

1 Can behaviour impede evolution? Persistence of  
2 singing effort after morphological song loss in  
3 crickets

4 Jack G. Rayner<sup>1\*</sup>, Will T. Schneider<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Nathan W. Bailey<sup>1</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup> School of Biology, University of St Andrews, St Andrews

6 <sup>2</sup> Current address: Department of Physiology, Development and Neuroscience, University of Cambridge,  
7 Cambridge

8 \* Contributed equally

9

10 Evolutionary loss of sexual signals is widespread. Examining the consequences for  
11 behaviours associated with such signals can provide insight into factors promoting or  
12 inhibiting trait loss. We tested whether a behavioural component of a sexual trait, male  
13 calling effort, has been evolutionary reduced in silent populations of Hawaiian field crickets  
14 (*Teleogryllus oceanicus*). Cricket song requires energetically costly wing movements, but  
15 ‘flatwing’ males have feminised wings that preclude song and protect against a lethal,  
16 eavesdropping parasitoid. Flatwing males express wing movement patterns associated with  
17 singing but, in contrast to normal-wing males, sustained periods of wing movement cannot  
18 confer sexual selection benefits and should be subject to strong negative selection. We  
19 developed an automated technique to quantify how long males spend expressing wing  
20 movements associated with song. We compared calling effort among populations of  
21 Hawaiian crickets with differing proportions of silent males, and between male morphs.  
22 Contrary to expectation, silent populations invested as much in calling effort as non-silent  
23 populations. Additionally, flatwing and normal-wing males from the same population did not  
24 differ in calling effort. The lack of evolved behavioural adjustment following morphological  
25 change in silent Hawaiian crickets illustrates how behaviour might sometimes impede, rather  
26 than facilitate, evolution.

## 27 **Introduction**

28 A common intuition is that traits which no longer serve an adaptive function should be  
29 evolutionarily lost [1]. Secondary loss and vestigialisation of morphological traits are well-  
30 documented [2], but whether associated behaviours are also evolutionarily lost, for example  
31 through accumulation of neutral mutations [3,4], is less well understood. Alternatively, such  
32 behaviours could remain expressed and available for evolutionary co-option [5]. Secondary  
33 sexual traits provide an excellent opportunity to test this, because they frequently involve  
34 display behaviours that work in tandem with specialised morphological features to produce a  
35 conspicuous signal. The reduction and loss of sexual signals under natural selection is  
36 theoretically predicted [6,7] and widely observed [8,9]. Here we use populations of field  
37 crickets *Teleogryllus oceanicus* that have recently lost the ability to sing due to  
38 morphological change [10], yet retain central pattern generators that produce the behavioural  
39 component of song [11], to test whether selection has reduced the amount of effort males  
40 expend on non-functional signalling behaviour.

41 Male crickets produce song via movement of their forewings, causing sound-  
42 producing wing structures to resonate [12]. Females strongly prefer males that sing more  
43 [13–17], but calling behaviour incurs substantial energy expenditure [18–20] and is  
44 condition-dependent [15,21–23]. In *T. oceanicus*, males from populations on multiple  
45 Hawaiian islands have lost the ability to produce acoustic signals under selection from an  
46 acoustically-orienting parasitoid fly, *Ormia ochracea* [10]. In the best characterised example  
47 of song-loss, silence is caused by loss of sound-producing structures on the wings (the  
48 ‘flatwing’ phenotype). Flatwing’s emergence and spread has been well-documented in  
49 several populations on different islands: Kauai (first observed in 2003), Oahu (2005), and  
50 Hawaii (2010) [10,24,27]. In both Kauai and Oahu, flatwing segregates as a single-locus X-  
51 linked trait [10,24]. Silent males are strongly disadvantaged in the context of sexual selection

52 [25,26], but the phenotype nevertheless spread rapidly under selection from the fly. Flatwing  
53 males are capable of expressing the precise patterns of rhythmic forewing movement that  
54 produce song in normal-wing males [11]. Given its energetic costs and other known life-  
55 history trade-offs [15,18–23], calling effort – the amount of time spent producing wing  
56 movements associated with calling song – should be selected against.

57         We developed an automated video analysis technique to assay calling effort of males  
58 from populations with contrasting proportions of normal-wing and flatwing male phenotypes  
59 [27]. Our primary goal was to test the prediction that silent populations would show evolved  
60 reduction in calling effort compared with non-silent populations. We also estimated condition  
61 and measured testes mass to evaluate whether calling effort is associated with proxy  
62 measures of male quality. Finally, we tested whether, within a population, flatwing males  
63 show lower calling effort than normal-wing males. Evidence consistent with our predictions  
64 of reduced calling effort in silent populations would support the idea that behavioural  
65 evolution has facilitated the rapid spread of adaptive silence in crickets by reducing costly,  
66 fruitless singing effort. No difference in calling effort among populations or between morphs,  
67 however, would suggest selection has not reduced this non-adaptive trait, and its persistence  
68 could diminish the overall advantages of flatwing and enable co-option for other functions  
69 [1].

70

## 71 **Methods**

72 Further detail is supplied in Supporting Information. We sampled sites on Kauai ( $K_{VL}$ : 100%  
73 flatwing), Hawaii ( $H_{CL}$ : 90-100% normal-wing), and two nearby (~1km apart) sites on Oahu  
74 with contrasting proportions of silent and non-silent males ( $O_{AC}$ : 100% flatwing;  $O_{CC}$ : ~50%  
75 flatwing) in 2017 (Fig. 1A) [28]. Our estimation that ~50% of  $O_{CC}$  males would be able to  
76 sing owing to normal-wing venation was revised down to ~25% following identification of

77 an additional silencing phenotype in this population ('curly-wing' [28]). No curly-wing males  
78 were used in the current experiment. Assuming four generations per year, flatwing males had  
79 been present in Kauai and Oahu populations for approximately 56 and 48 generations,  
80 respectively, at the time of sampling; well within the ability of populations to exhibit adaptive  
81 evolution [29–32]. Flatwing males have been observed in Hawaii since 2010, but at low  
82 proportions (<10%) [24,27,28]. Lab stocks derived from each population were reared  
83 identically for two generations to minimise field-based maternal effects.

84 All crickets were reared in the same incubator, and test subjects were isolated from  
85 their final pre-adult instar. Upon adult eclosion we surgically removed the plectrum of the  
86 right forewing, which is necessary to produce song, from normal-wing males (Fig. 1B), and  
87 the same portion of the wing was also removed from flatwing males. All males were  
88 therefore silent throughout their lives, avoiding confounds that could arise if males receive  
89 auditory feedback from their own song or sing in response to others [33]. This enabled us to  
90 test for constitutive, i.e. genetic, differences in calling effort between populations and  
91 morphs. We tested experimental males once between 7 and 11 days post-adult eclosion;  
92 previous studies have found cricket calling behaviour is repeatable [34,35] and heritable [36–  
93 38]. We weighed males to the nearest 0.001g, measured pronotum lengths to the nearest  
94 0.01mm, and calculated scaled mass index (SMI) as a proxy of body condition [39] using  
95 pronotum length as the linear measurement.

96 We glued a reflective tag to the distal tip of each male's right forewing (Fig. 1B).  
97 After a ca.12-hour recovery period, we filmed two-hour calling effort trials using a Nikon  
98 D3300, recording under dim red light, with crickets physically and visually isolated from one  
99 another. Trials began 15 minutes after onset of the dark cycle to coincide with peak calling  
100 activity in wild populations [34]. Automated analysis was performed in MATLAB using  
101 custom scripts to quantify the duration of wing movement bouts associated with calling song

102 for each cricket. Briefly, image brightness and contrast were adjusted and the background  
103 removed so that only reflective wing tags were visible. Centre coordinates for each tag were  
104 recorded so distances moved between frames could be calculated. Differences between X-  
105 coordinates were used to determine whether each distance was positive or negative. Distances  
106 were converted into the time/frequency domain using a continuous wavelet transform (CWT)  
107 between 1 to 20 Hz. For wing movements to qualify as singing, four criteria needed to be  
108 met: (1) mean power between 10-16 Hz (13 Hz being the observed frequency of *T. oceanicus*  
109 wing movements during calling song, based on [11]) exceeded a threshold of 0.7 of the CWT  
110 output; (2) 90% of the power in the CWT output was between 10-16 Hz; (3) peak frequency  
111 power was between 9 and 17 Hz, and at this peak the CWT output power was greater than  
112 1.5; (4) the duration of singing exceeded 0.6 seconds. Episodes of singing that restarted  
113 within 10 seconds were recorded as a single bout. These parameters were chosen based on  
114 careful analysis of singing in trials using unmuted normal-wing crickets (Supporting  
115 Information). We validated the technique by tracking tagged, audible normal-wing males ( $N$   
116 = 22; 9h 34m of recording), and cross-referencing with simultaneous audio recording, which  
117 indicated a low rate of error. We also used data from these recordings of unmuted normal-  
118 wing males to confirm that the procedure of muting the muted normal-wing crickets used in  
119 trials did not reduce their investment in calling effort compared to intact normal-wing males  
120 (Supporting Information).

121 Statistical analysis was performed in R v.3.4.4. Calling effort (i.e. time spent singing,  
122 [21–23]), was normalised by Yeo-Johnson transformation. Variation in calling effort was  
123 analysed using a linear mixed model (LMM), with *population* modelled as a categorical  
124 factor and *trial ID* as a random effect to account for batch effects. *Age* in days post-eclosion,  
125 *total mass*, and *SMI* were included as covariates, scaled and centred, with *population* by  
126 covariate interactions. Interactions which did not approach significance ( $P > 0.1$ ) were


127 removed from final models. Morph variation within mixed populations was analysed in the  
128 same way, but with *morph* replacing *population* as the categorical variable. Visualisation  
129 indicated a non-linear effect of SMI, so it was included as both a linear and quadratic  
130 predictor using the R function *poly* to account for covariance. Models were tested with Type  
131 III or II sums of squares depending on whether they did (III) or did not (II) include  
132 interactions.

133

## 134 **Results**

135 Calling effort was recorded for 342 males (H<sub>CL</sub>=95 [90 normal-wing, 5 flatwing]; O<sub>CC</sub>=82  
136 [45 normal-wing, 37 flatwing]; O<sub>AC</sub>=85 flatwing, and K<sub>VL</sub>=80 flatwing). O<sub>AC</sub> and K<sub>VL</sub>  
137 populations reared from eggs collected from wild-caught females contained only flatwing  
138 males, supporting the observation that normal-wing males are absent in these populations  
139 [27,28,40].

140         Mean and median calling effort across populations were 458 and 137 (Q1: 44, Q3:  
141 429) seconds, respectively. There was no evidence males from silent populations spent less  
142 time calling (Table 1; Fig 1C). Similarly, there was no evidence in the O<sub>CC</sub> population, in  
143 which normal-wing and silent flatwing morphs co-occur, of any reduced investment in song  
144 by flatwing males (Table S2) and there was a similar pattern in the H<sub>CL</sub> population, though  
145 with too few flatwing males for statistical comparison (Fig. 1D). Time spent calling scaled  
146 positively with condition, but this relationship appeared to tail off at the highest measures of  
147 condition (Fig. S1). Overall, the LMM accounted for little of the total variance in calling  
148 effort ( $R^2=0.08$ ). Including testes mass in the model as an additional covariate (reducing *N*  
149 from 342 to 318) alongside somatic measures of mass and SMI produced similar results,  
150 though with a significant interaction between mass and population, and testes mass did not  
151 predict time spent calling (Table S1).



153

154 **Figure 1.** **A)** Map of the Hawaiian islands with locations of study populations. The inset  
 155 graph shows proportions of silent males in respective populations from [28]: the segmented  
 156 bar for OCC illustrates ~33% of the silent males (the lighter portion) are silent due to curly-  
 157 wing rather than flatwing morphology. **B)** Diagram of a normal-wing male with a reflective  
 158 tag (black) applied to its dorsal-right forewing. The plectrum, surgically removed or sham-  
 159 operated in test males, is highlighted in red. **C)** Calling effort across populations, and **D)** of  
 160 Nw and Fw males in HCL (i) and OCC (ii) populations in which they co-occur; the HCL  
 161 comparison is included for visualisation only and was not statistically tested due to the small  
 162 Fw sample. Points are jittered along X-axes, black points and error bars represent mean  $\pm$  SD.

163

164 **Discussion**



165 Sexually selected traits are often opposed by countervailing natural selection [6,7,41,42],  
166 which can lead to their evolutionary reduction or loss [8,9]. Understanding the consequences  
167 for behaviours previously associated with the signal can provide information about factors  
168 that may facilitate (if behaviour is lost) or stymie (if behaviour persists) such trait losses. We  
169 found neither silent populations of *T. oceanicus*, nor silent males in mixed populations,  
170 showed any reduction in calling effort. This calling effort will deplete energy reserves and  
171 involve resource allocation trade-offs [19,20], reducing the relative fitness advantages of  
172 silent males, and its persistence appears inconsistent with the view that behaviour facilitates  
173 the early stages of adaptive evolution [43,44]. Here, persistent signalling behaviour imposes a  
174 double cost on flatwing males: not only can they not produce signals, they still expend effort  
175 trying to do so.

176 Evolved song loss in Hawaiian populations of *T. oceanicus* has been well-  
177 documented, and has occurred through a variety of morphological means [10,24,28]. In all  
178 cases, males which cannot produce song at ordinary levels persist in attempting to sing  
179 [11,28]. It is perhaps unsurprising that silent flatwing males exhibit the same calling effort as  
180 normal-wing males: for flatwing crickets to evolve lower song effort than normal-wing  
181 crickets from the same population would require that mutations causing reduced investment  
182 become genetically linked with causative *flatwing* mutation(s) on the X-chromosome, which  
183 is unlikely. However, the persistence of calling effort in populations where all or almost all  
184 males are silent, and have been for many generations, is surprising. Calling effort appears to  
185 be an evolvable trait in field crickets; evolutionary shifts in the onset of calling have been  
186 documented in *T. oceanicus* [45], and several cricket species are behaviourally mute [46]. It  
187 remains an open question why morphological losses of sexual signalling in this system have  
188 not been accompanied by vestigialisation of associated signalling effort.

189           The persistence of costly calling behaviours in silent males and in silent populations  
190 of *T. oceanicus* is not without parallel in other species. Populations of rattlesnakes of the  
191 genus *Crotalus* express only vestigial rattles and are incapable of producing a warning signal,  
192 but nevertheless silently ‘rattle’ their tails when disturbed by humans [47–49]. Along similar  
193 lines, several species of the *adiastola* group of Hawaiian *Drosophila* exhibit a courtship ritual  
194 in which they raise and vibrate their abdomen, yet males of only one species express long  
195 clavate hairs which sweep the female’s head as this occurs. The elaboration of these hairs is  
196 suggested to have evolved following the courtship behaviour, rather than having been lost in  
197 related lineages [50]. It is plausible that if selection against song-associated wing movements  
198 in Hawaiian field crickets is sufficiently weak, these movements could be similarly co-opted,  
199 for example via substrate-borne vibrations detectable at close-range [51], or lead to the regain  
200 of song [40,52]. Gray et al. [52] demonstrated the feasibility of the latter scenario by inducing  
201 expression of calling song in a cricket species, *Gryllus ovisopis*, in which it has been  
202 evolutionarily lost.

203           Our results suggest an interesting counterpoint to the widely supposed role of  
204 behaviour in the early stages of rapid adaptation [43,44]; constraints associated with less  
205 evolutionarily responsive behaviours might reduce the benefit of novel adaptive variants. In  
206 the case of song-loss in *T. oceanicus* these costs are evidently marginal compared with the  
207 overwhelming benefits of evading parasitism, but under different conditions, similar costs  
208 could inhibit or even preclude populations from rapidly adapting to changes in their  
209 environment. This maintenance of ‘vestigial behaviours’ could play an important role in  
210 eventual re-emergence of previously lost traits over longer-term evolutionary timescales  
211 [40,53].

212

213 **Acknowledgements**

214 We thank Audrey Grant, Megan McGunnigle and David Forbes for assistance with cricket  
215 maintenance. NWB is grateful to the Natural Environmental Research Council for funding  
216 (NE/L011255/1). Two reviewers provided feedback which improved our manuscript.

217

### 218 **Data accessibility**

219 Raw data and scripts are available as supplementary material. Raw data have also been  
220 deposited at <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.g79cnp5m8> (pending activation)

221

222 Temporary URL: [https://datadryad.org/stash/share/qMJl\\_uP-](https://datadryad.org/stash/share/qMJl_uP-)

223 [xKQZMp1jTvCQZ6hkCGEL06g\\_KMHR1hDwy10](https://datadryad.org/stash/share/qMJl_uP-xKQZMp1jTvCQZ6hkCGEL06g_KMHR1hDwy10)

224

### 225 **Author contributions**

226 JGR, WTS & NWB conceived experiments; WTS & JGR implemented experimental design;  
227 JGR & NWB performed fieldwork; JGR conducted experiments; WTS automated video  
228 tracking; JGR performed statistical analysis; JGR & NWB wrote the manuscript with input  
229 from WTS. All authors approve the final version of the manuscript and agree to be held  
230 accountable for the work therein.

231

232 **References**

- 233 1. Porter ML, Crandall KA. 2003 Lost along the way: The significance of evolution in  
234 reverse. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **18**, 541–547.
- 235 2. Fong DW, Kane TC, Culver DC. 1995 Vestigialization and loss of nonfunctional  
236 characters. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **26**, 249–268.  
237 (doi:10.1146/annurev.es.26.110195.001341)
- 238 3. Carson HL, Chang LS, Lyttle TW. 1982 Decay of female sexual behavior under  
239 parthenogenesis. *Science (80-. )*. **218**, 68–70. (doi:10.1126/science.218.4567.68)
- 240 4. Wilkens H. 1988 Evolution and genetics of epigeal and cave *Astyanax fasciatus*  
241 (Characidae, Pisces): support for the neutral mutation theory. In *Evolutionary biology*  
242 (eds MK Hecht, B Wallace), Boston, MA: Springer.
- 243 5. Moczek AP. 2008 On the origins of novelty in development and evolution. *BioEssays*  
244 **30**, 432–447. (doi:10.1002/bies.20754)
- 245 6. Fisher RA. 1930 *The genetical theory of natural selection*. Oxford, England:  
246 Clarendon Press. (doi:10.1038/158453a0)
- 247 7. Lande R. 1981 Models of speciation by sexual selection on polygenic traits. *Proc.*  
248 *Natl. Acad. Sci.* **78**, 3721–3725. (doi:10.1073/pnas.78.6.3721)
- 249 8. Wiens JJ. 2001 Widespread loss of sexually selected traits: How the peacock lost its  
250 spots. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **16**, 517–523. (doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(01)02217-0)
- 251 9. Kraaijeveld K. 2014 Reversible Trait Loss: The Genetic Architecture of Female  
252 Ornaments. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **45**, 159–177. (doi:10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-  
253 120213-091550)
- 254 10. Zuk M, Rotenberry JT, Tinghitella RM. 2006 Silent night: adaptive disappearance of a  
255 sexual signal in a parasitized population of field crickets. *Biol. Lett.* **2**, 521–524.  
256 (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2006.0539)

- 257 11. Schneider WT, Rutz C, Hedwig B, Bailey NW. 2018 Vestigial singing behaviour  
258 persists after the evolutionary loss of song in crickets. *Biol. Lett.* **14**, 20170654.  
259 (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2017.0654)
- 260 12. Pfau, Koch. 1994 The functional morphology of singing in the cricket. *J. Exp. Biol.*  
261 **195**, 147–167.
- 262 13. Cade WH, Cade ES. 1992 Male mating success, calling and searching behaviour at  
263 high and low densities in the field cricket, *Gryllus integer*. *Anim. Behav.* **43**, 49–56.  
264 (doi:10.1016/S0003-3472(05)80070-3)
- 265 14. Crnokrak P, Roff DA. 1995 Fitness differences associated with calling behaviour in  
266 the two wing morphs of male sand crickets, *Gryllus firmus*. *Anim. Behav.* **50**, 1475–  
267 1481. (doi:10.1016/0003-3472(95)80004-2)
- 268 15. Holzer B, Jacot A, Brinkhof MWG. 2003 Condition-dependent signaling affects male  
269 sexual attractiveness in field crickets, *Gryllus campestris*. *Behav. Ecol.* **14**, 353–359.  
270 (doi:10.1093/beheco/14.3.353)
- 271 16. Hunt J, Brooks R, Jennions MD. 2005 Female mate choice as a condition-dependent  
272 life-history trait. *Am. Nat.* **166**, 79–92. (doi:10.1086/430672)
- 273 17. Drayton JM, Milner RNC, Hunt J, Jennions MD. 2010 Inbreeding and advertisement  
274 calling in the cricket *Teleogryllus commodus*: Laboratory and field experiments.  
275 *Evolution.* **64**, 3069–3083. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2010.01053.x)
- 276 18. Prestwich KN, Walker TJ. 1981 Energetics of singing in crickets: Effect of  
277 temperature in three trilling species (Orthoptera: Gryllidae). *J. Comp. Physiol.* **143**,  
278 199–212. (doi:10.1007/BF00797699)
- 279 19. Hoback WW, Wagner W. 1997 The energetic cost of calling in the variable field  
280 cricket, *Gryllus lineaticeps*. *Physiol. Entomol.* **22**, 286–290. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-  
281 3032.1997.tb01170.x)

- 282 20. Hack MA. 1998 The energetics of male mating strategies in field crickets (Orthoptera:  
283 Gryllinae: Gryllidae). *J. Insect Behav.* **11**, 853–867. (doi:10.1023/A:1020864111073)
- 284 21. Hunt J, Brooks R, Jennions MD, Smith MJ, Bentsen CL, Bussière LF. 2004 High-  
285 quality male field crickets invest heavily in sexual display but die young. *Nature* **432**,  
286 1024–1027. (doi:10.1038/nature03084)
- 287 22. Judge KA, Ting JJ, Gwynne DT. 2008 Condition dependence of male life span and  
288 calling effort in a field cricket. *Evolution.* **62**, 868–878. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-  
289 5646.2008.00318.x)
- 290 23. Houslay TM, Houslay KF, Rapkin J, Hunt J, Bussière LF. 2017 Mating opportunities  
291 and energetic constraints drive variation in age-dependent sexual signalling. *Funct.*  
292 *Ecol.* **31**, 728–741. (doi:10.1111/1365-2435.12766)
- 293 24. Pascoal S, Cezard T, Eik-Nes A, Gharbi K, Majewska J, Payne E, Ritchie MG, Zuk M,  
294 Bailey NW. 2014 Rapid convergent evolution in wild crickets. *Curr. Biol.* **24**, 1369–  
295 1374. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2014.04.053)
- 296 25. Tanner JC, Swanger E, Zuk M. 2019 Sexual signal loss in field crickets maintained  
297 despite strong sexual selection favoring singing males. *Evolution.* **73**, 1482–1489.  
298 (doi:10.1111/evo.13761)
- 299 26. Rayner JG, Bailey NW. 2019 Testing the role of same-sex sexual behaviour in the  
300 evolution of alternative male reproductive phenotypes. *Anim. Behav.* **157**.  
301 (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2019.08.017)
- 302 27. Zuk M, Bailey NW, Gray B, Rotenberry JT. 2018 Sexual signal loss: The link between  
303 behaviour and rapid evolutionary dynamics in a field cricket. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **87**, 623–  
304 633. (doi:10.1111/1365-2656.12806)
- 305 28. Rayner JG, Aldridge S, Montealegre-Z F, Bailey NW. 2019 A silent orchestra:  
306 convergent song loss in Hawaiian crickets is repeated, morphologically varied, and

- 307 widespread. *Ecology* **100**, e02694. (doi:10.1002/ecy.2694)
- 308 29. Fricke C, Arnqvist G. 2007 Rapid adaptation to a novel host in a seed beetle  
309 (*Callosobruchus maculatus*): The role of sexual selection. *Evolution*. **61**, 440–454.  
310 (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2007.00038.x)
- 311 30. Marchini M, Sparrow LM, Cosman MN, Dowhanik A, Krueger CB, Hallgrimsson B,  
312 Rolian C. 2014 Impacts of genetic correlation on the independent evolution of body  
313 mass and skeletal size in mammals. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **14**, 258. (doi:10.1186/s12862-  
314 014-0258-0)
- 315 31. Szűcs M, Vahsen ML, Melbourne BA, Hoover C, Weiss-Lehman C, Hufbauer RA.  
316 2017 Rapid adaptive evolution in novel environments acts as an architect of population  
317 range expansion. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **114**, 13501–13506.  
318 (doi:10.1073/pnas.1712934114)
- 319 32. Foucault Q, Wieser A, Waldvogel AM, Feldmeyer B, Pfenninger M. 2018 Rapid  
320 adaptation to high temperatures in *Chironomus riparius*. *Ecol. Evol.* **8**, 12780–12789.  
321 (doi:10.1002/ece3.4706)
- 322 33. Jang Y. 2011 Male responses to conspecific advertisement signals in the field cricket  
323 *Gryllus rubens* (Orthoptera: Gryllidae). *PLoS One* **6**, e16063.  
324 (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0016063)
- 325 34. Kolluru GR. 1999 Variation and repeatability of calling behavior in crickets subject to  
326 a phonotactic parasitoid fly. *J. Insect Behav.* **12**, 611–626.  
327 (doi:10.1023/A:1020923602780)
- 328 35. Bertram SM, Thomson IR, Auguste B, Dawson JW, Darveau CA. 2011 Variation in  
329 cricket acoustic mate attraction signalling explained by body morphology and  
330 metabolic differences. *Anim. Behav.* **82**, 1255–1261.  
331 (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2011.08.021)

- 332 36. Hedrick A V. 2002 Female choice and the heritability of attractive male traits: an  
333 empirical study. *Am. Nat.* **132**, 267–276. (doi:10.1086/284849)
- 334 37. Webb KL, Roff DA. 1992 The quantitative genetics of sound production in *Gryllus*  
335 *firmus*. *Anim. Behav.* **44**, 823–832. (doi:10.1016/S0003-3472(05)80578-0)
- 336 38. Gray DA, Cade WH. 1999 Quantitative genetics of sexual selection in the field cricket,  
337 *Gryllus integer*. *Evolution.* **53**, 848–854. (doi:10.2307/2640724)
- 338 39. Peig J, Green AJ. 2009 New perspectives for estimating body condition from  
339 mass/length data: The scaled mass index as an alternative method. *Oikos* **118**, 1883–  
340 1891. (doi:10.1111/j.1600-0706.2009.17643.x)
- 341 40. Tinghitella RM, Broder ED, Gurule-Small GA, Hallagan CJ, Wilson JD. 2018 Purring  
342 crickets: the evolution of a novel sexual signal. *Am. Nat.* **192**, 773–782.  
343 (doi:10.1086/700116)
- 344 41. Zahavi A. 1975 Mate selection-A selection for a handicap. *J. Theor. Biol.* **53**, 205–  
345 214. (doi:10.1016/0022-5193(75)90111-3)
- 346 42. Andersson M. 1986 Evolution of condition-dependent sex ornaments and mating  
347 preferences: sexual selection based on viability differences. *Evolution.* **40**, 804–816.  
348 (doi:10.2307/2408465)
- 349 43. Wong BBM, Candolin U. 2015 Behavioral responses to changing environments.  
350 *Behav. Ecol.* **26**, 665–673. (doi:10.1093/beheco/aru183)
- 351 44. Bailey NW, Marie-Orleach L, Moore AJ. 2018 Indirect genetic effects in behavioral  
352 ecology: does behavior play a special role in evolution? *Behav. Ecol.* **29**, 1–11.  
353 (doi:10.1093/beheco/arx127)
- 354 45. Zuk M, Simmons L, Cupp L. 1993 Calling characteristics of parasitized and  
355 unparasitized populations of the field cricket *Teleogryllus oceanicus*. *Behav. Ecol.*  
356 *Sociobiol.* **33**, 339–343. (doi:10.1007/BF00172933)



- 357 46. Walker TJ. 1974 *Gryllus ovisopis* N. Sp.: A taciturn cricket with a life cycle  
358 suggesting allochronic speciation. *Florida Entomol.* **57**, 13–22. (doi:10.2307/3493823)
- 359 47. Johnson WW. 1972 *Baja California: The American wilderness*. New York: Time-Life  
360 Books.
- 361 48. Shaw CE. 1964 A snake easily ruffled but unrattled. *Zoonoz* **37**, 1–7.
- 362 49. Radcliffe CW, Maslin TP. 1975 A new subspecies of the red rattlesnake, *Crotalus*  
363 *ruber*, from San Lorenzo Sur Island, Baja California Norte, Mexico. *Copeia* **1975**,  
364 490–493. (doi:10.2307/1443647)
- 365 50. Carson HL. 1978 Speciation and sexual selection in Hawaiian *Drosophila*. In  
366 *Ecological Genetics: The Interface* (ed PF Brussard), pp. 93–107. Berlin: Springer-  
367 Verlag.
- 368 51. Latimer W, Schatral A. 1983 The acoustic behaviour of the bushcricket *Tettigonia*  
369 *cantans* I. Behavioural responses to sound and vibration. *Behav. Processes* **8**, 113–124.
- 370 52. Gray DA, Hormozi S, Libby FR, Cohen RW. 2018 Induced expression of a vestigial  
371 sexual signal. *Biol. Lett.* **14**. (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2018.0095)
- 372 53. Bailey NW, Pascoal S, Montealegre-Z F. 2019 Testing the role of trait reversal in  
373 evolutionary diversification using song loss in wild crickets. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*  
374 **116**, 8941–8949. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1818998116)
- 375 53. Rayner JG, Schneider WT, Bailey NW. (2020) Data from: Can behaviour impede  
376 evolution? Persistence of singing effort after morphological song loss in crickets.  
377 *Dryad Digital Repository* (<https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.g79cnp5m8>)

378

379 **Tables**

380 **Table 1.** The results of an LMM ( $N=342$ ,  $R^2=0.08$ ) for time spent singing, with a random  
381 effect of trial.

382

<b>Predictor</b>	<b><i>df</i></b>	<b><math>X^2</math></b>	<b><i>P</i></b>
Population	3	2.119	0.548
Age	1	0.067	0.798
Mass	1	0.589	0.443
SMI*	2	18.583	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Population × mass	3	6.559	0.087

383 Significant P-values (<0.05) are highlighted in bold.

384 \* SMI is included in the model as an orthogonal polynomial with 2 degrees, to account for non-linear  
385 effects