



HAL
open science

The role of social costs as a mechanism enforcing the honesty of ultraviolet-reflecting signals in a lizard

Anna Kawamoto, Jean-François Le Galliard, Arnaud Badiane

► **To cite this version:**

Anna Kawamoto, Jean-François Le Galliard, Arnaud Badiane. The role of social costs as a mechanism enforcing the honesty of ultraviolet-reflecting signals in a lizard. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 2021, 133 (4), pp.1126-1138. 10.1093/biolinnean/blab008 . hal-03376443

HAL Id: hal-03376443

<https://cnrs.hal.science/hal-03376443v1>

Submitted on 13 Oct 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1
2
3 1 **The role of social costs as a mechanism enforcing the honesty of ultraviolet signals in a**
4
5 2 **lizard**

6
7 3 Anna Kawamoto*¹, Jean-François Le Galliard^{1,2}, Arnaud Badiane*¹
8
9 4

10
11
12 5 ¹ Sorbonne Université, CNRS, IRD, INRA, Institut d'écologie et des sciences de
13
14 6 l'environnement (IEES), 4 Place Jussieu, 75005 Paris, France.

15
16
17 7 ² Centre de recherche en écologie expérimentale et prédictive (CEREEP-Ecotron
18
19 8 IleDeFrance), Département de biologie, Ecole Normale Supérieure, CNRS, PSL Research
20
21 9 University, UMS 3194, 11 chemin de Busseau, 77140 Saint-Pierre-lès-Nemours, France
22
23

24 10
25
26 11 * Both authors contributed equally to this work
27
28
29 12

30
31 13 **Corresponding author:** Anna Kawamoto - annakaw423@gmail.com
32
33 14

34
35 15 **Short title:** Social costs of an ultraviolet signal
36
37
38 16
39
40 17
41
42 18
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 19 **Abstract**
4

5 20 According to animal signalling theory, social costs, for example induced by aggression from
6
7 21 conspecifics, are one of the mechanisms maintaining signal honesty. While our understanding
8
9 22 of signal evolution has much improved for pigment-based colours, the mechanisms
10
11 23 maintaining the honesty of structural colour signals, such as ultraviolet (UV), remain elusive.
12
13 24 Here, we used the common lizard *Zootoca vivipara* to test whether the honesty of UV signals
14
15 25 displayed on male throats is under social control. To do so, we staged dyadic agonistic
16
17 26 interactions between non-manipulated focal males and opponents of either larger or smaller
18
19 27 body size. We used either control or manipulated UV signals to create small cheaters with
20
21 28 UV-enhanced throats, large cheaters with UV-reduced throats, and their respective controls.
22
23 29 In support of a conventional signal hypothesis, focal males were aggressive towards large
24
25 30 cheaters and became submissive when these large cheaters retaliated, and were less
26
27 31 submissive against small cheaters. However, that focal males were not more aggressive
28
29 32 towards small cheaters contradicts our initial predictions. We then confirmed that male UV
30
31 33 coloration and bite force were good predictors of contest outcomes in control conditions.
32
33 34 Overall, we provide partial evidence suggesting that social costs enforce UV signal honesty in
34
35 35 common lizards.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 37 **Key words:** Animal communication – Deception – Male competition – Ultraviolet – *Zootoca*
45
46 38 *vivipara*
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

42 **Introduction**

43 Animals use an astounding variety of signals to communicate with one another and these
44 signals constitute the backbone of animal social interactions. To be evolutionarily stable,
45 signals must confer net fitness benefits to both senders and receivers and this condition can be
46 achieved only if signals are honest on average (Maynard Smith & Harper, 2003; Searcy &
47 Nowicki, 2005; Bradbury & Vehrencamp, 2011). When the interests of senders and receivers
48 diverge, mechanisms enforcing signal honesty are required to prevent low-quality individuals
49 from dishonestly signalling high quality (Searcy & Nowicki, 2005). For example, differential
50 costs conditional on the sender's quality may be associated with the signal to ensure its
51 honesty (Searcy & Nowicki, 2005; Bradbury & Vehrencamp, 2011; Higham, 2014). These
52 costs may be a direct consequence of signal production and/or maintenance (i.e. physiological
53 costs, Zahavi, 1975; Grafen, 1990; Higham, 2014; Webster, Ligon, & Leighton, 2018), or
54 may be imposed by receivers, for example in the form of retaliation or punishment during
55 social interactions (i.e. social costs, Johnstone & Norris, 1993; Guilford & Dawkins, 1995;
56 Bradbury & Vehrencamp, 2011; Bachmann *et al.*, 2017).

57 Conventional signals, sometimes referred to as badges of status in the context of male
58 competition, fall in the second category (Hurd, 1997; Whiting, Nagy, & Bateman, 2003;
59 Bradbury & Vehrencamp, 2011). They are linked to the advertised quality based on an
60 arbitrary convention (Guilford & Dawkins, 1995; Hurd & Enquist, 2005) and are often
61 associated with socially imposed costs during agonistic interactions (Higham, 2014; Weaver,
62 Koch, & Hill, 2017). Tibbetts (2014) and Webster *et al.* (2018) further highlight that
63 physiological and social costs need not be mutually exclusive in maintaining honest signalling
64 and argue that, regardless of whether physiological costs exist or not, social costs are likely to
65 arise during aggressive interactions. This is because receivers are more likely to attack when
66 rivals have similar signalling level as their own (Tibbetts, 2014), and/or when they discern a

1
2
3 67 mismatch between their opponent's quality and signalling level (Rohwer & Rohwer, 1978). In
4
5 68 both cases, cheating becomes particularly costly for low-quality individuals because of the
6
7 69 increased risk of injury due to physical attacks (Tibbetts, 2014). In spite of this, most studies
8
9 70 investigating honest signalling focused on physiological costs and very few on social costs,
10
11 71 thus leading Bachmann *et al.* (2017) to call for adequately designed studies to reduce this
12
13 72 research bias.
14
15

16
17 73 Colour signals constitute a diverse class of signals and result from different colour-
18
19 74 producing mechanisms including pigmentary and structural components (Shawkey & D'Alba,
20
21 75 2017). Recent evidence has much improved our understanding of the signalling role and
22
23 76 evolution of pigment-based colours such as melanin- and carotenoid-based colours (Svensson
24
25 77 & Wong, 2011; Roulin, 2016; Weaver *et al.*, 2017; San-Jose & Roulin, 2018). In fact, most
26
27 78 conventional signals described so far are colour signals (but see Molles & Vehrencamp, 2001;
28
29 79 Vehrencamp, 2001) displayed during male-male competition that involve pigment-based
30
31 80 colours, especially melanin-based black or white coloration (Møller, 1987; Martín &
32
33 81 Forsman, 1997; Qvarnstrom, 1997; Beani & Turillazzi, 1999; Ligon & McGraw, 2016;
34
35 82 Bachmann *et al.*, 2017). Social costs can also maintain the honesty of rapid colour change
36
37 83 (Ligon & McGraw, 2016), and of pigment-based colours potentially costly to produce (Martín
38
39 84 & Forsman, 1997).
40
41
42
43

44 85 The costs maintaining the honesty of structural colour signals, including ultraviolet
45
46 86 (UV) signals, are yet to be uncovered. Some lines of argument suggest that assembling the
47
48 87 dermal, light-scattering nanoscale structures composing structural coloration could pose
49
50 88 developmental challenges, which could ultimately maintain signal honesty but robust
51
52 89 evidence is still lacking (Fitzpatrick, 1998; Kemp & Rutowski, 2007; Kemp, Herberstein, &
53
54 90 Grether, 2012; Kemp & Grether, 2015; White, 2020). UV signals have also been suggested to
55
56 91 function as conventional signals especially in lizards, but hard proof is still needed to confirm
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 92 this hypothesis (Whiting *et al.*, 2003; Stapley & Whiting, 2006). Names *et al.* (2019)
4
5 93 manipulated the UV-blue patches of male common wall lizards (*Podarcis muralis*) during
6
7 94 male agonistic contests. They found that males were less aggressive and more submissive
8
9
10 95 against cheaters than against honest males, thus rejecting a conventional signal hypothesis in
11
12 96 this species. In blue tits (*Cyanistes caeruleus*), three important studies suggested that the UV
13
14 97 coloration displayed on male crowns may function as conventional signals during male
15
16 98 contests (Alonso-Alvarez *et al.*, 2004; Poesel *et al.*, 2007; Rémy *et al.*, 2010). These,
17
18 99 however, are not conclusive since they were designed to explore the role of UV signals during
19
20
21 100 agonistic interactions rather than to test whether social costs enforced their honesty.
22
23

24 101 To identify social costs of colour signals, researchers must experimentally create out-of-
25
26 102 equilibrium colour signals to simulate cheating individuals and examine whether these
27
28 103 cheaters receive more aggression than honest signallers during agonistic interactions (Ligon &
29
30 104 McGraw, 2016; Bachmann *et al.*, 2017; Names *et al.*, 2019). In this study, we used the
31
32 105 common lizard *Zootoca vivipara* to investigate whether or not socially imposed costs
33
34 106 maintain the honesty of UV signals. Male common lizards display UV-reflecting signals on
35
36 107 their throat (Martin *et al.*, 2013) that play a role during male-male competition (Martin *et al.*,
37
38 108 2016) and female mate choice (Badiane *et al.*, 2020). In addition, UV chroma on male throat
39
40 109 increases with age and body size (Bonnaffé *et al.*, 2018). Altogether, these results strongly
41
42 110 suggest that male UV-reflecting throats might signal male quality in *Z. vivipara*. Furthermore,
43
44 111 body size is one of the best predictors of male contest outcome in lizards with larger lizards
45
46 112 more likely to win fights than smaller ones (Carpenter, 1995; Fitze & Le Galliard, 2008;
47
48 113 Names *et al.*, 2019). Body size is thus a cue widely used by lizards to extract information on
49
50 114 male quality (we use the terms ‘signal’ and ‘cue’ as defined in Bradbury & Vehrencamp,
51
52 115 2011).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 116 Here, we first determined whether or not male-induced social costs are associated with
4
5 117 dishonest UV signals in this species, and then investigated the relative importance of male UV
6
7 118 signals, bite force and body size during male agonistic contests. To do so, we designed dyadic
8
9 119 agonistic encounters between non-manipulated focal males and opponents that were either
10
11 120 smaller or larger than focal males, with either a control (i.e. honest) or a manipulated (i.e.
12
13 121 cheaters) UV-reflecting throat. To disrupt the correlation between UV signal and quality, we
14
15 122 used lizards of different body size. Our rationale was that precise quality traits advertised by
16
17 123 UV signals are not completely known yet in this species, but body size is a well-known cue of
18
19 124 male quality that correlates with UV signals in this and other lizards species (Bonnaffé *et al.*,
20
21 125 2018). Specifically, small opponents were either UV-control or UV-enhanced so as to create
22
23 126 cheaters of lower quality (i.e. small) with high signalling level. Large opponents were either
24
25 127 UV-control or UV-reduced so as to create cheaters of higher quality (i.e. large) with a low
26
27 128 signalling level. If the UV-reflecting throat functions as socially enforced conventional
28
29 129 signals, we predict that cheaters will pay the cost of their dishonesty in the form of received
30
31 130 aggression from focal males. We thus expected focal males to behave more aggressively and
32
33 131 be less submissive against cheaters than against honest opponents.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Material and Methods**

41 *Study species*

42
43 134 The common lizard (*Zootoca vivipara*) is a small lacertid inhabiting humid habitats across
44
45 135 Eurasia (Massot *et al.*, 1992). In our study site, adult males usually emerge from hibernation
46
47 136 in March. The emergence of females starts approximately 3-4 weeks later in the beginning of
48
49 137 April, depending on weather conditions, and marks the beginning of the mating season
50
51 138 (Massot *et al.*, 1992). During the mating season, males chase away other males to ensure
52
53 139 access to females and there is endurance competition among males to find mates (Heulin,
54
55 140 1988). Adult common lizards occupy overlapping home-ranges and are polygynandrous, with
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 141 both sexes having multiple sexual partners (Laloi *et al.*, 2004; Fitze *et al.*, 2005). Adult males
4
5 142 have a conspicuous belly ranging from yellow to red, interspersed with numerous black spots
6
7 143 (Martin *et al.*, 2013; San-Jose *et al.*, 2017). In females, ventral coloration is duller, from
8
9 144 cream to orange, with fewer black spots than males and extends more on the throat (Bauwens,
10
11 145 1987; Cote *et al.*, 2008). In addition, the ventral and throat coloration have a secondary
12
13 146 reflectance peak in the UV, which is especially pronounced in males, particularly on their
14
15 147 throat (Martin *et al.*, 2013).

148 *Sampling and measurements*

149 On March 19th 2019, we captured 59 adult males by hand at the Centre de Recherche en
150 Ecologie Expérimentale et Prédictive (CEREEP-Ecotron Ile-De-France, 48°17'N, 2°41'E),
151 where a captive population of common lizards is maintained in separate 100-m² enclosures
152 under natural, outdoor environmental conditions. We brought the lizards to the laboratory,
153 measured their snout-vent length (SVL) with a ruler (± 1 mm), and their body mass using a
154 digital scale (± 1 mg). We also measured bite force, which provides a good proxy for fighting
155 ability and whole-organism performance in lizards (Huyghe *et al.*, 2005; Lappin & Husak,
156 2005). To do so, we used a purpose-built bite force meter constructed from a modified Sauter
157 25N digital force gauge. We retained the maximum score out of three bite force
158 measurements and made sure that the lizards had a body temperature comprised between
159 30°C and 35°C when biting (Lappin & Jones, 2014), since their preferred body temperature is
160 around 32-34°C (Rozen-Rechels *et al.*, 2020).

161 We obtained reflectance spectra from the throat and belly of each male (two replicates
162 per body region) using a USB-2000 diode-array spectrophotometer with a R400-7-UV/VIS
163 reading-illumination probe (Ocean Optics Inc.) and a notebook computer running OceanView
164 (Ocean Optics Inc.). We took reflectance readings in a darkened room using an HL-2000
165 Halogen-Deuterium light source (Ocean Optics Inc.) for full spectrum illumination. We

1
2
3 166 recorded reflectance spectra relative to a white diffuse standard (WS1; Ocean Optics Inc.) and
4
5 167 a dark reading. We set integration time to 9, scans to average to 10, and boxcar width to 10.
6
7 168 For data acquisition, we hand-held the probe over the centre of the targeted colour patch with
8
9 169 a 90° angle between the probe and the skin surface (i.e. coincident normal recording
10
11 170 geometry, Anderson & Prager, 2006). An entomological pin attached to the tip of the probe
12
13 171 allowed us to maintain a constant distance of 3 mm between the tip of the probe and the skin
14
15 172 surface. We always aimed the probe at a skin area larger than 1.5 mm in diameter that did not
16
17 173 contain any black spot to avoid spectral contamination (Badiane *et al.*, 2017). We later
18
19 174 processed spectral data in R v.3.3.2 (R Development Core Team, 2017) using the package
20
21 175 *pavo* 2.0 (Maia *et al.*, 2019). We cropped each spectrum between 300-700 nm, smoothed
22
23 176 them using a loess smooth span of 0.2, and averaged the two replicates recorded for each
24
25 177 body region. Then, we extracted two UV-related colorimetric variables from the throat
26
27 178 spectra, namely spectral intensity (i.e. $R_{300-700}$), and UV chroma (i.e. $R_{300-400}/R_{300-700}$).
28
29
30
31
32

33 179 Following measurement, we placed the lizards individually in opaque terraria
34
35 180 (25x15.5x15 cm) layered with soil substrate, and equipped with a shelter (7,6 x 15,2 x 15,1
36
37 181 cm, ExoTerra) and a small water dish (Petri dish ~5 cm in diameter). An incandescent bulb
38
39 182 (25 W) and white light UV-B neon tubes (Reptisun 10.0 UVB, Zoomed) provided heat and
40
41 183 light following a 10/14-h dark-light schedule. We provided food three times a week (300-400
42
43 184 mg of live house crickets, *Acheta domesticus*) and water *ad libitum*. Lizards were housed for a
44
45 185 total of 18 days, including 10 days of acclimation to the laboratory conditions during which
46
47 186 we waited the lizards' first moult to occur as it marks the onset of sexual activity (Laloi *et al.*,
48
49 187 2011), and 8 days of experiment.
50
51
52

53 188 *Colour manipulation and behavioural assays*

54
55 189 Behavioural assays took place in a temperature-controlled room maintained at 21°C using two
56
57 190 neutral arenas to eliminate any resident-intruder effect (Martin *et al.*, 2015, 2016). Arenas
58
59
60

1
2
3 191 were composed of a large opaque plastic terrarium (75x50x40 cm) with one transparent wall
4
5 192 to allow video recording, and contained a layer of blond peat as substrate. Two removable
6
7 193 opaque plastic walls divided the arena into two equally-sized compartments on both sides and
8
9 194 a larger compartment at the centre. The two compartments at the extremities of the arena
10
11 195 served as solitary holding areas to allow acclimation to the neutral arena, and were each
12
13 196 equipped with a 25-W heat bulb placed 15 cm above a shelter (Exoterra Inc.) that also acted
14
15 197 as basking spot. In the central compartment, we placed another 30-W heat bulb 15 cm above a
16
17 198 wooden basking spot (12x8x1.5 cm). We illuminated the arenas with a light-emitting plasma
18
19 199 fixture (Gavita Pro 270° GROW LEP) placed 80 cm above the bottom of the arena. This light
20
21 200 source reproduces almost exactly the full spectrum of the sun, including UVB and UVA
22
23 201 thanks to a UV transmitting glass filter, and is thus ideal to examine the role of UV signals
24
25 202 during laboratory experiments. White, opaque curtains surrounded the two arenas at a 1-m
26
27 203 distance to create visual isolation. Two digital SLR cameras (Nikon D500 and Nikon D5300)
28
29 204 mounted on tripods recorded the experiments in high definition from a lateral, slightly
30
31 205 elevated point of view, through the transparent wall of the arena.
32
33
34
35
36

37 206 To test the hypothesis that male-induced social costs are associated with dishonest UV
38
39 207 signals in common lizards, we staged dyadic encounters using 59 adult male common lizards
40
41 208 (SVL, range = 50-63, mean = 57; body mass, range = 2.4-5.3 , mean = 3.8). Each dyadic
42
43 209 interaction was unique and involved medium-sized (56-60 mm in SVL), non-manipulated
44
45 210 focal males (n = 29), which faced opponents of either larger (n = 15) or smaller size (n = 15)
46
47 211 with control or manipulated throat UV reflectance. Small opponents ranged from 50-55 mm
48
49 212 in SVL and were either UV-control or UV-enhanced. Large opponents (60-63 mm in SVL), in
50
51 213 contrast, were either UV-control or UV-reduced. This study design allowed us to create a
52
53 214 mismatch between UV signalling level and body size, and ultimately with male quality since
54
55 215 body size is a primary predictor of fighting ability and male contest outcome in lizards
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 216 (Carpenter, 1995; Karsten *et al.*, 2009; Baird, 2013; Names *et al.*, 2019). Focal males were
4
5 217 always 3-6 mm larger ($\beta = 4.21 \text{ mm} \pm 0.41$, $p < 0.001$) and 1-5 mm smaller ($\beta = -2.84 \text{ mm} \pm$
6
7 218 0.42 , $p < 0.001$) than their small and large opponents, respectively. There were no significant
8
9 219 differences in body size and body mass between small controls and small cheaters (SVL: $\beta = -$
10
11 220 $0.38 \text{ mm} \pm 0.66$, $p = 0.978$; body mass: $\beta = -0.21 \text{ mm} \pm 0.21$, $p = 0.846$), nor between large
12
13 221 controls and large cheaters (SVL: $\beta = 0.30 \pm 0.68$, $p = 0.991$; body mass: $\beta = 0.37 \pm 0.22$, $p =$
14
15 222 0.465).

19
20 223 To reduce the UV reflectance within the natural range of variation, we used UV-
21
22 224 blocking (290-400 nm) inorganic agents (zinc oxide and titanium dioxide) mixed with a fat
23
24 225 combination of petroleum jelly and liquid paraffin (respectively, 6:4:50:40 for 100 g). Large
25
26 226 males of the control group were treated with the fat combination and large males of the UV-
27
28 227 reduced treatment were treated with the fat combination mixed with the inorganic agents
29
30 228 (Figure 1). The spectral curve of this UV-reduction corresponded well with the spectra
31
32 229 obtained in previous studies (Martin *et al.*, 2016; Badiane *et al.*, 2020). We applied both
33
34 230 mixtures using a thin paintbrush on the lizards' throat, from the tip of the jaw to the collar
35
36 231 scale row. To enhance throat UV reflectance, we used a light orange Edding 4500 T-shirt
37
38 232 marker pen (colour code 016) that reflects in the UV range. This marker is similar to those
39
40 233 previously used to enhance UV-blue coloration in birds and lizards (Kurvers *et al.*, 2010;
41
42 234 Rémy *et al.*, 2010; Names *et al.*, 2019), except that we used light orange instead of light blue
43
44 235 in our study because it better matches the natural throat colour of male common lizards. To
45
46 236 facilitate the marker application on the lizards' throat, we dismantled the marker and pressed
47
48 237 the ink reservoir so as to deposit a drop of water-based ink on a plate, then we dipped the tip
49
50 238 of a forceps into the droplet and spread it on the lizards' throat from the tip of the jaw to the
51
52 239 collar scale row. We then let it dry for a few minutes before starting the experiments. Small
53
54 240 lizards from the UV-enhanced group were treated with this marker pen while small lizards
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 241 from the UV-control group were not treated at all (Figure 1). As Figure 1 illustrates, our UV-
4
5 242 enhancing treatment augmented throat reflectance in UV but also in the orange part of the
6
7 243 spectrum, and spectral shape looked somewhat artificial. This marker pen, however, produced
8
9 244 the best spectral shape of all the different marker pens and paintings we have tried.
10
11

12 245 Each focal male participated in four dyadic encounters against four different males from
13
14 246 the four treatments (i.e. small cheaters, small controls, large cheaters, and large controls)
15
16 247 presented in a random sequence. We chose the opponent so as to standardize the size
17
18 248 difference between focal and opponent males, such that the largest focal males encountered
19
20 249 the largest opponents from both the small and large size categories, and the smallest focal
21
22 250 males faced the smallest opponents of both size categories. We designed the experiment such
23
24 251 that focal males participated to encounters only once every two days, and opponents not more
25
26 252 than once a day. We performed a total of 116 trials during 8 days with a maximum of 16 trials
27
28 253 per day (8 trials per arena per day) during the activity period of the lizards from 09:00 to
29
30 254 17:00. Most males from the paired interactions had no prior knowledge of each other because
31
32 255 they were hosted in separate enclosures during all their lives, except for 14 tests (12%) for
33
34 256 which both males came from the same 100-m² enclosure. However, in 12 out of these 14
35
36 257 encounters, both males were entering their first reproductive season (almost 2 years old) and
37
38 258 had therefore not competed in the past. The two remaining contests both involved a sexually
39
40 259 mature male (almost 3 years old) against a newly sexually mature male (almost 2 years old),
41
42 260 and had therefore never competed against each other. In the light of this, it is unlikely that
43
44 261 prior knowledge due to sexual competition among the males impacted our results.
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 262 Before each experiment, we removed the participating males from their home terrarium,
52
53 263 manipulated their throat coloration, and randomly placed each male in one of the two
54
55 264 compartments of the neutral arena. We allowed a first 10-min acclimation period with the
56
57 265 shelters and basking spot in both compartments. After 10 min, we removed the shelters from
58
59
60

1
2
3 266 the compartments and allowed another 10-min acclimation period without shelters to force
4
5 267 them to be active, leaving the heat bulb turned on for thermoregulation. After this 20-min
6
7 268 acclimation period with and without shelters (and without observers), the experiment started
8
9 269 as we removed the opaque walls to reveal the central area and immediately turned the heat
10
11 270 bulbs from the two compartments off, such that the only basking spot left is the wooden plate
12
13 271 at the centre of the arena. We turned the video camera on and left the room to prevent any
14
15 272 observer-induced disturbance. The experiment lasted 20 min as the two males behaved and
16
17 273 competed for the basking spot. Next, a single observer, blind to the experimental treatments,
18
19 274 used Jwatcher (Blumstein & Daniel, 2007) to analyse the lizards' behaviours from all the
20
21 275 video recordings to avoid any observer effect.
22
23
24
25

26 276 We recorded each time a lizard performed any of the behaviours described in Table 1
27
28 277 (Martin *et al.*, 2016; Names *et al.*, 2019). We assigned a coefficient to each of these
29
30 278 behaviours to give more weight to the most aggressive behaviours, since they are more likely
31
32 279 to be costly for the opponent (Carazo, Font, & Desfilis, 2008; Abalos *et al.*, 2016). Although
33
34 280 an obvious hierarchy exists between behaviours with regard to contest escalation, there still is
35
36 281 some degree to which coefficient assignment can be subjective and arbitrary. Hence, in
37
38 282 addition to the first set of coefficients we consider as most relevant, we assigned two more
39
40 283 sets of coefficients to examine how coefficient assignment may influence our results. We thus
41
42 284 calculated three versions of the aggression score and three versions of the submission score as
43
44 285 indicated in Table 1. In addition, we recorded basking duration, that is the time spent basking
45
46 286 on the wooden plate, because males competed over a unique basking spot. We also recorded
47
48 287 the duration of wall-scratching behaviour for each male. This behaviour consists of males
49
50 288 scratching the walls of the arena to try to escape and may be due to stress as a consequence of
51
52 289 laboratory conditions (de Fraipont 2000, Rozen-Rechels 2018). It may also be triggered by a
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 290 male fleeing from another male. None of the contests resulted in observable injuries and all
4
5 291 males were released to their semi-natural outdoor enclosures after the 8 days of experiment.

7
8 292 *Statistical analyses*

9
10 293 We used R v.3.3.2 (R Development Core Team, 2017) to perform two complementary set of
11
12 294 statistical analyses of the behavioural data.

14
15 295 *Social costs on dishonest UV signals*

16
17 296 First, to test whether or not social costs are imposed on dishonest male UV signals, we
18
19 297 calculated two categorical variables named ‘opponent size’ with two levels (‘large’ and
20
21 298 ‘small’) and named ‘opponent honesty’ with two levels (‘honest’ and ‘cheaters’). Honest
22
23 299 males corresponded to UV-control males while cheaters corresponded to manipulated males
24
25 300 from both the UV-reduced and UV-enhanced treatment groups. Then, we ran LMMs for
26
27 301 Gaussian variables and GLMMs for Poisson variables using the following response variables
28
29 302 for focal males: the three versions of aggression score, the three versions of submission score,
30
31 303 basking duration, and duration of wall-scratching behaviour. We included male ID and trial
32
33 304 order as random intercepts in these models. We considered trial order as random because we
34
35 305 were not interested in the effects of trial order *per se*; however, we also ran these models with
36
37 306 trial order as fixed factor and present the results from post-hoc Tukey tests when significant.
38
39 307 We included the additive effects of opponent size and opponent honesty as well as their two-
40
41 308 way interactions, and the additive effect of bite force as fixed effects. When the interaction
42
43 309 was significant, we split our data set according to the “opponent size” category to explore the
44
45 310 interaction. To reduce the impact of influential values (detected with Cook’s distances) and
46
47 311 improve our models, we performed an alpha-winsorisation with a 0.03 trim on the submission
48
49 312 score and wall-scratching behaviour. For all the models described above, we checked the
50
51 313 model assumptions using the *performance* R package (Lüdtke *et al.*, 2020). We used a
52
53 314 squared-root transformation for wall-scratching behaviour to comply with these assumptions.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 315 All continuous variables assuming a Gaussian distribution were centred and scaled prior to
4
5 316 analyses to ease result interpretations (Schielzeth, 2010).
6

7
8 317 *Determinants of male contests*
9

10 318 Next, to explore the role of body size, bite force, and throat UV reflectance during male
11
12 319 agonistic contests, we analysed only interactions between focal males and control opponents
13
14 320 from both size categories, thus excluding the cheaters. We used linear mixed-effects models
15
16 321 (LMMs) and generalized linear mixed-effects models (GLMMs) to test the additive effects of
17
18 322 bite force, UV chroma, spectral intensity, opponent body size, opponent UV chroma, and
19
20 323 opponent spectral intensity on the three versions of aggression score, the three versions of
21
22 324 submission score, basking duration, and duration of wall-scratching behaviour. We included
23
24 325 the same random intercepts as above. We used the *lme4* R package (Bates *et al.*, 2015) to
25
26 326 perform GLMMs on count variables assuming a negative binomial distribution for the
27
28 327 aggression score and a Poisson distribution for the submission score. For the remaining
29
30 328 response variables (i.e. basking duration, and wall-scratching duration), we assumed a
31
32 329 Gaussian distribution and used LMMs as implemented in the *nlme* R package (Pinheiro *et al.*,
33
34 330 2019). To reduce the impact of influential values (detected with Cook's distances) and
35
36 331 improve our models, we performed an alpha-winsorisation with a 0.03 trim on the submission
37
38 332 score and wall-scratching behaviour. We proceeded with a model selection and conditional
39
40 333 averaging procedure as implemented in the *MuMin* R package (Bartoń, 2019), using the
41
42 334 functions *dredge* and *model.avg*. This model selection procedure allowed us to select the best
43
44 335 models ($\Delta AICc < 2$) from all possible combinations of predictors, including a null model
45
46 336 without any predictor.
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 337 **Results**

54 338 *Social costs on dishonest UV signals*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 339 We found that the two-way interaction between opponent size and opponent honesty
4
5 340 influenced significantly the aggression score of focal males ($\beta = -0.33 \pm 0.12$, $p = 0.005$). In
6
7 341 conflicts with smaller males, opponent honesty did not significantly explain the aggression
8
9 342 score of focal males, though the tendency was a smaller aggression score of focal males (UV-
10
11 343 enhanced cheaters: $\beta = -0.15 \pm 0.09$, $p = 0.075$). In conflicts with larger males, focal males
12
13 344 were significantly more aggressive (by 1.2 units on average) towards UV-reduced cheaters
14
15 345 than towards honest opponents ($\beta = 0.18 \pm 0.08$, $p = 0.021$, Figure 2A). When the two
16
17 346 alternative versions of the aggression score were used, the results were qualitatively similar.
18
19
20
21

22 347 Furthermore, our analyses revealed that the two-way interaction between opponent size
23
24 348 and opponent honesty best explained the submission score of focal males ($\beta = -0.73 \pm 0.16$, p
25
26 349 < 0.001). More precisely, focal males were less submissive (by 1.4 units of submission score
27
28 350 on average) against small cheaters (UV-enhanced) than against small honest males ($\beta = -0.33$
29
30 351 ± 0.13 , $p = 0.012$), but more submissive (by 1.7 units on average) against large cheaters (UV-
31
32 352 reduced) than against large honest males ($\beta = 0.50 \pm 0.11$, $p < 0.001$; Figure 2B). When the
33
34 353 two alternative versions of the submission score were used, results were qualitatively similar
35
36 354 except that we did not find that focal males were less submissive against small cheaters (UV-
37
38 355 enhanced).
39
40
41
42

43 356 Moreover, treatment factors did significantly explain the time focal males spent at the
44
45 357 basking spot, nor the time spent performing wall-scratching behaviours. Statistics are fully
46
47 358 reported in Supp. Info. S1. When we included trial order as fixed instead of random factor, all
48
49 359 the above results were qualitatively similar, and we found that aggression ratio was lower
50
51 360 during the second trial than during the first ($\beta = -0.24 \pm 0.08$, $p = 0.025$) and the third ($\beta = -$
52
53 361 0.26 ± 0.09 , $p = 0.013$).
54
55
56

57 362 *Determinants of male contests in control interactions*
58
59
60

1
2
3 363 In control interactions, males with a higher aggression score (calculated with the first set of
4
5 364 coefficients) had a significantly higher bite force ($\beta = 0.29 \pm 0.11$, $p = 0.010$). This result was
6
7 365 corroborated when we used both alternative aggression scores. In addition, focal males were
8
9 366 more submissive (submission score calculated with the first set of coefficients) against
10
11 367 opponents with a high throat spectral intensity ($\beta = 0.28 \pm 0.12$, $p = 0.023$). When we used the
12
13 368 two alternative versions of the aggression score, however, none of the predictors were
14
15 369 significant. We also found that males with a higher bite force tended to spend more time on
16
17 370 the basking spot than males with lower bite force ($\beta = 0.31 \pm 0.16$, $p = 0.059$). Focal males
18
19 371 spending more time performing wall-scratching behaviours had higher throat spectral
20
21 372 intensity ($\beta = 0.47 \pm 0.17$, $p = 0.006$). Statistics are fully reported in Supp. Info. S2. When we
22
23 373 included trial order as fixed instead of random factor, all the above results were qualitatively
24
25 374 similar, and we found that the submission score was lower during the third trial than during
26
27 375 the first ($\beta = -0.55 \pm 0.19$, $p = 0.017$), the second ($\beta = -0.92 \pm 0.25$, $p = 0.002$), and the fourth
28
29 376 trial ($\beta = -1.19 \pm 0.27$, $p < 0.001$).

377 **Discussion**

378 Our results revealed partial evidence that socially imposed costs may enforce the honesty of
39
40 379 UV-reflecting signals in male common lizards *Z. vivipara*. In support of the hypothesis of
41
42 380 social costs, focal males were more aggressive against large UV-reduced cheaters than against
43
44 381 large honest opponents, and were less submissive against small UV-enhanced cheaters than
45
46 382 against small honest opponents. However, inconsistently with this hypothesis, focal males
47
48 383 were not more aggressive against small UV enhanced cheaters than against small honest
49
50 384 opponents and were more submissive against large UV-reduced cheaters than against large
51
52 385 honest opponents. In addition to this, our analyses excluding manipulated males indicated that
53
54 386 male bite force is an important predictor of male contest outcome.

55
56
57
58
59 387 *Social costs on dishonest UV signals*
60

1
2
3 388 We provide partial evidence that the UV components of the UV-reflecting throat of common
4
5 389 lizards may function as conventional signals enforced by male-induced social costs. The story
6
7 390 becomes more complex than expected when we examine the aggression and submission
8
9 391 scores. On one hand, large males with UV-reduced throats received more aggressions but also
10
11 392 triggered more submissive behaviours in focal males. This result suggests that, for large
12
13 393 males, downplaying UV signals is costlier than being honest since these large UV-reduced
14
15 394 cheaters are more likely to be challenged by the smaller focal males. When the focal males
16
17 395 challenge the large cheaters, the latter may retaliate since, after all, they are larger and more
18
19 396 likely to win fights, and focal males end up being more submissive. Hence, under this
20
21 397 scenario, what seemed to be a contradictory result at first glance may in fact be coherent and
22
23 398 support the idea that UV signals function as conventional signals in this species. Although
24
25 399 large males pose a serious threat to smaller males, if a large male signals low condition, it
26
27 400 may pay-off for smaller males to challenge this large male and gain a fitness advantage (e.g.
28
29 401 access to resources and/or females). Unexpectedly, small UV-enhanced cheaters did not
30
31 402 receive more aggression from the focal males compared to their honest counterparts.
32
33 403 However, that focal males behaved less submissively against small cheaters aligns with the
34
35 404 predictions of a conventional signal hypothesis.
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 405 In the case of conventional signals, social costs are either imposed to individuals that
43
44 406 signal above a given threshold intensity or penalize the mismatch between the sender's quality
45
46 407 or behaviour and its signalling level. Signal honesty can therefore be maintained only if these
47
48 408 costs exceed the benefits of cheating (Searcy & Nowicki, 2005; Bradbury & Vehrencamp,
49
50 409 2011). However, some degree of deception may still arise and pay off as long as the signal
51
52 410 remains honest to some degree (Adams & Mesterton-Gibbons, 1995; Carazo & Font, 2014).
53
54 411 Individuals can either be exclusively honest or exclusively dishonest, or switch from one
55
56 412 strategy to another according to the situation they find themselves into, depending on whether
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 413 the signal is very labile and can change rapidly or not (Akçay, Campbell, & Beecher, 2013;
4
5 414 Wilson & Angilletta, 2015; Ligon & McGraw, 2016). In common lizards, the UV-reflecting
6
7 415 coloration on males' throat does not seem to change rapidly (Bonnaffé *et al.*, 2018), thus
8
9 416 leaving little room for “occasional” cheating. Retaliation or punishment rules taking the form
10
11 417 of physical and non-physical aggressions are the main mechanisms maintaining the honesty of
12
13 418 conventional signals (Martín & Forsman, 1997; Tibbetts & Izzo, 2010; Tibbetts, 2014;
14
15 419 Wilson & Angilletta, 2015; Ligon & McGraw, 2016). In this regard, the different behaviours
16
17 420 measured in our study do not have the same weight as evidence of socially imposed costs. Our
18
19 421 aggression score is the most meaningful factor here because it is the most likely to inflict a
20
21 422 cost (e.g. injury) on the opponent. Overall, social costs taking the form of physical aggression
22
23 423 may be quite high in common lizards, as 43% of our staged encounters (50 out of 116)
24
25 424 escalated to the point of a male biting another male at least once. Although we cannot
26
27 425 estimate the cost-benefit balance of cheating in our study, the risk of injury due to physical
28
29 426 aggression is high and should not be neglected in this species (Le Galliard *et al.*, 2005). On
30
31 427 top of this, other behavioural processes, for instance in the form of non-physical aggression
32
33 428 and/or spatial dominance, not necessarily measured, may increase the impact of social costs.
34
35 429 Our submission score may therefore capture the reaction to such behaviours and give us hints
36
37 430 on whether or not social costs exist. Altogether, our results seem to indicate that cheating is
38
39 431 generally more costly than being honest, although it is not always clear-cut.

46
47 432 In fact, the inconsistencies in our results involved almost exclusively interactions
48
49 433 between focal males and small opponents, as small UV-enhanced cheaters did not receive
50
51 434 more aggression from focal males. A possible interpretation may simply be that cheating is
52
53 435 more likely to pay off for a small male that exaggerates its UV signal than for a large male
54
55 436 that downplays its signal. However, in the context of male-male competition, we would
56
57 437 expect social costs to prevent low-quality males from signalling high quality, and gain
58
59
60

1
2
3 438 advantage in terms of resources and/or access to females over males that are actually of higher
4
5 439 quality (e.g. Molles & Vehrencamp, 2001). Another hypothesis may be that smaller males
6
7 440 generally behave in a non-threatening way when they face larger males, for example by
8
9 441 avoiding being close to larger opponent. Therefore, focal males would not need to show any
10
11 442 sign of aggression and spatial occupancy, perhaps captured in our submission score, may be
12
13 443 enough to affirm dominance. Alternatively, if focal males are more aggressive towards any
14
15 444 opponent that signals above a given threshold intensity, and that small honest males are
16
17 445 already signalling close to or above that threshold, we would not see any difference in terms
18
19 446 of aggression score between small UV-enhanced cheaters and their honest counterparts.
20
21
22
23

24 447 However, in this context, we would not expect to find differences in the submission
25
26 448 score as we did here. This also raises the possibility that our results were obscured by our UV
27
28 449 manipulation protocol. While the experimental reduction of the UV reflectance within the
29
30 450 natural range of variation has been previously validated in the common lizard (Martin *et al.*,
31
32 451 2016; Badiane *et al.*, 2020) and other lizard species (Martin *et al.*, 2015; Names *et al.*, 2019),
33
34 452 it is much more difficult to enhance UV reflectance. To the best of our knowledge, only a
35
36 453 handful of studies have experimentally augmented the UV coloration of animals, mostly in
37
38 454 the blue tit *Cyanistes caeruleus* (Poesel *et al.*, 2007; Rémy *et al.*, 2010) and one study in the
39
40 455 common wall lizard *Podarcis muralis* (Names *et al.*, 2019). In these and our study, whether or
41
42 456 not these UV-enhanced patches can be considered to be within the natural range of variation
43
44 457 remains debatable, since spectral shape can look artificial. In addition, our marker pen did not
45
46 458 only increase reflectance in the UV range but also in the orange part of the spectrum (*idem*, to
47
48 459 a lesser extent, with the UV reduction treatment) and this may set a limit to results'
49
50 460 interpretations since we do not know how this may have influenced the outcome of our
51
52 461 behavioural experiments. It is therefore possible that the focal males did not consider the UV-
53
54 462 enhanced throat of small cheaters as a high signalling level, but simply as an 'odd' signal. For
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 463 example, the increased orange coloration on the throat may somewhat resemble female's
4
5 464 throats (Martin *et al.*, 2013) and thus confuse the receivers. In addition, we cannot exclude
6
7 465 that the artificial light orange colour faded to some extent during the experiment, although not
8
9
10 466 completely (pers. obs.). Future studies should investigate adequate methods to enhance
11
12 467 “naturally” UV coloration so that research on UV signalling may take a step forward.

14 468 *Determinants of male contests*

16
17 469 To further explore the individual determinants of male contests, we focused exclusively on
18
19 470 encounters between focal and honest males. We found that aggression score correlated
20
21 471 positively with male bite force, thus providing evidence that bite force is a good proxy of
22
23 472 male dominance. Bite force has been previously linked with male dominance (Husak *et al.*,
24
25 473 2006), male mating success (Lappin & Husak, 2005), and male fighting capacity (Huyghe *et*
26
27 474 *al.*, 2005) in lizards. Moreover, our results revealed that focal males were more submissive
28
29 475 against opponents with high throat intensity on one hand, but focal males with high throat
30
31 476 intensity spent more time performing wall-scratching behaviour on the other. It may seem
32
33 477 contradictory if we interpret wall-scratching behaviour as a submissive behaviour, which
34
35 478 could well be the case, but it could also be linked with individual stress unrelated to the
36
37 479 opponent behaviour (de Fraipont *et al.*, 2000; Rozen–Rechels *et al.*, 2018). Nevertheless, the
38
39 480 results from this first part of the analyses were somewhat sensitive to the different set of
40
41 481 coefficients used to calculate the aggression and submission scores. Hence, the robustness of
42
43 482 these results is somewhat challenged, and this should lead behavioural ecologists and
44
45 483 ethologists to take the effects of weighted behaviours into account when behavioural scores
46
47 484 are calculated.

53 485 *Conclusion*

55
56 486 Overall, our study highlights that UV coloration of male throat plays a role during male
57
58 487 contests, both from the point of view of the signaller, as it correlates with the signaller's
59
60

1
2
3 488 behaviour, and from the perspective of the receiver since receivers adjust their behaviour
4
5 489 based on these signals. Therefore, our study confirms the importance of UV coloration as
6
7 490 predictors of male contest outcomes in the common lizard (Martin *et al.*, 2016). However, we
8
9 491 can only provide partial evidence that social costs maintain the honesty of UV-reflecting
10
11 492 signals. This is because we observed different patterns of physical and non-physical
12
13 493 aggression in the face of deception in situations where focal males faced small opponents than
14
15 494 with large opponents. Although not entirely conclusive, this suggests that UV signals can be
16
17 495 honest thanks to context-dependent social costs imposed by rival males during male-male
18
19 496 competition. Future work should keep investigating these avenues of signal honesty with UV
20
21 497 signals to improve our understanding of animal communication at large.
22
23
24

25 26 498 **Research data**

27
28 499 All data used in this study will be made freely available on the public repository Zenodo.
29

30 500 **Acknowledgements**

31
32 501 We are thankful to Bruno Malhao for helping us build the two experimental arenas and Simon
33
34 502 Chollet for lending the plasma lamps. This study is part of the project UVSIGNAL funded by
35
36 503 a Marie Sklodowska-Curie fellowship (European program Horizon 2020) attributed to Arnaud
37
38 504 Badiane. This work has benefited from technical and human resources provided by CEREEP-
39
40 505 Ecotron IleDeFrance (CNRS/ENS UMS 3194) as well as financial support from the Regional
41
42 506 Council of Ile-de-France under the DIM Program R2DS bearing the reference I-05-098/R. It
43
44 507 has received a support under the program " Investissements d'Avenir" launched by the French
45
46 508 government and implemented by ANR with the reference ANR-11-INBS-0001 AnaEE France
47
48 509 and ANR-10-IDEX-0001-02 PSL. The capture, handling, and experimentation on the animals
49
50 510 in this study was authorized by the Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur, de la Recherche et
51
52 511 de l'Innovation (ref. APAFIS#19642-2019030616456029v4), and by the Direction
53
54 512 départementale de la protection des populations (ref. 2017-01666).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 513 **References**
4

- 5 514 **Abalos J, Pérez i de Lanuza G, Carazo P & Font E. 2016.** The role of male coloration in
6
7 515 the outcome of staged contests in the European common wall lizard (*Podarcis muralis*).
8
9 516 *Behaviour* **153**: 607–631.
- 10
11
12 517 **Adams ES & Mesterton-Gibbons M. 1995.** The cost of threat displays and the stability of
13
14 518 deceptive communication. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **175**: 405–421.
- 15
16
17 519 **Akçay Ç, Campbell SE & Beecher MD. 2013.** Individual differences affect honest
18
19 520 signalling in a songbird. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **281**.
- 20
21 521 **Alonso-Alvarez C, Bertrand S, Devevey G, Gaillard M, Prost J, Faivre B & Sorci G.**
22
23 522 **2004.** An experimental test of the dose-dependent effect of carotenoids and immune activation
24
25 523 on sexual signals and antioxidant activity. *American Naturalist* **164**: 651–659.
- 26
27
28 524 **Anderson S & Prager M. 2006.** Quantifying colors. In: Hill GE, McGraw KJ, eds. *Bird*
29
30 525 *coloration: Volume 1, mechanisms and measurements.*, 41–89.
- 31
32
33 526 **Bachmann JC, Cortesi F, Hall MD, Marshall NJ, Salzburger W & Gante HF. 2017.**
34
35 527 Real-time social selection maintains honesty of a dynamic visual signal in cooperative fish.
36
37 528 *Evolution Letters* **1**: 269–278.
- 38
39
40 529 **Badiane A, Pérez i de Lanuza G, García-Custodio M del C, Carazo P & Font E. 2017.**
41
42 530 Colour patch size and measurement error using reflectance spectrophotometry. *Methods in*
43
44 531 *Ecology and Evolution* **8**: 1585–1593.
- 45
46
47 532 **Badiane A, Martin M, Meylan S, Richard M, Decencièrre Ferrandière B & Le Galliard**
48
49 533 **JF. 2020.** Male ultraviolet reflectance and female mating history influence female mate
50
51 534 choice and male mating success in a polyandrous lizard. *Biological Journal of the Linnean*
52
53 535 *Society* **130**: 586–598.
- 54
55
56 536 **Baird TA. 2013.** Lizards and other reptiles as model systems for the study of contest
57
58 537 behaviour. In: Hardy IC, Briffa M, eds. *Animal Contests.*, 258–286.
59
60

- 1
2
3 538 **Bartoń K. 2019.** ‘MuMin’: Multi-model inference.
4
- 5 539 **Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B & Walker S. 2015.** Fitting linear mixed-effects models
6
7 540 using lme4. *Journal of statistical software* **67**: 1–48.
8
9
- 10 541 **Bauwens D. 1987.** Sex recognition by males of the lizard *Lacerta vivipara*: an introductory
11
12 542 study. *Amphibia-Reptilia* **8**: 49–57.
13
- 14 543 **Beani L & Turillazzi S. 1999.** Stripes display in hover-wasps (Vespidae: Stenogastrinae): A
15
16 544 socially costly status badge. *Animal Behaviour* **57**: 1233–1239.
17
- 18
19 545 **Blumstein DT & Daniel JC. 2007.** Quantifying behavior the Jwatcher way.
20
- 21 546 **Bonnaffé W, Martin M, Mugabo M, Meylan S & Le Galliard J. 2018.** Ontogenetic
22
23 547 trajectories of body coloration reveal its function as a multicomponent nonsenescent signal.
24
25 548 *Ecology and Evolution* **8**: ece3.4369.
26
- 27
28 549 **Bradbury JW & Vehrencamp SL. 2011.** *Principles of animal communication*. Sinauer
29
30 550 Association Press Sunderland.
31
- 32
33 551 **Carazo P & Font E. 2014.** ‘Communication breakdown’: The evolution of signal
34
35 552 unreliability and deception. *Animal Behaviour* **87**: 17–22.
36
- 37 553 **Carazo P, Font E & Desfilis E. 2008.** Beyond ‘nasty neighbours’ and ‘dear enemies’?
38
39 554 Individual recognition by scent marks in a lizard (*Podarcis hispanica*). *Animal Behaviour* **76**:
40
41 555 1953–1963.
42
- 43
44 556 **Carpenter GC. 1995.** Modeling Dominance : the Influence of size, coloration, and
45
46 557 experience on dominance relations in tree lizards (*Urosaurus ornatus*). *Herpetological*
47
48 558 *Monographs* **9**: 88–101.
49
- 50
51 559 **Cote J, Le Galliard JF, Rossi JM & Fitze PS. 2008.** Environmentally induced changes in
52
53 560 carotenoid-based coloration of female lizards: a comment on Vercken et al. *Journal of*
54
55 561 *Evolutionary Biology* **21**: 1165–1172.
56
- 57
58 562 **Fitze PS, Le Galliard JF, Federici P, Richard M & Clobert J. 2005.** Conflict over
59
60

- 1
2
3 563 multiple-partner mating between males and females of the polygynandrous common lizards.
4
5 564 *Evolution* **59**: 2451–2459.
6
7 565 **Fitze PS & Le Galliard JF. 2008.** Operational sex ratio, sexual conflict and the intensity of
8
9 566 sexual selection. *Ecology Letters* **11**: 432–439.
10
11 567 **Fitzpatrick S. 1998.** Colour schemes for birds: Structural coloration and signals of quality in
12
13 568 feathers. *Annales Zoologici Fennici* **35**: 67–77.
14
15 569 **de Fraipont M, Colbert J, John-Alder H & Meylan S. 2000.** Increased pre-natal maternal
16
17 570 corticosterone promotes in common of offspring philopatry lizards *Lacerta vivipara*. *Journal*
18
19 571 *of Animal Ecology* **69**: 404–413.
20
21 572 **Le Galliard JF, Fitze PS, Ferrière R & Clobert J. 2005.** Sex ratio bias, male aggression,
22
23 573 and population collapse in lizards. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **102**:
24
25 574 18231–18236.
26
27 575 **Grafen A. 1990.** Biological signals as handicaps. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **144**: 517–
28
29 576 546.
30
31 577 **Guilford T & Dawkins MS. 1995.** What are conventional signals? *Animal Behaviour* **49**:
32
33 578 1689–1695.
34
35 579 **Heulin B. 1988.** Observations sur l'organisation de la reproduction et sur les comportements
36
37 580 sexuels et agonistiques chez *Lacerta vivipara*. *Vie et milieu* **38**: 177–187.
38
39 581 **Higham JP. 2014.** How does honest costly signaling work? *Behavioral Ecology* **25**: 8–11.
40
41 582 **Hurd PL. 1997.** Is signalling of fighting ability costlier for weaker individuals? *Journal of*
42
43 583 *Theoretical Biology* **184**: 83–88.
44
45 584 **Hurd PL & Enquist M. 2005.** A strategic taxonomy of biological communication. *Animal*
46
47 585 *Behaviour* **70**: 1155–1170.
48
49 586 **Husak JF, Lappin KA, Fox SF & Lemos-Espinal JA. 2006.** Bite-Force Performance
50
51 587 Predicts Dominance in Male Venerable Collared Lizards (*Crotaphytus antiquus*). *Copeia*
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


- 1
2
3 588 **2006**: 301–306.
4
5 589 **Huyghe K, Vanhooydonck B, Scheers H, Molina-Borja M & Van Damme R. 2005.**
6
7 590 Morphology, performance and fighting capacity in male lizards, *Gallotia galloti*. *Functional*
8
9 591 *Ecology* **19**: 800–807.
10
11 592 **Johnstone RA & Norris K. 1993.** Badges of status and the cost of aggression. *Behavioral*
12
13 593 *Ecology and Sociobiology* **32**: 127:134.
14
15 594 **Karsten KB, Andriamandimbiarisoa LN, Fox SF & Raxworthy CJ. 2009.** Sexual
16
17 595 selection on body size and secondary sexual characters in 2 closely related, sympatric
18
19 596 chameleons in Madagascar. *Behavioral Ecology* **20**: 1079–1088.
20
21 597 **Kemp DJ & Grether GF. 2015.** Integrating functional and evolutionary approaches to the
22
23 598 study of color-based animal signals. In: *Animal Signaling and Function: An Integrative*
24
25 599 *Approach.*, 111–140.
26
27 600 **Kemp DJ, Herberstein ME & Grether GF. 2012.** Unraveling the true complexity of costly
28
29 601 color signaling. *Behavioral Ecology* **23**: 233–236.
30
31 602 **Kemp DJ & Rutowski RL. 2007.** Condition dependence, quantitative genetics, and the
32
33 603 potential signal content of iridescent ultraviolet butterfly coloration. *Evolution* **61**: 168–183.
34
35 604 **Kurvers RHJM, Delhey K, Roberts ML & Peters A. 2010.** No consistent female
36
37 605 preference for higher crown UV reflectance in Blue Tits *Cyanistes caeruleus*: A mate choice
38
39 606 experiment. *Ibis* **152**: 393–396.
40
41 607 **Laloi D, Richard M, Lecomte J, Massot M & Clobert J. 2004.** Multiple paternity in
42
43 608 clutches of common lizard *Lacerta vivipara*: Data from microsatellite markers. *Molecular*
44
45 609 *Ecology* **13**: 719–723.
46
47 610 **Laloi D, Eizaguirre C, Fédérici P & Massot M. 2011.** Female choice for heterozygous
48
49 611 mates changes along successive matings in a lizard. *Behavioural Processes* **88**: 149–154.
50
51 612 **Lappin AK & Husak JF. 2005.** Weapon performance, not size, determines mating success
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 613 and potential reproductive output in the collared lizard (*Crotaphytus collaris*). *American*
4
5 614 *Naturalist* **166**: 426–436.
- 6
7 615 **Lappin AK & Jones MEH. 2014.** Reliable quantification of bite-force performance requires
8
9 616 use of appropriate biting substrate and standardization of bite out-lever. *The Journal of*
10
11 617 *Experimental Biology* **217**: 4303–4312.
- 12
13 618 **Ligon RA & McGraw KJ. 2016.** Social costs enforce honesty of a dynamic signal of
14
15 619 motivation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **283**.
- 16
17 620 **Lüdecke D, Makowski D, Waggoner P & Patil I. 2020.** Performance: Assessment of
18
19 621 regression models performance, CRAN, R package.
- 20
21 622 **Maia R, Gruson H, Endler JA & White TE. 2019.** pavo 2: new tools for the spectral and
22
23 623 spatial analysis of colour in R. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **10**: 1097–1107.
- 24
25 624 **Martin M, Meylan S, Gomez D & Le Galliard JF. 2013.** Ultraviolet and carotenoid-based
26
27 625 coloration in the viviparous lizard *Zootoca vivipara* (Squamata: Lacertidae) in relation to age,
28
29 626 sex, and morphology. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **110**: 128–141.
- 30
31 627 **Martin M, Meylan S, Perret S & Le Galliard JF. 2015.** UV coloration influences spatial
32
33 628 dominance but not agonistic behaviors in male wall lizards. *Behavioral Ecology and*
34
35 629 *Sociobiology* **69**: 1483–1491.
- 36
37 630 **Martin M, Meylan S, Haussy C, Decencièrè B, Perret S & Le Galliard JF. 2016.** UV
38
39 631 color determines the issue of conflicts but does not covary with individual quality in a lizard.
40
41 632 *Behavioral Ecology* **27**: 262–270.
- 42
43 633 **Martín J & Forsman A. 1997.** Social costs and development of nuptial coloration in male
44
45 634 *Psammmodromus algirus* lizards : an experiment. *Behavioral Ecology* **10**: 396–400.
- 46
47 635 **Massot M, Clobert J, Pilorge T, Lecomte J & Barbault R. 1992.** Density dependence in
48
49 636 the common lizard: demographic consequences of a density manipulation. *Ecology* **73**: 1742–
50
51 637 1756.
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 638 **Maynard Smith J & Harper D. 2003.** *Animal signals*. New York: Oxford University Press.
4
5 639 **Møller AP. 1987.** Variation in badge size in male house sparrows *Passer domesticus*:
6
7 640 evidence for status signalling. *Animal Behaviour* **35**: 1637–1644.
8
9
10 641 **Molles LE & Vehrencamp SL. 2001.** Songbird cheaters pay a retaliation cost: Evidence for
11
12 642 auditory conventional signals. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **268**:
13
14 643 2013–2019.
15
16
17 644 **Names G, Martin M, Badiane A & Le Galliard JF. 2019.** The relative importance of body
18
19 645 size and UV coloration in influencing male-male competition in a lacertid lizard. *Behavioral*
20
21 646 *Ecology and Sociobiology* **73**: 98.
22
23
24 647 **Pinheiro J, Bates D, DebRoy S, Sarkar D & RCoreTeam. 2019.** nlme: Linear and
25
26 648 nonlinear mixed effects models.
27
28
29 649 **Poesel A, Peters A, Dabelsteen T, Darden SK & Delhey K. 2007.** Territorial responses of
30
31 650 male blue tits, *Cyanistes caeruleus*, to UV-manipulated neighbours. *Journal of Ornithology*
32
33 651 **148**: 179–187.
34
35
36 652 **Qvarnstrom A. 1997.** Experimentally increased badge size increases male competition and
37
38 653 reduces male parental care in the collared flycatcher. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
39
40 654 *Biological Sciences* **264**: 1225–1231.
41
42
43 655 **R Development Core Team. 2017.** R: A language and environment for statistical computing.
44
45 656 **Rémy A, Grégoire A, Perret P & Doutrelant C. 2010.** Mediating male-male interactions:
46
47 657 The role of the UV blue crest coloration in blue tits. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **64**:
48
49 658 1839–1847.
50
51
52 659 **Rohwer S & Rohwer FC. 1978.** Status signalling in Harris Sparrows. *Animal Behaviour* **26**:
53
54 660 1012–1022.
55
56
57 661 **Roulin A. 2016.** Condition-dependence, pleiotropy and the handicap principle of sexual
58
59 662 selection in melanin-based colouration. *Biological Reviews* **91**: 328–348.
60


- 1
2
3 663 **Rozen-Rechels D, Badiane A, Agostini S, Meylan S & Le Galliard J. 2020.** Water
4
5 664 restriction induces behavioral fight but impairs thermoregulation in a dry-skinned ectotherm.
6
7 665 *Oikos* **129**: 572–584.
8
9
10 666 **Rozen-Rechels D, Dupoué A, Meylan S, Decencière B, Guingand S & Le Galliard JF.**
11
12 667 **2018.** Water restriction in viviparous lizards causes transgenerational effects on behavioral
13
14 668 anxiety and immediate effects on exploration behavior. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*
15
16 669 **72**.
17
18
19 670 **San-Jose LM, Huyghe K, Schuerch J & Fitze PS. 2017.** More melanized males bite
20
21 671 stronger but run slower: potential performance trade-offs related to melanin-based coloration.
22
23 672 *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **122**: 184–196.
24
25
26 673 **San-Jose LM & Roulin A. 2018.** Toward understanding the repeated occurrence of
27
28 674 associations between melanin-based coloration and multiple phenotypes. *The American*
29
30 675 *Naturalist* **192**: 111–130.
31
32
33 676 **Schielzeth H. 2010.** Simple means to improve the interpretability of regression coefficients.
34
35 677 *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **1**: 103–113.
36
37
38 678 **Searcy W & Nowicki S. 2005.** *The evolution of animal communication: reliability and*
39
40 679 *deception in signaling systems*.
41
42
43 680 **Shawkey MD & D’Alba L. 2017.** Interactions between colour-producing mechanisms and
44
45 681 their effects on the integumentary colour palette. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*
46
47 682 *Society B: Biological Sciences* **372**: 20160536.
48
49
50 683 **Stapley J & Whiting MJ. 2006.** Ultraviolet signals fighting ability in a lizard. *Biology*
51
52 684 *Letters* **2**: 169–172.
53
54
55 685 **Svensson PA & Wong BBM. 2011.** Carotenoid-based signals in behavioural ecology: A
56
57 686 review. *Behaviour* **148**: 131–189.
58
59 687 **Tibbetts EA. 2014.** The evolution of honest communication: Integrating social and
60

- 1
2
3 688 physiological costs of ornamentation. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* **54**: 578–590.
- 4
5 689 **Tibbetts EA & Izzo A. 2010.** Social punishment of dishonest signalers caused by mismatch
6
7 690 between signal and behavior. *Current Biology* **20**: 1637–1640.
- 8
9 691 **Vehrencamp SL. 2001.** Is song-type matching a conventional signal of aggressive intentions?
10
11 692 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **268**: 1637–1642.
- 12
13 693 **Weaver RJ, Koch RE & Hill GE. 2017.** What maintains signal honesty in animal colour
14
15 694 displays used in mate choice? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B:*
16
17 695 *Biological Sciences* **372**: 20160343.
- 18
19 696 **Webster MS, Ligon RA & Leighton GM. 2018.** Social costs are an underappreciated force
20
21 697 for honest signalling in animal aggregations. *Animal Behaviour* **143**: 167–176.
- 22
23 698 **White TE. 2020.** Structural colours reflect individual quality : a meta-analysis. *Biology*
24
25 699 *Letters* **16**: 20200001.
- 26
27 700 **Whiting MJ, Nagy K a & Bateman PW. 2003.** Evolution and maintenance of social status-
28
29 701 signaling badges. In: *Lizard social behavior.*, 47—82.
- 30
31 702 **Wilson RS & Angilletta MJ. 2015.** Dishonest signaling during aggressive interactions:
32
33 703 Theory and Empirical Evidence. In: *Animal Signaling and Function: An Integrative*
34
35 704 *Approach.*, 205–227.
- 36
37 705 **Zahavi A. 1975.** Mate selection - A selection for a handicap. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*
38
39 706 **53**: 205–214.
- 40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Reflectance spectra resulting from the different UV treatments of our experimental UV treatments applied on a single individual so that the spectral variations represented are only due to the experimental treatments. Small cheaters were UV-enhanced using a light orange marker pen. Small honest males were not manipulated. Large cheaters were UV-reduced using a mix of UV-blocking inorganic agents and a fat solution. Large honest males were treated with a fat solution only.

423x352mm (72 x 72 DPI)



Violin plots including the mean and standard errors of the aggression score (A) and the submission score (B) of focal males according to the opponent body size and UV treatment. Aggression and submission scores were calculated by adding the aggressive and submissive behaviours, respectively, weighted by their coefficient (coef.1 from table 1). UV signals were reduced in large cheaters but enhanced in small cheaters. Levels of significance are indicated ($p < 0.05$ *, $p < 0.01$ **, $p < 0.001$ ***).

625x352mm (72 x 72 DPI)

Table 1: List and descriptions of the different behaviours displayed by male *Zootoca vivipara* and their associated coefficient used to calculate scores. Coef.1 corresponds to the first set of coefficients that we assigned to the behaviours and consider as the most realistic ranking. Coef.2 and Coef.3 are two additional sets of coefficients that vary slightly from Coef.1 to examine how coefficient assignment affect our results.

Scores	Behaviours	Description	Coef.1	Coef.2	Coef.3
Aggression score	Approach	Reduce distance with rival	1	1	1
	Chase	Quickly follows fleeing rival	2	2	2
	Lunge	Hits rival with closed mouth	3	3	3
	Retaliation	Lunge in response to rival approach or lunge	3	3	3
	Bite	Holds rival for < 2 s	4	3	4
	Bite hold	Holds rival for > 2 s	5	3	4
Submission score	Tail wagging	Wagging movements of the tail	1	1	1
	Burry	Number of times a lizard burry itself into the soil substrate	2	1	2
	Escape	Rapid movement away from the rival	3	1	2
Other variables	Basking duration	Time spent basking on the wooden spot	-	-	-
	Wall-scratching duration	Time spent scratching the walls of the arena	-	-	-

The role of social costs as a mechanism enforcing the honesty of ultraviolet signals in a lizard

1 **Supplementary information S1 - Social costs on dishonest UV signals**

2

3 Test statistics resulting from our models performed to investigate whether social costs are
 4 associated with signal honesty. Estimates \pm standard error and the p-value of each predictor
 5 are indicated. These models took the form $response \sim opponent\ size * opponent\ honesty +$
 6 $bite\ force + random\ intercept\ factors$. Random factors were always the ID of focal males and
 7 trial order. The term ‘interaction’ means the two-way interaction between ‘opponent size’ and
 8 ‘opponent honesty’. Levels of significance are indicated (* < 0.05 , ** < 0.01 , *** < 0.001).

9

10 Table S1. Coefficient for each predictor and response variable.

Predictors	Aggression score	Submission score	Basking duration	Wall-scratching duration
Bite Force	0.18 ± 0.11 P = 0.101	-0.05 ± 0.14 P = 0.710	0.12 ± 0.12 P = 0.334	0.12 ± 0.15 P = 0.418
Opponent honesty	0.20 ± 0.08 P = 0.012*	0.51 ± 0.10 P < 0.001***	-0.39 ± 0.23 P = 0.100	-0.17 ± 0.19 P = 0.385
Opponent size	0.22 ± 0.09 P = 0.009**	-0.22 ± 0.12 P = 0.055	-0.29 ± 0.24 P = 0.218	-0.16 ± 0.20 P = 0.411
Interaction	-0.33 ± 0.12 P = 0.004**	-0.73 ± 0.16 P < 0.001***	0.60 ± 0.33 P = 0.077	0.19 ± 0.28 P = 0.499

11

12

13

14 **Supplementary information S2 – Contest outcome in control interactions**

15 Results of the model selection procedure taking into account only the interactions between
 16 focal males and control opponents and excluding manipulated opponents. Table S2 provides
 17 the best models ($\Delta AICc < 2$) and the null model for each response variable obtained from our
 18 model selection procedure involving a total of 64 models. We also provide the AICc score,

60

The role of social costs as a mechanism enforcing the honesty of ultraviolet signals in a lizard

19 the $\Delta AICc$, and the weight of each one of the best models. Table S3 summarises the
 20 conditional model averaging and indicates the estimates \pm the adjusted standard error and the
 21 p value of each predictor. When the predictor *Null* is indicated, it corresponds to the null
 22 model in which no predictors were added. These models were in the form $response \sim$
 23 $predictors + random\ intercept\ factors$. Random factors were always ID of the focal male and
 24 trial order.

26 Table S2. Best models for each response variable.

Response	Predictors	AICc	$\Delta AICc$	Weight
Aggression score	Bite Force	374.07	0.00	0.16
	Bite Force + UV _{chroma}	375.30	1.23	0.09
	Bite Force + Opponent UV _{intensity}	375.61	1.44	0.08
	Bite Force + UV _{intensity}	375.71	1.64	0.07
	<i>Null</i>	377.81	3.74	0.02
Submission score	Opponent UV _{intensity}	348.57	0.00	0.23
	Opponent UV _{intensity} + UV _{intensity}	350.36	1.78	0.09
	<i>Null</i>	354.55	5.98	0.01
Basking duration	Opponent UV _{chroma} + Bite Force	154.89	0.00	0.09
	Opponent UV _{chroma} + Bite Force + UV _{intensity}	155.62	0.73	0.06
	Bite Force	155.72	0.83	0.06
	Bite Force + Opponent Body Size	156.16	1.28	0.05
	Bite Force + UV _{intensity}	156.24	1.35	0.05
	Bite Force + Opponent Body Size + UV _{intensity}	156.77	1.89	0.04
	Opponent UV _{chroma}	156.85	1.96	0.03
<i>Null</i>	157.20	2.32	0.03	
Wall- scratching duration	UV _{intensity}	136.69	0.00	0.18
	Opponent Body Size + UV _{intensity}	138.05	1.36	0.09
	UV _{chroma} + UV _{intensity}	138.27	1.58	0.08
	<i>Null</i>	140.44	3.75	0.03

28 Table S3. Conditional model-averaged coefficient ($\beta \pm se$), p -value, and sum of weights (sw)
 29 for each predictor and response variable.

The role of social costs as a mechanism enforcing the honesty of ultraviolet signals in a lizard

Predictors	Aggression score	Submission score	Basking duration	Wall-scratching duration
UV _{chroma}	0.15 ± 0.12	-0.11 ± 0.23	0.12 ± 0.17	-0.21 ± 0.17
	P = 0.249	P = 0.626	P = 0.503	P = 0.218
	sw = 0.36	sw = 0.23	sw = 0.26	sw = 0.30
UV _{intensity}	0.08 ± 0.11	0.24 ± 0.23	-0.22 ± 0.17	0.47 ± 0.17
	P = 0.452	P = 0.297	P = 0.183	P = 0.006**
	sw = 0.27	sw = 0.29	sw = 0.43	sw = 0.87
Opponent UV _{chroma}	0.04 ± 0.14	-0.04 ± 0.15	-0.19 ± 0.14	0.08 ± 0.20
	P = 0.771	P = 0.818	P = 0.186	P = 0.682
	sw = 0.23	sw = 0.23	sw = 0.47	sw = 0.25
Opponent UV _{intensity}	0.13 ± 0.14	0.26 ± 0.12	-0.06 ± 0.14	0.05 ± 0.11
	P = 0.357	P = 0.038*	P = 0.652	P = 0.641
	sw = 0.30	sw = 0.94	sw = 0.23	sw = 0.22
Opponent size	0.11 ± 0.28	-0.24 ± 0.20	-0.19 ± 0.31	-0.34 ± 0.25
	P = 0.703	P = 0.239	P = 0.554	P = 0.167
	sw = 0.23	sw = 0.25	sw = 0.33	sw = 0.32
Bite Force	0.29 ± 0.11	-0.06 ± 0.24	0.31 ± 0.16	0.04 ± 0.17
	P = 0.010*	P = 0.812	P = 0.059	P = 0.838
	sw = 0.84	sw = 0.23	sw = 0.66	sw = 0.22

30

31

32

33