fig. 5a, c). Conversely, *voiced FM* was at its lowest at intermediate
311 *Ta*'s and increased at higher temperatures, but this trend should be viewed with caution because
312 data are sparse at high *Ta* (Fig. 5b). *Recovery time* and *unvoiced FM* increased in an approximately
313 linear manner with *Order* (Fig. 6a, c). *Voiced FM*, however, tended to decrease slightly as birds
314 sang more songs (Fig. 6b). The effect of *RH* and *OD* on vocal performance were weak, so we do not
315 discuss them further (Figs. S4 and S5).

316 The conditional effects of *Time* on the simple acoustic traits showed that both *gap duration* and, to a
317 lesser degree, *note duration* decreased during the dawn chorus and started to increase after sunrise
318 (Fig. S6a-b). *Gap BW* and especially *note BW* narrowed during the dawn chorus and then start to
319 broaden after sunrise (Fig. S6c-d). *Order* did not have strong independent relationships with any
320 simple acoustic traits except for a negative relationship with *gap duration* (Fig. S7). The estimated
321 effects of *Ta*, *RH*, and *OD* on the simple acoustic traits were weak (Figs. S8, S9, S10). Song rate
322 simulations using the simple acoustic traits predicted that singing with an elevated rate during the
323 dawn chorus period resulted in songs with shorter *gap duration*, and narrower *gap BW* than birds
324 that do not participate in the dawn chorus (Fig. S11a, c). The simulation predicts only a slight
325 difference in *note BW* and no difference in *note duration* between birds that do and do not
326 participate in the dawn chorus (Fig. S11b, d).

327

328

329 *Recovery time* was highly correlated with *gap duration* ($r = 0.94$) and moderately correlated with
330 *note duration* ($r = 0.24$). *Voiced FM* was highly correlated with *note duration* ($r = 0.98$), but very
331 weakly correlated with *note BW* ($r = 0.02$). *Unvoiced FM* was highly correlated with *gap duration* (r
332 $= 0.96$), and moderately correlated with *gap BW* ($r = -0.25$). All measured variables were positively

333 skewed. The skewness of deviation scores (*recovery time* = 3.44, *voiced FM* = 1.28, *unvoiced FM* =
334 2.48) exceeded that of the simple acoustic variables that comprised them (*note duration* = 1.11, *gap*
335 *duration* = 2.44, *note BW* = 0.48, *gap BW* = 0.57; note that *gap duration* does not contribute to
336 voiced FM).

337

338 **Discussion**

339 We modeled the effects of time of day and song rate on vocal performance to test the hypothesis
340 that male Adelaide's warblers warm up their voices during the dawn chorus. Our key finding was
341 that vocal performance was at its lowest when the birds begin singing, increased rapidly during the
342 dawn chorus, then leveled off when the dawn chorus ended (Fig. 3). This finding was robust,
343 occurring in all three performance metrics, with or without covariates and random variables. The
344 trend appears in models with the random variable *ST*, indicating that it is driven by changes in
345 performance within, rather than between, song types. It appears that the birds' voices "cool down"
346 overnight when they do not sing, and warm up again during the dawn chorus, supporting a key
347 prediction of the warm-up hypothesis.

348 If elaboration of the dawn chorus is an adaptation to warm up the voice, we expect that high song
349 rates, which characterize the dawn chorus, should promote increased performance. Using linear
350 models, Schraft et al. (2017) found that the cumulative number of songs sung positively influenced
351 performance, but time of day negatively influenced performance. Those findings suggest that song
352 rate (songs / time) may be a key driver of warm-up in vocal performance. Our models predicted that
353 singing at a high rate during the dawn chorus period and then switching to a low song rate resulted
354 in higher *recovery time* and *unvoiced FM* after dawn than did singing at a constant low rate
355 throughout the morning (Fig. 4a, c). We also found that both *Time* and *Order* positively influence

356 *recovery time* and *unvoiced FM* performance (Fig. 6a, c). Collectively, the song rate simulations
357 and conditional effects of *Time* and *Order* are consistent with the idea that song rate plays an
358 important role in vocal warm up.

359 It may be useful to think of performance as being influenced by “vocal performance potential”
360 (*VPP*), which encompasses all the physiological substrates that promote vocal performance. Unlike
361 “performance” itself, *VPP* can change even when the animal is not signaling. *VPP* may exceed
362 observed performance if an animal chooses to signal with low performance when it could signal
363 with high performance. We hypothesize that *VPP* can be improved (up to some point) by singing at
364 a high rate. When birds do not sing, or sing at low rates, *VPP* tends to decrease gradually, until it
365 reaches some lower limit. The finding that ruffed grouse (*Bonasa umbellus*) drumming performance
366 decreases after animals take a break from displaying is consistent with the idea that display rate
367 influences performance potential (Déaux et al. 2020). Similarly, human soccer players that re-warm
368 up during half time exhibit higher sprint performance than players that rest (Mohr et al. 2004).

369 Other variables, such as anatomy (Podos 2001), temperature (Fig. 5), hormone levels (Pasch et al.
370 2011) , and fatigue (Brumm and Slater 2006, Pasch et al. 2011), may also affect *VPP*.

371 Fatigue is particularly interesting if it trades off with warming up to shape the duration or intensity
372 of the dawn chorus. Most current evidence, however, does not support this hypothesis. Schraft et al.
373 (2017) did not find evidence that singing the same song type repeatedly induces fatigue in
374 Adelaide's warblers (Lambrechts and Dhondt 1988). Similarly, *recovery time* and *unvoiced FM* tend
375 to improve with the cumulative number of songs produced (Fig. 6a, c). The best existing evidence
376 that fatigue affects performance in Adelaide’s warblers is the slight decrease in *voiced FM* over
377 song order (Fig. 6b). It would be useful to conduct a study that directly measures or manipulates
378 song rate to examine its effects on fatigue.

379 We saw decreases over the course of the dawn chorus in all four of the simple acoustic variables on
380 which our performance metrics were based (Fig. S6). During the dawn chorus, songs became faster
381 overall (shorter *note duration* and *gap duration*) and their bandwidth narrowed (lower *note BW* and
382 *gap BW*). While the songs got faster overall as males warmed up their voices, the duration of the
383 silent gaps decreased faster than that of the notes, resulting in an increase in sound density (a.k.a.,
384 percent of sound; Cardoso et al. 2009, Logue et al. 2020) at the level of the whole song. Similarly,
385 although both *note BW* and *gap BW* decreased, *note duration* and (especially) *gap duration*
386 decreased more, resulting in an increase in *voiced* and *unvoiced FM* speed. We also saw a
387 substantial decrease in *gap duration* with *order*, suggesting that song rate drives the reduction in
388 *gap duration* (Fig. S7a). We conclude that *gap duration* is the only simple acoustic variable in our
389 study that improves with warm-up. Improvement in *gap duration* compensates for decreases in the
390 performance of other variables, driving improvements in *recovery time* and *unvoiced FM* during the
391 dawn chorus.

392 One acoustic variable (*gap duration*) is the main driver of improvement in performance during the
393 dawn chorus, raising the question of whether to focus on that variable alone or the composite
394 variables (deviation scores) derived from trade-off plots (Cardoso 2017). The trade-offs observed in
395 this study and in Logue et al. 2020 show that the processes that generate songs are limited. Songs
396 that require birds to approach those limits more closely require higher performance whether those
397 songs make greater demands along one or both acoustic axes of the trade-off graph. Thus, we can
398 conclude that performance improves during the dawn chorus whether we focus on simple acoustic
399 variables or deviation scores.

400 This study investigates the sender's side of the communication interaction, so it is reasonable to
401 focus on the kind of variable whose production is most constrained. Consider the deviation score
402 *recovery time* as an example. *Recovery time* is more constrained than the simple acoustic variable

403 *gap duration* because *recovery time* accounts for the mediating effect of *note duration* on *gap*
404 *duration*. Skewness analysis supports this conclusion. All deviation scores in our study were
405 characterized by higher skewness than their constituent acoustic variables (Logue et al. 2020). We
406 conclude that deviation scores are more constrained than the simple acoustic variables from which
407 they are calculated, so it is appropriate to focus on deviation scores when considering constraints on
408 signal production.

409 We observed slightly higher vocal performance at intermediate temperatures in two of the three
410 performance metrics (Fig. 5a, c). If these trends are repeatable, they are evidence that some kinds of
411 vocal performance peak at intermediate temperatures. Low performance at low temperatures is
412 consistent with the idea that physical warming contributes to vocal warm-up. Follow-up studies that
413 examine the relationships among *T_a*, body temperature, and vocal performance would be useful.
414 Low performance at high temperatures is a common finding (Schulte et al. 2011; Brandt et al. 2018;
415 Levesque and Marshall 2021). If high ambient temperature negatively affects vocal performance,
416 increases in average temperatures caused by global warming might lower performance and select
417 for males that sing during cooler periods (e.g., earlier in the morning).

418 In Adelaide's warbler, the dawn chorus is characterized not only by high song rates, but also by
419 frequent song type switches and specific song types from the singer's repertoire ("Category B"
420 songs; Staicer 1992, Kaluthota et al. 2019)). Frequent song type switching may warm up the voice
421 better than monotonous singing if different song types require different motor patterns. Similarly,
422 Category B songs may promote warm up if, for example, they require more varied motor patterns
423 than do other songs (Staicer 1996). Previous findings that Category B songs have lower
424 performance than Category A songs may be attributable to the fact that Category B songs tend to be
425 sung before birds are fully warmed up (Beebee 2004, Price and Crawford 2013). Future studies
426 should investigate the effects of song type switching and the use of Category B songs on vocal

427 warm-up to further characterize the relationship between the structure of the dawn chorus and its
428 function(s).

429 *Voiced FM* behaved differently than the other deviation scores in the *Order* effects, *Ta* effects, and
430 song rate analysis. One explanation for these differences is that long *note durations* correspond to
431 low *voiced FM* performance but high *recovery time* performance. Singers may sacrifice *voiced FM*
432 to allow greater improvements in *recovery time*. The relative importance of different performance
433 variables to both signalers and signal receivers is an important area for future study. A second
434 possible explanation for the divergent behavior of *voiced FM* is that our measure of *voiced FM* is
435 blind to patterns of within-note frequency modulation that do not affect *note BW* (Logue et al. 2020,
436 Goller 2022). An analytic method that traces the contour of each note, like *FEX*, while measuring
437 *voiced FM* separately from *unvoiced FM* would overcome this limitation. A third possible
438 explanation is that our *voiced FM* metric ignores an important constraint. The songbird syrinx
439 includes two sound sources that specialize in different frequency ranges (Suthers and Zollinger
440 2008). Our measure of *voiced FM* does not consider how *FM* may be constrained differently
441 depending on whether the bird is using the right side of the syrinx, the left side, or both sides
442 (Goller 2022).

443 Future studies with Adelaide's warblers should test whether performance functions in mate
444 attraction and territory defense. The warm-up hypothesis for the function of the dawn chorus would
445 be on firmer footing if it were clear that vocal performance influenced receiver responses in this
446 species, as it appears to in some other songbirds (de Kort et al. 2009, Byers et al. 2010, Phillips and
447 Derryberry 2017). A female preference for high performance songs, combined with our finding that
448 Adelaide's warblers' vocal performance increases during the dawn chorus, could explain why the
449 dawn chorus is restricted to the breeding season in this species (Staicer 1992). Receiver-side studies

450 could also clarify which acoustic parameters, if any, are most salient to receivers (Phillips and
451 Derryberry 2017).

452 We conclude that male Adelaide’s warblers’ vocal performance increases rapidly during the dawn
453 chorus because vigorous (high rate) singing temporarily increases performance potential. Our
454 results are the strongest support to date for the hypothesis that increasing vocal performance via
455 warming up has contributed to the elaboration of the dawn chorus. A convincing demonstration of
456 that hypothesis would require evidence that high vocal performance is adaptive in this taxon, and
457 that evolutionary elaboration of the dawn chorus coincides with increased performance after dawn.
458 An alternative interpretation of our data is that participation in the dawn chorus may warm up the
459 voice incidentally without any adaptive benefit. We find this non-adaptive explanation less likely
460 because Adelaide’s warblers often sing near their performance limits (Logue et al. 2020) and vocal
461 performance has been shown to have important fitness-related consequences in other species (Podos
462 and Sung 2020). The hypothesis that warming up the voice is one function of the dawn chorus is
463 compatible with other hypothesized functions of the dawn chorus. It seems plausible that different
464 evolutionary paths have led to elaborate dawn choruses in different taxa (Staicer et al. 1996, Gil and
465 Llusia 2020).

466 More broadly, this study highlights a possible role for “warming up” in the evolution of signaling
467 behavior. It is well-established that selection for immediate communication functions shapes
468 signaling behavior. While Adelaide’s warblers may (and likely do) communicate during the dawn
469 chorus, our study suggests that singing behavior during the dawn chorus has also been shaped by
470 selection favoring rapid vocal warm-up. It may be the case that signaling behavior in other species
471 is also influenced by selection to warm up quickly and efficiently.

472 **Funding**

473 This work was supported by a Discovery Grant from the Natural Sciences and Engineering
474 Research Council of Canada (grant number RGPIN-2015-06553) to author [DML].

475 **Acknowledgements**

476 We thank Daniel Pereira, Josiris Rodríguez, Eva M. Rivera-Meléndez, Dawson Lehmann,
477 Lambert Heatlie, Nolan Gooding, Shelby Prevost, Cole Pawlenchuck, Paloma Sanchez-
478 Jaureguí, Fabio L. Tarazona, Jorge Illanas, Krystal Medina, Alfredo Lamela, Bailey Parker,
479 Tony Shlakoff, Casandra Logue, Joshua Baez, Ruben Irizarry, and Alicia Garcia who
480 helped to record birdsongs, process song recordings, and score the data. We also thank
481 Liam R. Mitchell who helped with data processing and modeling. Dr. Robert Lachlan
482 provided helpful advice and information about Luscinia. Dr. Gonçalo Cardoso provided
483 useful information about double quantile regression. We would also like to thank Dr.
484 Hannes A. Schraft, Dr. Andrew Iwaniuk, and members of the Behavioral and Evolutionary
485 Ecology Research Seminar at the University of Lethbridge who provided insight into the
486 conceptualization of this project and data analysis. Finally, we are grateful to Dr. Diego Gil
487 and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on a previous draft of this
488 manuscript.

489 Analyses reported in this article can be reproduced using the data provided by Author
490 (XXXX)

491 **References**

- 492 Amir O, Amir N, Michaeli O. 2005. Evaluating the influence of warmup on singing voice quality
493 using acoustic measures. *J Voice*. 19(2): 252-260.
- 494 Beebee, MD. 2004. Variation in vocal performance in the songs of a wood-warbler: evidence for
495 the function of distinct singing modes. *Ethol*. 110(7): 531-542.
- 496 Bishop, D. 2003a. Warm-up II: performance changes following active warm up on exercise
497 performance. *Sports Med*. 33(1): 483-498.
- 498 Bishop, D. 2003b. Warm up I. *Sports Med*. 33(6): 439-454.
- 499 Brandt EE, Kelley JP, Elias DO. 2018. Temperature alters multimodal signaling and mating success
500 in an ectotherm. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol*. 72(12): 191-205.
- 501 Brumm H, Slater PJ. 2006. Ambient noise, motor fatigue, and serial redundancy in chaffinch song.
502 *Behav Ecol Sociobiol*. 60(4): 475-481.
- 503 Bürkner P-C. 2018. Advanced Bayesian multilevel modeling with the R package brms. *The R*
504 *Journal*. 10(1): 395-411.
- 505 Burt J. 1995-2006. *Syrinx*. Version 2.6. Seattle, WA: University of Washington.
- 506 Byers J, Hebets E, Podos J. 2010. Female mate choice based upon male motor performance. *Anim*
507 *Behav*. 79(4): 771-778.
- 508 Cardoso GC. 2013. Using frequency ratios to study vocal communication. *Anim Behav*. 85(6):
509 1529-1532.

510 Cardoso GC. 2017. Advancing the inference of performance in birdsong. *Anim Behav.* 125: e29-
511 e32.

512 Cardoso GC. 2019. Double quantile regression accurately assesses distance to boundary trade-offs.
513 *Methods Ecol Evol.* 10(8): 1322-1331.

514 Cardoso GC, Atwell JW, Ketterson ED, Price TD. 2007. Inferring performance in the songs of
515 dark-eyed juncos (*Junco hyemalis*). *Behav Ecol.* 18(6): 1051-1057.

516 Cardoso GC, Atwell JW, Ketterson ED, Price TD. 2009. Song types, song performance, and the use
517 of repertoires in dark-eyed juncos (*Junco hyemalis*). *Behav Ecol*, 20(4): 901-907.

518 Catchpole CK, Slater PJ. 2003. Bird song: biological themes and variations. Cambridge, England:
519 Cambridge university press.

520 Center for Conservation Bioacoustics. 2019. Raven Pro: Interactive Sound Analysis Software.
521 Version 1.6.1. Ithaca, NY: The Cornell Lab of Ornithology. Available from:
522 <https://ravensoundsoftware.com/software/raven-pro/>.

523 de Kort SR, Eldermire ER, Cramer ER, Vehrencamp SL. 2009. The deterrent effect of bird song in
524 territory defense. *Behav Ecol.* 20(1): 200-206.

525 Déaux EC, O'Neil NP, Jensen AM, Charrier I, Iwaniuk AN. 2020. Courtship display speed varies
526 daily and with body size in the Ruffed Grouse (*Bonasa umbellus*). *Ethol.* 126(5): 528-539.

527 Dinh JP, Peters S, Nowicki S. 2020. Song performance improves with continued singing across the
528 morning in a songbird. *Anim Behav.* 167: 127-137.

- 529 Fradkin AJ, Zazryn TR, Smoliga JM. 2010. Effects of warming-up on physical performance: a
530 systematic review with meta-analysis. *J Strength Cond Res.* 24(1): 140-148.
- 531 Geberzahn N, Aubin T. 2014. Assessing vocal performance in complex birdsong: a novel approach.
532 *BMC Biol.* 12(1): 1-9.
- 533 Gelman A, Hill J. 2006. Data analysis using regression and multilevel/hierarchical models.
534 Cambridge, England: Cambridge university press.
- 535 Gelman A, Shirley K. 2011. Inference from simulations and monitoring convergence. *Handbook of*
536 *markov chain monte carlo.* London: Chapman & Hall/CRC. p. 163-74.
- 537 Gil D, Llusia D. 2020. The bird dawn chorus revisited. In: Aubin, T, Mathevon, N, editors. *Coding*
538 *strategies in vertebrate acoustic communication.* Cham, Switzerland: Springer. p. 45-90.
- 539 Goller F. 2022. Vocal athletics—from birdsong production mechanisms to sexy songs. *Anim Behav.*
540 184: 173-184.
- 541 Hartley RS, Suthers RA. 1989. Airflow and pressure during canary song: direct evidence for mini-
542 breaths. *J Comp Physiol A.* 165(1): 15-26.
- 543 Hedley RW, Logue DM, Benedict L, Mennill DJ. 2018. Assessing the similarity of song-type
544 transitions among birds: evidence for interspecies variation. *Anim Behav.* 140: 161-170.
- 545 Hoese WJ, Podos J, Boetticher NC, Nowicki S. 2000. Vocal tract function in birdsong production:
546 experimental manipulation of beak movements. *J Exp Biol.* 203(12): 1845-1855.
- 547 Kaluthota CD, Medina OJ, Logue DM. 2019. Quantifying song categories in Adelaide's Warbler
548 (*Setophaga adelaidae*). *J Ornithol.* 160(2): 305-315.

549 Kutner MH, Nachtsheim CJ, Neter J, Li W. 2005. Applied linear statistical models. New York,
550 USA: McGraw-Hill New York.

551 Lachlan R. 2007. Luscinia: a bioacoustics analysis computer program. Version 2.14. Available
552 from: <https://rflachlan.github.io/Luscinia/>.

553 Lambrechts M, Dhondt A. 1988. The anti-exhaustion hypothesis: A new hypothesis to explain song
554 performance and song switching in the great tit. Anim Behav. 36(2): 327-334.

555 Levesque DL, Marshall KE. 2021. Do endotherms have thermal performance curves? J Exp Biol.
556 224(3): jeb141309.

557 Logue DM, Sheppard JA, Walton B, Brinkman BE, Medina OJ. 2020. An analysis of avian vocal
558 performance at the note and song levels. Bioacoustics. 29(6): 709-730.

559 McElreath R. 2020. Statistical rethinking: a Bayesian course with examples in R and Stan. New
560 York, USA: Chapman and Hall/CRC.

561 McKechnie AE, Wolf BO. 2019. The physiology of heat tolerance in small endotherms. Physiol.
562 34(5): 302-313.

563 Mohr M, Krstrup P, Nybo L, Nielsen JJ, Bangsbo J. 2004. Muscle temperature and sprint
564 performance during soccer matches—beneficial effect of re-warm-up at half-time. Scand J
565 Med Sci Sports. 14(3): 156-162.

566 Nowicki S, Westneat M, Hoese W. 1992. Birdsong: motor function and the evolution of
567 communication. Semin Neurosc. 4: 385-90.

- 568 Pasch B, George AS, Campbell P, Phelps SM. 2011. Androgen-dependent male vocal performance
569 influences female preference in Neotropical singing mice. *Anim Behav.* 82(2): 177-183.
- 570 Phillips JN, Derryberry EP. 2017. Vocal performance is a salient signal for male–male competition
571 in White-crowned Sparrows. *Auk.* 134(3): 564-574.
- 572 Plummer EM, Goller F. 2008. Singing with reduced air sac volume causes uniform decrease in
573 airflow and sound amplitude in the zebra finch. *J Exp Biol.* 211(1): 66-78.
- 574 Podos J. 1997. A performance constraint on the evolution of trilled vocalizations in a songbird
575 family (Passeriformes: Emberizidae). *Evol.* 51(2): 537-551.
- 576 Podos J. 2001. Correlated evolution of morphology and vocal signal structure in Darwin's finches.
577 *Nature.* 409(6817): 185-188.
- 578 Podos J, Moseley DL, Goodwin SE, McClure J, Taft BN, Strauss AVH, Rega-Brodsky C, Lahti
579 DC. 2016. A fine-scale, broadly applicable index of vocal performance: frequency excursion.
580 *Anim Behav.* 116: 203–212.
- 581 Podos J, Nowicki S. 2004. Beaks, adaptation, and vocal evolution in Darwin's finches. *Bioscience.*
582 54(6): 501-510.
- 583 Podos J, Sung H-C. 2020. Vocal performance in songbirds: from mechanisms to evolution. *The*
584 *neuroethology of birdsong.* Cham, Switzerland: Springer. p. 245-268.
- 585 Price JJ, Crawford CL. 2013. Use and characteristics of two singing modes in pine warblers. *Wilson*
586 *J Ornithol.* 125(3): 552-561.

587 R Core Team. 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Version 4.1.0.
588 Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Available from: [https://www.R-427](https://www.R-project.org/)
589 [project.org/](https://www.R-project.org/).

590 Schraft HA, Medina OJ, McClure J, Pereira DA, Logue DM. 2017. Within-day improvement in a
591 behavioural display: wild birds 'warm up'. *Anim Behav.* 124: 167-174.

592 Schulte PM, Healy TM, Fangué NA. 2011. Thermal performance curves, phenotypic plasticity, and
593 the time scales of temperature exposure. *Integr Comp Biol.* 51(5): 691-702.

594 Staicer CA. 1996. Acoustical features of song categories of the Adelaide's Warbler (*Dendroica*
595 *adelaidae*). *Auk.* 113(4): 771-783.

596 Staicer CA, Spector D, Horn A. 1996. The dawn chorus and other diel patterns in acoustic
597 signaling. In: Kroodsma D, Miller E, editors. *Ecology and evolution of acoustic*
598 *communication in birds*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. p. 426-453

599 Staicer CA. The role of male song in the socioecology of the tropical resident Adelaide's warbler
600 (*Dendroica adelaidae*). [Dissertation]. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts; 1992

601 Suthers RA, Zollinger SA. 2004. Producing song: the vocal apparatus. *Ann NY Acad Sci.* 1016(1):
602 109-129.

603 Suthers RA, Zollinger SA. 2008. From brain to song: the vocal organ and vocal tract. In: Zeigler
604 HP, Marler P, editors. *Neuroscience of birdsong*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University
605 Press. p. 78-98.

606 Tan CL, Knight ZA. 2018. Regulation of body temperature by the nervous system. *Neuron*. 98(1):
607 31–48.

608 Textor J, Van der Zander B, Gilthorpe MK, Liskiewicz M, Ellison GTH. 2016. Robust causal
609 inference using directed acyclic graphs: the R package 'dagitty'. *Int J Epidemiol*. 45(6): 1887-
610 1894.

611 The University of Utah. [Internet]. Meso West, Weather Conditions for CRRP4. Utah, USA:
612 University of Utah; [updated 2022 June 5; cited 2022 June 5]. Available from:
613 https://mesowest.utah.edu/cgi-bin/droman/meso_base_dyn.cgi?stn=CRRP4.

614 Thorsen S. [Internet]. 1995-2022. Timeanddate. Stavanger, Norway: timeanddate.com; [updated
615 2022 June 5; cited 2022 June 5]. Available from:
616 <https://www.timeanddate.com/sun/@4567986>.

617 Toms JD. [Internet]. 2020. Adelaide's warbler (*Setophaga adelaidae*), version 1.0. Ithaca, NY
618 (USA); birdsoftheworld.org; [updated 2020 Mar 4; cited 2022 June 5]. Available from:
619 <https://birdsoftheworld.org/bow/species/adewar1/1.0/introduction>.

620 Vazquez-Cardona J. Is the dawn chorus an adaptation to warm-up the voice in Adelaide's warbler
621 (*Setophaga adelaidae*)? [M.Sc. Master's thesis]. Lethbridge, AB: University of Lethbridge;
622 2021

623 Westreich D, Greenland S. 2013. The table 2 fallacy: Presenting and interpreting confounder and
624 modifier coefficients. *Am J Epidemiol*. 177(4): 292-298.

625 Wickham H. 2016. *ggplot2*: Elegant graphics for data analysis. Springer-Verlag New York.

626 Wilson DR, Bitton PP, Podos J, Mennill DJ. 2014. Uneven sampling and the analysis of vocal
627 performance constraints. *Am Nat*. 183(2): 214–228.

628 **Figure legends**

629 **Figure 1.** Scatterplot of a hypothetical constrained relationship between two traits. The black line is
630 the 10th quantile regression line used to estimate a performance limit. The deviation score is the
631 orthogonal distance between each data point and the performance limit. Figure reproduced from
632 Logue et al. (Logue et al. 2020) with the authors' permission.

633 **Figure 2.** Sound spectrograms of four song types from male Adelaide's warblers (Hann window, 512
634 points / sample).

635 **Figure 3.** Plots showing the effect of time relative to sunrise on the acoustic performance variables
636 (a) *recovery time*, (b) *voiced frequency modulation*, and (c) *unvoiced frequency modulation* in male
637 Adelaide's warbler song. The signs of the performance variables are standardized and multiplied by
638 -1, so high values indicate high performance. Each graph shows the songs (semi-transparent black
639 dots), time of sunrise (vertical gray line), estimated mean performance based on vocal performance
640 alone (orange line), and conditional effect of time on performance after accounting for covariates
641 and random terms (curved blue line; shading = 95% CI). The dawn chorus is visible as a dense
642 cloud of points that ends shortly after dawn.

643 **Figure 4.** Plots of simulated data comparing the expected distribution of (a) *recovery time*, (b)
644 *voiced frequency modulation*, and (c) *unvoiced frequency modulation* over the course of the
645 morning when birds do (blue) or do not (orange) sing at an elevated rate during the dawn chorus
646 period. We standardized the performance variables and multiplied them by -1, so high values
647 indicate high performance. Graphs show the time of sunrise (vertical gray line).

648 **Figure 5.** Conditional effects of air temperature on the acoustic performance variables (a) *recovery*
649 *time*, (b) *voiced frequency modulation*, and (c) *unvoiced frequency modulation* in male Adelaide's
650 warbler song. We multiplied the performance variables by -1 so that high values would indicate

651 high performance. Each graph shows the songs (semi-transparent black dots), the conditional effects
652 of air temperature on performance from a generalized linear mixed model (curved blue line), and its
653 95% credible interval (turquoise).

654 **Figure 6.** Effects of the cumulative number of songs sung over the course of the morning on the
655 acoustic performance variables (a) *recovery time*, (b) *voiced frequency modulation*, and (c)
656 *unvoiced frequency modulation* in male Adelaide's warbler song. See Fig. 5 caption for details.