



HAL
open science

When the mean no longer matters: developmental diet affects behavioral variation but not population averages in the house cricket (*Acheta domesticus*)

Raphaël Royauté, Ned A Dochtermann

► To cite this version:

Raphaël Royauté, Ned A Dochtermann. When the mean no longer matters: developmental diet affects behavioral variation but not population averages in the house cricket (*Acheta domesticus*). *Behavioral Ecology*, 2017, 28, pp.337 - 345. 10.1093/beheco/arw164 . hal-03955457

HAL Id: hal-03955457

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03955457>

Submitted on 22 Mar 2023

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.

Copyright

1 **When the mean no longer matters: developmental diet affects behavioral**
2 **variation but not population averages in the house cricket (*Acheta domesticus*)**

3

4 Raphaël Royauté ^{a*} and Ned A. Dochtermann ^a

5 ^a Department of Biological Sciences; North Dakota State University

6 * corresponding author: raphael.royaute@gmail.com (701-231-8993)

7

8

9

10

11 Abbreviated title: Diet effects on personality differences

12

13 **ABSTRACT**

14 Despite recent progress elucidating the genetic basis for behavioral variation, the effects of the
15 developmental environment on the maintenance and generation of behavioral variation across
16 multiple traits remains poorly resolved. We investigated how nutritional status during
17 development affected behavioral variation and covariance between activity in an open field test
18 and response to cues of predator presence in the house cricket (*Acheta domesticus*). We provided
19 98 juvenile crickets with either a high or low quality diet during development throughout which
20 we measured body mass, activity in a modified open-field and response to predator excreta twice
21 every week for three weeks. Diet quality affected growth rate but not average activity or
22 response to cues of predator presence, nor the correlation between the two. However,
23 repeatability (τ) in response to cues of predator presence was reduced by 0.24 in individuals
24 exposed to the high quality diet versus the low quality diet. Larger individuals also increased
25 their response to predator cues when reared on a high quality diet, suggesting negative feedbacks
26 between growth rate and antipredator behaviors. Our results also indicate that changes in the
27 developmental environment are not sufficient to collapse behavioral syndromes, suggesting a
28 genetic link between activity and predator cue response in house crickets, and that nutritional
29 stress early in life can lead to more consistent behavioral responses when individuals faced
30 predatory threats. Our results demonstrate that subtle differences in the quality of the
31 environment experienced early in life can influence how individuals negotiate behavioral and
32 life-history trade-offs later in life.

33 **Key-words** Activity, animal personality, antipredator response, behavioral variation,
34 behavioral syndromes, permanent environment, developmental conditions, diet quality, house
35 crickets

36

37 INTRODUCTION

38 The environment organisms experience during development can have a considerable influence
39 on phenotypic expression. For example, individuals are primed to adjust their phenotype to
40 developmental cues through epigenetic changes (Ledón-Rettig et al. 2012; Weaver et al. 2004)
41 which can have long-term consequences on morphology, physiology, and behavior (Kasumovic
42 2013; Snell-Rood 2013; West-Eberhard 2003). Understanding the contribution of the
43 developmental environment to phenotypic expression is therefore fundamental to understanding
44 the generation of *stable individual differences* in behavior (i.e. animal personality and behavioral
45 syndromes, Réale et al. 2007; Sih et al. 2004a; Sih et al. 2004b).

46 Personality variation arises from the combined influence of genetic and environmental
47 factors (Dingemanse and Dochtermann 2014, Han and Dingemanse 2015) with each accounting
48 for around 50% of observed personality variation (Dochtermann et al. 2015). A large part of
49 personality research has focused its attention on quantifying the genetic inheritance of behavioral
50 variation (Taylor et al. 2012), its fitness consequences (Bergeron et al. 2013), and implications
51 for a population's evolutionary trajectories (Dochtermann and Dingemanse 2013). However,
52 these areas of attention largely deal with ultimate causes and consequences of personality
53 variation and behavioral syndromes and as such are fundamentally multi-generational topics. In
54 contrast, variation in the environment an individual experiences during development—such as
55 food abundance, food quality, conspecific density, or presence of predator cues—typically
56 operate within the life-time of individuals.

57 Focusing on how within-lifetime processes affect the expression of behavioral variation is
58 necessary because differences in early experiences may place individuals along different life-
59 history trajectories in interaction with their behavioral types (Buss and Greiling 1999; Carere et

60 al. 2005). Since changes in the expression of a behavioral phenotype are often associated with
61 costs (reviewed by Snell-Rood 2013), such changes might be restricted to sensitive periods
62 during early development (Groothuis and Trillmich 2011). Manipulative studies have identified
63 many of the developmental conditions that influence the expression of behaviors (diet quality:
64 Noguera et al. 2015, immune challenge: Butler et al. 2012; predation pressure: Niemelä et al.
65 2012b; access to shelter: Bengston and Jandt 2014; conspecific cues: DiRienzo et al. 2012;
66 Niemelä et al. 2012a; physical and social environment: Liedtke et al. 2015). Most of these
67 studies, however, focus strictly on changes in the population average while effects on behavioral
68 variation *in and of itself* remain largely ignored (but see DiRienzo et al. 2015). This is a missed
69 opportunity because determining the effects of developmental conditions on behavioral variation
70 can shed light on the set of factors that promote the generation of stable individual differences
71 (Duckworth 2010; Han and Dingemanse 2015; Jandt et al. 2014; Stamps and Groothuis 2010)

72 The developmental environment can also create conditions by which morphological and
73 behavioral variation dynamically interact with each other via feedback loops. For example, diet
74 quality impacts growth rates (Hunt et al. 2005b) and resulting morphological differences can in
75 turn affect behavioral and life history strategies (Lee et al. 2015; Metcalfe and Monaghan 2001).
76 Feedback loops connecting behavior with an individual's morphology (e.g. condition or other
77 state variables, *sensu* Houston and McNamara 1999) can then affect the expression of behavioral
78 variation within a population. Under a negative feedback scenario, if individuals with access to
79 higher quality or more food are larger or have positive energy balances, they are expected to
80 engage in asset protection (Clark 1994; Clark and Mangel 2000) and limit the amount of risk-
81 taking behaviors over time. This behavioral change is then expected to reduce the amount of
82 personality variation observed over time (Dall et al. 2004; Luttbeg and Sih 2010). In a positive

83 feedback scenario, such as state-dependent safety (Luttbeg and Sih 2010), individuals with
84 higher body-sizes or more positive energy balance are less likely to be captured by predators and
85 can increase their foraging effort under predation risk, in turn increasing their state value. Such a
86 feedback loop is again expected to increase the amount of among-individual variation present
87 within a population and lead to stable behavioral differences (Luttbeg and Sih 2010). While
88 state-dependent models of personality have been extensively investigated through theoretical and
89 conceptual models (Dall et al. 2004; Luttbeg and Sih 2010; Montiglio and Royauté 2014; Sih et
90 al. 2015; Wolf et al. 2007), they remain poorly studied empirically (but see Mathot et al. 2011).
91 In the absence of direct tests, state-dependent feedback can be indicated by among-individual
92 state-based differences in behavior (Sih et al. 2015).

93 State-dependent feedback loops and their effects on behavioral variation are further
94 complicated by the fact that behavioral responses are frequently integrated within behavioral
95 syndromes (Sih et al. 2004 a,b). Because they are generated in part through genetic correlations
96 (Dochtermann and Roff 2010; Dochtermann 2011; Han and Dingemanse 2015), behavioral
97 syndromes may constrain evolutionary responses (Dochtermann and Dingemanse 2013) and may
98 prevent populations from reaching adaptive peaks if behavioral syndromes are robust to
99 environmental variability. There is, however, considerable variation among organisms and
100 within populations in the behaviors associated within a syndrome, often depending on
101 environmental conditions (Bell 2005; Bell and Sih 2007; Dingemanse et al. 2007; Royauté et al.
102 2014, 2015a). Unfortunately, despite the stability of behavioral syndromes over multiple life-
103 stages having been well studied (Brodin 2009; Sinn et al. 2008; Wilson and Krause 2012), the
104 developmental characteristics that shape the emergence of syndromes are poorly understood
105 (Han and Dingemanse 2015).

106 Here we investigated how variation in a single component of the developmental
107 environment, diet quality, influenced subsequent variation in and correlations among body mass,
108 activity, and response to cues of predator presence in juvenile house crickets (*Acheta*
109 *domesticus*). Specifically, we aimed to answer the following questions: (1) Does variation in diet
110 quality generate different developmental trajectories in growth rates, activity, and response to
111 cues of predator presence? (2) Does diet quality increase or decrease body mass and behavioral
112 variation? (3) Does diet quality affect the strength of correlations between morphological and
113 behavioral traits? At the population average level, we expected a low quality diet to decrease
114 growth rate and, as a result, increase individual's propensity to exhibit risky behaviors in order to
115 meet energetic demands (state-dependent safety and starvation avoidance principles, Luttbegg and
116 Sih 2010; Figure 1a). Here, this would translate into higher activity levels and a higher
117 propensity to ignore the presence of predatory cues. In contrast, we expected individuals fed a
118 high quality diet to increase their growth rate and avoid risky situations through the asset
119 protection principle (Clark 1994; Luttbegg and Sih 2010; Figure 1b). For effects on trait
120 covariance, we predicted a negative correlation between activity and antipredator response in
121 both treatments since the patterns of effect of growth rates on these traits are opposite and
122 symmetrical across diet quality treatments (Figure 1). We also predicted that due to the cost of
123 plasticity, individuals fed a low quality diet would decrease the amount of behavioral plasticity
124 (measured here as the residual within-individual variance V_R —*sensu* Westneat et al. 2015—
125 although here this measure conflates measurement error, organismal error, and plasticity).
126 Finally, since individuals would be more constrained in terms of energy allocation we also
127 expected a “ceiling effect” on among-individual variation (V_{ID}) such that V_{ID} in body mass
128 would be lower in the low quality diet treatment.

129

130 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

131 **House cricket rearing and diet preparation**

132 We purchased one-week old *Acheta domesticus* from Fluker's Farm (Port Allen, LA, USA).

133 Crickets were housed individually in 0.71L containers and provided with *ad libitum* food and

134 water, as well as pieces of egg carton for shelter. All individuals were maintained under a 12:12

135 light/dark photoperiod. Individuals were fed a standard laboratory diet and allowed to habituate

136 to their containers for a minimum of seven days before being randomly assigned to either a high

137 or low quality diet (Table 1) and beginning behavioral trials.

138 We varied diet quality by producing food pellets baked from high protein fish flakes

139 (high quality diet, TetraMin Plus) and cellulose mixed with fish flakes (low quality diet, two

140 parts cellulose to one part fish flakes). Thus the nutritive quality of the high quality diet was 3

141 times higher than that of the low quality diet (Table 1). The use of non-nutritive cellulose also

142 imposed gut limitations on intake, preventing individuals in the low quality diet treatment from

143 circumventing diet quality differences. Food pellets were produced by mixing ground fish flakes

144 with water or cellulose and water and cooking the mixture in a Plexiglas mold at 60°C for 12h

145 following Hunt et al. (2005). A preliminary study completed on a subset of 40 crickets (20 low

146 quality, 20 high quality) showed substantial differences in growth rates between the two diets

147 after 10 days of treatment (diet \times day interaction, $P < 0.05$) (Figure S1). Because these crickets

148 originate from captive populations, a direct comparison with their wild diet is difficult. However,

149 the low quality diet treatment provided considerably lower energy than our standard laboratory

150 diet (ground Purina chick starter chow, 2.88 cal/g, Purina Mills®, St Louis, MO, U.S.A.; Table

151 1).

152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174

Behavioral tests

To test whether diet quality affected patterns of behavioral variance and covariance, we recorded individuals' activity levels in a modified open-field arena (obstacle course assay) and response to diluted gecko excreta (response to a cue of predator response assay). Behavioral testing began within one week of arrival and testing occurred between 1 October 2014 and 3 March 2015. Due to logistical constraints, crickets were assayed in batches of 20 individuals with 10 individuals randomly assigned to either the high or low diet quality treatments. Five separate batches were sequentially reared and assayed and "batch" was included in all analyses (see below) to statistically account for any potential effects on average behavior. Behavioral trials for batches 1 – 5 began on 1 October 2014, 11 November 2014, 12 January 2015, 27 January 2015, and 6 February 2015 respectively. In order to minimize potential carry-over effects from exposure to cues of predator presence, the obstacle course assay was always conducted first followed by testing an individual's antipredator response. We thoroughly cleaned each arena in between trials with 70% ethanol wipes to avoid chemical trace of conspecifics from influencing the behavior of subsequently tested individuals. We recorded mass to the nearest mg immediately after the antipredator assay. This procedure was repeated twice every week over a three week period for a maximum of six behavioral measures per individual per assay. In total we were able to record the behavioral responses of 98 individuals (low quality diet: n = 45, high quality diet: n = 53) with a total of 446 individual observations (low quality diet: n = 198, high quality diet: n = 248; Table S1). Due to mortality during the course of development, particularly in the low quality diet, only 35% of individuals survived until sexual characteristics were noticeable. We thus did not include sex in analyses.

175

176 *Obstacle course activity*

177 Activity was measured in a modified open field test, in which individuals had to navigate around
178 multiple obstacles to explore the entire arena. The arena was 60 cm × 60 cm × 15 cm high,
179 constructed of sealed plastic, and had a Plexiglas lid. This obstacle course behavioral protocol
180 has previously been used with *A. domesticus* to evaluate exploratory behavior (Dochtermann and
181 Nelson 2014) and behavior-physiology correlations (Royauté et al. 2015b). Individuals were left
182 to rest for 30s in a 5 cm diameter container introduced into the lower right section of the arena
183 (Z1, Figure S2a). We then allowed the cricket to move freely through the arena for 220 seconds.
184 We calculated the total distance travelled through the arena (in cm) with Ethovision X (Noldus
185 Information Technology).

186

187 *Response to cues of predator presence*

188 Considerable research with a variety of cricket species has examined latency to emerge from
189 shelter following disturbance under the assumption that this latency relates to anti-predator
190 behavior (e.g. Hedrick 2000; Hedrick and Kortet 2012; Kortet et al. 2007; Niemelä et al. 2015).
191 Such latencies are ecologically reasonable measures of anti-predator behavior, particularly for
192 males, but are not the only means by which crickets assess or respond to potential predator
193 presence. For example, over the last decade it has been repeatedly demonstrated that Gryllidae
194 crickets respond to chemical cues of predators via either escape or avoidance behaviors (Kortet
195 and Hedrick 2004; Storm and Lima 2008; Storm and Lima 2010). Response to chemical cues has
196 likewise been used to measure response to potential predation threat in a variety of invertebrates

197 and vertebrates (e.g. Herman and Valone 2000; Dochtermann et al. 2012; Nelson et al. 2013;
198 Patterson et al. 2013).

199 That crickets respond to chemical cues of predator presence should not be surprising as
200 chemosensory cues are known to be important and often sufficient and/or necessary to illicit a
201 variety of behavioral responses. The importance of chemical cues to crickets has been
202 demonstrated, for example, in male-male agonistic interactions (e.g. Iwasaki and Katagiri 2008),
203 in female assessment of male quality (e.g. Kortet and Hedrick 2005), self-reference to prevent
204 repeated matings with the same individuals (e.g. Weddle et al. 2013), and, as mentioned above,
205 in eliciting response to potential predator presence.

206 To measure response to cues of potential predator presence here we collected excreta
207 from two subadult and one adult leopard gecko (*Eublepharis macularius*) that were fed a mixed
208 diet of crickets (*A. domesticus*) and mealworms (*Tenebrio molitor*). Leopard geckos were housed
209 according to North Dakota State University IACUC standards (Protocol number: A14006).
210 Collected excreta was ground weekly and diluted with deionized water (1 ml H₂O : 5 mg
211 excreta). This solution was then applied to 15 cm diameter Whatman filter paper discs (Figure
212 S2b) with a 5 cm diameter central cutout that allowed crickets to be left to rest unexposed to the
213 predatory cue. Each predatory disc was left to dry for a minimum of 2 h and was stored at 4 °C
214 before trials. We inserted the predatory cue disc at the bottom of a 15cm diameter arena and left
215 the cricket to rest for 30 s under a 5 cm diameter cup in the non-treated central cutout. We then
216 allowed the cricket to move freely for 220 s and estimated the distance travelled (in cm) through
217 Ethovision. Previous experiments with this protocol showed that crickets had heightened activity
218 levels in presence of diluted gecko excreta compared to a water control ($t_{48} = 2.05$, $p = 0.046$;

219 Figure S3), thus greater activity during anti-predator trials was interpreted as greater
220 responsiveness to predator cues.

221

222 **Data analysis**

223 All analyses were conducted in R 3.2.2 (R Development Core Team 2013) with the package
224 MCMCglmm for Bayesian mixed models (Hadfield 2010).

225

226 *Effect of diet quality on average trait value and trait repeatability*

227 We estimated the effects of diet type and development on activity, response to cues of predator
228 presence, and mass using Bayesian univariate mixed models. Mass was \log_{10} -transformed and all
229 response variables were expressed as standard deviation units. The third batch of crickets had
230 stronger mortality due to winter shipment and we included a three-way interaction for diet type,
231 day (centered) since placed on either the low or high quality diet, and batch number. Additional
232 fixed effects included condition (injured or not), time of testing, temperature (expressed as
233 among and within individual values; van de Pol and Wright 2009), and whether the cricket
234 crawled under the filter paper during the antipredator response assay to control for potential
235 confounds and “pseudo-repeatability” (Nakagawa and Schielzeth 2010; Westneat et al. 2011).
236 Individual identity was included as a random effect and variance components were estimated
237 separately by diet treatment to allow comparison of trait repeatabilities (Royauté et al. 2015a).
238 We specified a Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) chain with 1.3×10^6 iterations, 300000
239 burn-in period and a thinning interval of 1000. We tested the influence of prior type on our
240 results by comparing results from an inverse-Wishart prior to those estimated with maximum

241 likelihood. Prior type had very little influence on our estimates and we present the results based
242 on the inverse-Wishart prior.

243 MCMC approaches to fitting mixed models, like used above, do not allow classic tests of
244 “significance” Thus, to test for the “significance” of the diet × day × batch effects on body size
245 and behaviors we employed two approaches. First, we specified seven *a priori* models (Table
246 S3) of different ways in which our predictor variables might have affected body size or
247 behaviors. The models we evaluated differed in the complexity of interactions included, ranging
248 from a full model including the three-way interaction of diet × day × batch, all two-way
249 interactions, and all main effects to reduced models that included single main effects. For these
250 different models, we then compared their “Deviance Information Criterion values” (DIC).
251 Models with lower DIC have better support and models with $\Delta\text{DIC} < 4$ were considered as
252 statistically equivalent. This procedure is analogous to the Likelihood Ratio tests for fixed effects
253 performed with frequentist mixed models (Zuur 2009). Second, to assess the “significance” of
254 particular terms we examined whether individual model terms as estimated had 95% credibility
255 intervals that overlapped zero.

256 We calculated repeatability (τ) as the posterior mode of $\tau = V_{\text{ID}} / (V_{\text{ID}} + V_{\text{R}})$ with V_{ID}
257 being the among-individual variance and V_{R} the within-individual (or residual) variance. We
258 also calculated the MCMC posterior distribution of differences in repeatability between the diets
259 ($\Delta\tau = \tau_{\text{HighQual}} - \tau_{\text{LowQual}}$). This metric provides an estimation of the effect size for the difference
260 in repeatability (Royauté et al. 2014, 2015a). Here positive values of $\Delta\tau$ indicate greater
261 repeatability in the high quality diet treatment. “Significance” and inference of this difference
262 was based on the proportion of posterior estimates that excluded zero. We repeated this
263 procedure on each variance component (V_{ID} and V_{R}) to determine whether changes in

264 repeatability were linked to changes in any specific variance component. Importantly estimates
265 of values like $\Delta\tau$ may differ from a comparison of $\tau_{\text{HighQual}} - \tau_{\text{LowQual}}$ because the former is
266 calculated directly from each MCMC iteration.

267

268 *Effect of diet quality on behavioral correlations*

269 We tested whether diet quality affected correlations among activity, antipredator response, and
270 mass by specifying a multivariate mixed model which was fit separately for each diet type. We
271 included all three traits as response variables and used individuals as random effects. All fixed
272 effects and model conditions were as above. This procedure allowed us to estimate and compare
273 among- (r_{ID}) and within-individual (r_{WI}) correlation matrices between diet types (following
274 Dingemanse and Dochtermann 2013). As above, we compared the magnitude of the difference in
275 posterior estimates of correlation coefficients between the treatments ($\Delta r = r_{\text{HighQual}} - r_{\text{LowQual}}$)
276 and base our inferences on the proportion of estimates excluding zero.

277

278 **RESULTS**

279 **Effect of diet quality on average trait value and trait variation**

280 Diet quality positively affected growth rate (diet \times day interaction, estimate \pm CI; $\beta = 0.04 \pm$
281 [0.03:0.05]) but had no effect on average activity ($\beta = 0.00 \pm [-0.05:0.05]$) or response to cues of
282 predator presence ($\beta = 0.02 \pm [-0.03:0.08]$) (Figure 2, Table S2). These inferences are consistent
283 with our model comparison results which indicated similar patterns as none of the best models
284 had substantially higher support than the null model for behavioral data ($\Delta\text{DIC} < 4$, Table S3).
285 We did, however, detect a significant three-way interaction between diet, day, and batch number

286 on body mass, indicating that the positive effect of the high quality diet on growth rate varied
287 among batches (Table S3, Figure S4).

288 The repeatability of response to cues of predator presence was lower in the high quality
289 diet (low quality: $\tau = 0.36 \pm [0.21; 0.53]$, high quality: $\tau = 0.16 \pm [0.07; 0.27]$, $\Delta\tau = -0.24$, $P =$
290 0.01 ; Figure 3), but no significant differences were detected in repeatability for activity or mass
291 (activity: $\Delta\tau = -0.02$, $P = 0.43$; mass: $\Delta\tau = 0.03$, $P = 0.27$; Figure 3, Table S2). The observed
292 changes in the repeatability of antipredator response were more strongly influenced by an
293 increase in within-individual variation in the high quality diet rather than a decrease in among-
294 individual variance (among-individual variance: $\Delta V_{ID} = -0.18$, $P = 0.07$; within-individual
295 variance: $\Delta V_R = 0.27$, $P = 0.008$; Figure 3 and Figure S5). This suggests that individuals
296 provided with a high quality diet were more inconsistent across repeated testing in their response
297 to predator cues while individuals provided with a poor diet quality remained relatively
298 consistent over the duration of the experiment.

299

300 **Effect of diet quality on behavioral correlations**

301 We found no evidence for a change in behavioral syndrome structure mediated by diet quality.
302 Instead, activity and antipredator response were positively correlated with similar effect sizes in
303 both treatments (low quality: $r_{ID} = 0.39 \pm [0.05; 0.71]$, $r_{WI} = 0.31 \pm [0.18; 0.47]$; high quality: r_{ID}
304 $= 0.31 \pm [0.02; 0.64]$, $r_{WI} = 0.40 \pm [0.27; 0.51]$, Figure 4). In the high quality diet, larger
305 individuals had a greater antipredator response while this association was not detected in the low
306 quality diet (i.e. body mass \times antipredator correlation: low quality: $r_{ID} = 0.01 \pm [-0.41; 0.33]$;
307 high quality: $r_{ID} = 0.39 \pm [0.02; 0.62]$; $\Delta r_{ID} = 0.38$, $P = 0.04$) (Figure 4, Table S4).

308

309 **DISCUSSION**

310 Our aim here was to test whether the developmental environment experienced by individuals
311 affects behavioral means, behavioral variation, and the covariance between activity and response
312 to cues of predator response. We did find evidence of diet manipulation affecting multiple levels
313 of trait variation however those patterns often contradicted our theoretical predictions (Figure 1).
314 Besides greater growth (and thus mass) for the high versus low quality diet, we predicted
315 decreased activity and increased response to predator cues in the high versus low quality diets.
316 We also had initially predicted that among-individual variation in mass would be lower in the
317 low quality diet versus the high quality diet and that within-individual variation in behaviors
318 would be higher in the high quality diet than the low, resulting in greater behavioral repeatability
319 in the low quality diet. Although a higher diet quality increased cricket growth rate, we found
320 surprisingly little effect on either average activity or response to predator cues. Further, we found
321 decreased within-individual variation—evidence of lower behavioral plasticity in the low quality
322 diet—but only for the response to cues of predator presence. Finally, the activity-predator cue
323 response behavioral syndrome was not affected by diet quality but the sign of the correlation was
324 opposite to that expected. This suggests that the developmental diet, as manipulated here, can
325 have non-intuitive consequences on trait expression when hierarchical patterns of variation are
326 taken into account.

327 As expected, increasing diet quality resulted in faster growth rates and thus greater body
328 mass. However, this change in population growth rate did not have consequences on population
329 average behaviors. This led us to generally reject our prediction that individuals in a low quality
330 diet would follow the state-dependent safety principle while individuals in the high quality diet
331 would follow an asset protection model (but see below). Instead, the influence of diet quality had

332 stronger consequences on trait repeatability and covariance. That diet affected the magnitude of
333 behavioral variation in the absence of a population-level behavioral change is particularly
334 intriguing. Because individuals were maintained in their treatments for only 30 days, it is
335 possible that the effects of diet quality manifest themselves quickly on individual variation but
336 require longer exposure before population shifts are detected. In such a case, maintaining
337 individuals on the different diet regimes over the entirety of development and maturity would be
338 necessary to determine the long-term consequences of diet type on activity and response to cues
339 of predator presence.

340 Crickets reared on a lower quality diet demonstrated a higher repeatability of their
341 response to cues of predator presence but not their activity. As expected, plasticity in responses
342 to cues of predator presence were favored only when individuals had access to sufficient
343 nutritive resources (i.e. the high quality diet) and individuals under nutritive stress exhibited
344 higher individual consistency in their responses to cues of predator presence, causing higher
345 repeatability. In addition, the largest crickets from the high quality diet treatment reduced risk-
346 taking by expressing a stronger response to cues of predator presence (Figure 4). This indicates
347 partial support for the asset protection principle—wherein individuals that accumulate more
348 assets over time (e.g. increase in body mass) preserve assets by reducing risky behaviors—
349 despite a lack of general support for the principle herein.

350 These observations lead to two important insights on the influence of diet quality on
351 behavioral variation: First, a higher diet quality and higher caloric content diet may alleviate the
352 costs to behavioral plasticity by attenuating individual trade-offs. In contrast, individuals
353 experiencing nutritive stress may face stronger allocation trade-offs due to limits on energy
354 acquisition and a higher cost of switching behavioral responses. Second, changes in diet quality

355 may have the potential to change the magnitude of state-dependent feedback loops (e.g. in this
356 case the correlation between body mass and response to cues of predator presence between the
357 two treatments), which in turn can have a profound influence on the maintenance of among-
358 individual variation. Unfortunately our experimental design only allowed us to test for the direct
359 effect of growth rate on behavior through diet manipulation and not for recursive effects of
360 behavior on growth rates. Recursive effects are expected to reduce the amount of personality
361 differences over time, because individual protecting assets would acquire resources at a lower
362 rate (Luttbegg and Sih 2010; Montiglio and Royauté 2014).

363 According to our predictions, we expected a negative among-individual correlation
364 between activity and response to cues of predator presence. However, the traits were positively
365 correlated. Because activity and response to cues of predator presence were both measured as
366 distance moved through an arena, it is possible that a positive structural correlation will be
367 present between measurements, over-riding more biologically relevant and interesting
368 relationships. However, we view this explanation as insufficient given past experiments with this
369 species. For example, movement rates of *A. domesticus* measured in different arenas can be
370 uncorrelated even if each behavior demonstrates repeatability (Dochtermann and Nelson 2014).
371 Specifically, Dochtermann and Nelson (2014) found that activity (distance moved) measured in
372 an obstacle course arena and activity (distance moved) in maze exploration trials were not
373 correlated. A more plausible explanation for our results therefore is that the activity-predator cue
374 response syndrome is robust to changes in the permanent environment as the among-individual
375 correlations did not vary between low and high quality diet treatments (Figure 4). This general
376 inference holds even if we were assaying activity in different contexts (e.g. open field trials:
377 “exploration of a control environment”, predator cue trials: “exploration of an altered

378 environment”; *sensu* Dingemanse et al. 2007). That is, even if considering activity in the
379 presence and absence of predators as separate contexts, we still demonstrated that the among-
380 individual correlation was robust to permanent environmental differences.

381 Among-individual correlations, i.e. behavioral syndromes (Dingemanse et al. 2012), are
382 generated by both additive genetic correlations and permanent environment correlations
383 (Dingemanse and Dochtermann 2013; Dingemanse and Dochtermann 2014). In our study,
384 additive genetic correlations should have been the same between the two treatments as
385 individuals were randomly assigned to the two diet types. Any differences in among-individual
386 correlations between the two treatments are therefore attributable to changes in permanent
387 environmental correlations or $\mathbf{G} \times \mathbf{E}$ effects (Han and Dingemanse 2015). That the activity-
388 predator cue response syndrome was unchanged suggests two alternative explanations: First, this
389 syndrome might be primarily underpinned by genetic correlations. Second, diet quality may have
390 little contribution to the permanent environment correlation and other environmental cues (e.g.,
391 temperature, predator presence, maternal effects) could be more influential. We view this latter
392 explanation as less likely because of the strong influence of diet quality on life-history
393 trajectories (Houslay et al. 2015; Tatar and Carey 1995), morphological (e.g. Braendle et al.
394 2006), physiological (e.g. Cruz et al. 2004), and behavioral traits (Akman et al. 2004; Tremmel
395 and Muller 2013; Wilder and Rypstra 2008) that has been demonstrated in a considerable
396 number of species, including crickets (Hunt et al. 2005a; Hunt et al. 2004; Hunt et al. 2006;
397 Zajitschek et al. 2009; Zajitschek et al. 2012).

398 As mentioned, there has been extensive research demonstrating the effects of diet and
399 condition on behavior in crickets (see above). Moreover, beyond just general condition or energy
400 availability, attention to particular stoichiometric relationships has highlighted subtle differences

401 in the effects of diet on behavior (e.g. Bertram et al. 2009; Han et al. 2016; reviewed by Han and
402 Dingemanse 2015). Our results are particularly interesting even with this existing literature for
403 several reasons. For example, despite a major difference in dietary value (Table 1), no mean
404 effects on behavior were statistically detectable. This lack of detectable effects is surprising not
405 only because of the existing literature but also given the clear predictions available from
406 conceptual and theoretical frameworks (e.g. the asset protection principle; Luttbeg and Sih
407 2010). Moreover, our approach of partitioning variation and explicitly estimating among- versus
408 within-individual variation and correlations revealed that, despite a lack of mean effects, within-
409 individual variation in response to cues of predator presence differed between the two diet
410 treatments. Most previous manipulations of diet, condition, and state have largely failed to
411 explicitly estimate these types of effects and thus have failed to detect the effect noted here (but
412 see Han et al. 2016 for a notable exception). More generally, our study shows that the outcomes
413 of state manipulation on behavioral variation and behavioral syndromes are not obvious and may
414 fail to confirm theoretical predictions. Indeed, while we found partial support for the asset
415 protection principle regarding antipredator response in the high quality diet, the changes in
416 behavioral variance were more due to an increase in behavioral plasticity than to a decrease in
417 among-individual variance contrary to our predictions. It remains unclear whether manipulating
418 state generally has stronger effects on behavioral averages, behavioral variances, or on
419 behavioral syndromes.

420

421 **Funding**

422 NAD and RR were supported by a North Dakota EPSCoR grant. RR was also supported by the
423 NDSU Department of Biological Sciences.

424

425 **Acknowledgements**

426 We thank R. Altenburg, E. Boyd, C. Garrison, P. Keefe, K. Pnewski and T. Schwab for
427 assistance with cricket rearing and data collection. We also thank two anonymous reviewers for
428 insightful comments that markedly improved the paper.

429

430 **Data Accessibility**

431 Analyses reported in this article can be reproduced using the data provided by Royauté and
432 Dochtermann (2016).

433

434 **References**

- 435 Akman C, Zhao Q, Liu X, Holmes G. 2004. Effect of food deprivation during early development
436 on cognition and neurogenesis in the rat. *Epilepsy Behav.* 5:446 - 454.
- 437 Bell AM. 2005. Behavioural differences between individuals and two populations of stickleback
438 (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*). *J Evol Biol.* 18:464-473.
- 439 Bell AM, Sih A. 2007. Exposure to predation generates personality in threespined sticklebacks
440 (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*). *Ecol Lett.* 10:828-834.
- 441 Bengston SE, Jandt JM. 2014. The development of collective personality: the ontogenetic drivers
442 of behavioral variation across groups. *Front Ecol Evol.* 2:81.
- 443 Bergeron P, Montiglio PO, Réale D, Humphries MM, Gimenez O, Garant D. 2013. Disruptive
444 viability selection on adult exploratory behaviour in eastern chipmunks. *J Evol Biol.*
445 26:766-774.
- 446 Bertram SM, Whattam EM, Visanuvimol L, Bennett R, Lauzon C, 2009. Phosphorus availability
447 influences cricket mate attraction displays. *Anim Behav* 77:525-530.
- 448 Braendle C, Davis GK, Brisson JA, Stern DL. 2006. Wing dimorphism in aphids. *Heredity.*
449 97:192-199.
- 450 Brodin T. 2009. Behavioral syndrome over the boundaries of life - carryovers from larvae to
451 adult damselfly. *Behav Ecol.* 20:30-37.
- 452 Buss DM, Greiling H. 1999. Adaptive individual differences. *J Personality.* 67:209-243.
- 453 Butler MW, Toomey MB, McGraw KJ, Rowe M. 2012. Ontogenetic immune challenges shape
454 adult personality in mallard ducks. *Proc R Soc B.* 279:326-333.
- 455 Carere C, Drent PJ, Privitera L, Koolhaas JM, Groothuis TG. 2005. Personalities in great tits,
456 *Parus major*: stability and consistency. *Anim Behav.* 70:795-805.

457 Clark CW. 1994. Antipredator behavior and the asset-protection principle. *Behav Ecol.* 5:159-
458 170.

459 Clark CW, Mangel M. 2000. *Dynamic State Variable Models in Ecology: Methods and*
460 *Applications: Methods and Applications: Oxford University Press, USA.*

461 Cruz, x, Neto A, xa, P, Bozinovic F. 2004. The Relationship between Diet Quality and Basal
462 Metabolic Rate in Endotherms: Insights from Intraspecific Analysis. *Physiological and*
463 *Biochemical Zoology: Ecological and Evolutionary Approaches.* 77:877-889.

464 Dall SRX, Houston AI, McNamara JM. 2004. The behavioural ecology of personality: consistent
465 individual differences from an adaptive perspective. *Ecol Lett.* 7:734-739.

466 Dingemanse NJ, Dochtermann NA. 2013. Quantifying individual variation in behaviour: mixed-
467 effect modelling approaches. *J Anim Ecol.* 82:39-54.

468 Dingemanse NJ, Dochtermann NA. 2014. *Individual behaviour: behavioural ecology meets*
469 *quantitative genetics: Oxford University Press.*

470 Dingemanse NJ, Dochtermann NA, Nakagawa S. 2012. Defining behavioural syndromes and the
471 role of ‘syndrome deviation’ in understanding their evolution. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol.*
472 66:1543-1548.

473 Dingemanse NJ, Wright J, Kazem AJ, Thomas DK, Hickling R, Dawnay N. 2007. Behavioural
474 syndromes differ predictably between 12 populations of three-spined stickleback. *J Anim*
475 *Ecol.* 76:1128-1138.

476 DiRienzo N, Niemelä PT, Skog A, Vainikka A, Kortet R. 2015. Juvenile pathogen exposure
477 affects the presence of personality in adult field crickets. *Front Ecol Evol.* 3:36.

478 DiRienzo N, Pruitt JN, Hedrick AV. 2012. Juvenile exposure to acoustic sexual signals from
479 conspecifics alters growth trajectory and an adult personality trait. *Anim Behav.* 84:861-
480 868.

481 Dochtermann NA, 2011. Testing Cheverud's conjecture for behavioral correlations and
482 behavioral syndromes. *Evolution* 65:1814-1820.

483 Dochtermann NA, Dingemanse NJ. 2013. Behavioral syndromes as evolutionary constraints.
484 *Behav Ecol.* 24:806-811.

485 Dochtermann NA, Jenkins SH, Swartz M, Hargett AC, 2012. The roles of competition and
486 environmental heterogeneity in the maintenance of behavioral variation. *Ecology*
487 93:1330-1339.

488 Dochtermann NA, Nelson AB. 2014. Multiple Facets of Exploratory Behavior in House Crickets
489 (*Acheta domesticus*): Split Personalities or Simply Different Behaviors? *Ethology.*
490 120:1110-1117.

491 Dochtermann NA, Roff DA, 2010. Applying a quantitative genetics framework to behavioural
492 syndrome research. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B.* 365:4013-4020.

493 Dochtermann NA, Schwab T, Sih A. 2015. The contribution of additive genetic variation to
494 personality variation: heritability of personality. *Proc R Soc B* 282.

495 Duckworth RA. 2010. Evolution of personality: developmental constraints on behavioral
496 flexibility. *The Auk.* 127:752-758.

497 Groothuis TG, Trillmich F. 2011. Unfolding personalities: the importance of studying ontogeny.
498 *Dev Psychobiol.* 53:641-655.

499 Hadfield JD. 2010. MCMC methods for multi-response generalized linear mixed models: the
500 MCMCglmm R package. *J Stat Soft.* 33:1-22.

501 Han CS, Dingemanse NJ. Effect of diet on the structure of animal personality. 2015. Front Zool.
502 12(Suppl 1):S5.

503 Han CS, Jäger HY, Dingemanse NJ. 2016. Individuality in nutritional preferences: a multi-level
504 approach in field crickets. Sci Rep. 6.

505 Hedrick AV, 2000. Crickets with extravagant mating songs compensate for predation risk with
506 extra caution. Proc R Soc B. 267:671-675.

507 Hedrick AV, Kortet R, 2012. Sex differences in the repeatability of boldness over
508 metamorphosis. Behav Ecol Sociobiol. 66:407-412.

509 Herman CS, Valone TJ, 2000. The effect of mammalian predator scent on the foraging behavior
510 of *Dipodomys merriami*. Oikos. 91:139-145.

511 Houslay TM, Hunt J, Tinsley MC, Bussière LF. 2015. Sex differences in the effects of juvenile
512 and adult diet on age-dependent reproductive effort. J Evol Biol. 28:1067-1079.

513 Houston A, McNamara J. 1999. Models of adaptive behaviour. Cambridge, UK; New York,
514 N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.

515 Hunt J, Brooks R, Jennions M. 2005a. Female mate choice as a condition - dependent life -
516 history trait. Am Nat. 166:79 - 92.

517 Hunt J, Brooks R, Jennions M, Smith M, Bentsen C, Bussiere L. 2004. High-quality male field
518 crickets invest heavily in sexual display but die young. Nature. 432:1024 - 1027.

519 Hunt J, Brooks R, Jennions Michael D. 2005b. Female Mate Choice as a Condition-Dependent
520 Life-History Trait. Am Nat. 166:79-92.

521 Hunt J, Jennions M, Spyrou N, Brooks R. 2006. Artificial selection on male longevity influences
522 age-dependent reproductive effort in the black field cricket *Teleogryllus commodus*. Am
523 Nat. 168:E72 - E86.

524 Iwasaki M, Katagiri C, 2008. Cuticular lipids and odors induce sex-specific behaviors in the
525 male cricket *Gryllus bimaculatus*. *Comp Biochem Physiol A Mol Integr Physiol*.
526 149:306-313.

527 Jandt JM, Bengston S, Pinter-Wollman N, Pruitt JN, Raine NE, Dornhaus A, Sih A. 2014.
528 Behavioural syndromes and social insects: personality at multiple levels. *Biol Rev*.
529 89:48-67.

530 Kasumovic MM. 2013. The multidimensional consequences of the juvenile environment:
531 towards an integrative view of the adult phenotype. *Anim Behav*. 85:1049-1059.

532 Kortet R, Hedrick A, 2004. Detection of the spider predator, *Hololena nedra* by naive juvenile
533 field crickets (*Gryllus integer*) using indirect cues. *Behaviour* 141:1189-1196.

534 Kortet R, Hedrick A, 2005. The scent of dominance: female field crickets use odour to predict
535 the outcome of male competition. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol*. 59:77-83.

536 Kortet R, Hedrick A, 2007. A behavioural syndrome in the field cricket *Gryllus integer*:
537 intrasexual aggression is correlated with activity in a novel environment. *Biol J Linnean*
538 *Soc* 91:475-482.

539 Ledón-Rettig CC, Richards CL, Martin LB. 2012. Epigenetics for behavioral ecologists. *Behav*
540 *Ecol:ars*145.

541 Lee W-S, Monaghan P, Metcalfe NB. 2015. Perturbations in growth trajectory due to early diet
542 affect age-related deterioration in performance. *Funct Ecol*. 30: 625-635.

543 Liedtke J, Redekop D, Schneider JM, Schuett W. 2015. Early environmental conditions shape
544 personality types in a jumping spider. *Front Ecol Evol*. 3.

545 Luttbegg B, Sih A. 2010. Risk, resources and state-dependent adaptive behavioural syndromes.
546 *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*. 365:3977-3990.

547 Mathot KJ, van den Hout PJ, Piersma T, Kempenaers B, Réale D, Dingemanse NJ. 2011.
548 Disentangling the roles of frequency-vs. state-dependence in generating individual
549 differences in behavioural plasticity. *Ecol Lett.* 14:1254-1262.

550 Metcalfe NB, Monaghan P. 2001. Compensation for a bad start: grow now, pay later? *Trends*
551 *Ecol Evol.* 16:254-260.

552 Montiglio PO, Royauté R. 2014. Contaminants as a neglected source of behavioural variation.
553 *Anim Behav.* 88:29-35.

554 Nakagawa S, Schielzeth H. 2010. Repeatability for Gaussian and non-Gaussian data: a practical
555 guide for biologists. *Biol Rev.* 85:935-956.

556 Nelson AB, Alemadi SD, Wisenden BD, 2013. Learned recognition of novel predator odour by
557 convict cichlid embryos. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol.* 67:1269-1273.

558 Niemelä P, Lattenkamp EZ, Dingemanse NJ, 2015. Personality-related survival and sampling
559 bias in wild cricket nymphs. *Behav Ecol.* 26:936-946.

560 Niemelä P, Vainikka A, Lahdenperä S, Kortet R. 2012a. Nymphal density, behavioral
561 development, and life history in a field cricket. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol.* 66:645-652.

562 Niemelä PT, Vainikka A, Hedrick AV, Kortet R. 2012b. Integrating behaviour with life history:
563 boldness of the field cricket, *Gryllus integer*, during ontogeny. *Funct Ecol.* 26:450-456.

564 Noguera JC, Metcalfe NB, Surai PF, Monaghan P. 2015. Are you what you eat? Micronutritional
565 deficiencies during development influence adult personality-related traits. *Anim Behav.*
566 101:129-140.

567 Paterson RA, Pritchard DW, Dick JT, Alexander ME, Hatcher MJ, Dunn AM, 2013. Predator
568 cue studies reveal strong trait-mediated effects in communities despite variation in
569 experimental designs. *Anim Behav.* 86:1301-1313.

570 Réale D, Reader SM, Sol D, McDougall PT, Dingemanse NJ. 2007. Integrating animal
571 temperament within ecology and evolution. *Biol Rev.* 82:291-318.

572 Royauté R, Buddle CM, Vincent C. 2014. Interpopulation variations in behavioral syndromes of
573 a jumping spider from insecticide-treated and insecticide-free orchards. *Ethology.*
574 120:127-139.

575 Royauté R, Buddle CM, Vincent C. 2015a. Under the influence: sublethal exposure to an
576 insecticide affects personality expression in a jumping spider. *Funct Ecol.* 29:962-970.

577 Royauté R, Dochtermann N. Data from: When the mean no longer matters: developmental diet
578 affects behavioral variation but not population averages in the house cricket (*Acheta*
579 *domesticus*). *Behavioral Ecology.* <http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.nv835>

580 Royauté R, Greenlee K, Baldwin M, Dochtermann NA. 2015b. Behaviour, metabolism and size:
581 phenotypic modularity or integration in *Acheta domesticus*? *Anim Behav.* 110:163-169.

582 Sih A, Bell A, Johnson JC. 2004a. Behavioral syndromes: an ecological and evolutionary
583 overview. *Trends Ecol Evol.* 19:372-378.

584 Sih A, Bell AM, Johnson JC, Ziemba RE. 2004b. Behavioral syndromes: an integrative
585 overview. *Q Rev Biol.* 79:241-277.

586 Sih A, Mathot KJ, Moirón M, Montiglio P-O, Wolf M, Dingemanse NJ. 2015. Animal
587 personality and state-behaviour feedbacks: a review and guide for empiricists. *Trends*
588 *Ecol Evol.* 30:50-60.

589 Sinn DL, Gosling SD, Moltschanowskyj NA. 2008. Development of shy/bold behaviour in squid:
590 context-specific phenotypes associated with developmental plasticity. *Anim Behav.*
591 75:433-442.

592 Snell-Rood EC. 2013. An overview of the evolutionary causes and consequences of behavioural
593 plasticity. *Anim Behav.* 85:1004-1011.

594 Stamps JA, Groothuis TGG. 2010. The development of animal personality: relevance, concepts
595 and perspectives. *Biol Rev.* 85:301-325.

596 Storm JJ, Lima SL, 2008. Predator-naïve fall field crickets respond to the chemical cues of wolf
597 spiders. *Can J Zool.* 86:1259-1263.

598 Storm JJ, Lima SL, 2010. Mothers Forewarn Offspring about Predators: A Transgenerational
599 Maternal Effect on Behavior. *Am Nat.* 175:382-390.

600 Tatar M, Carey J. 1995. Nutrition mediates reproductive trade-offs with age-specific mortality in
601 the beetle *Callosobruchus maculatus*. *Ecology.* 76:2066 - 2073.

602 Taylor RW, Boon AK, Dantzer B, RéAle D, Humphries MM, Boutin S, Gorrell JC, Coltman
603 DW, McAdam AG. 2012. Low heritabilities, but genetic and maternal correlations
604 between red squirrel behaviours. *J Evol Biol.* 25:614-624.

605 Tremmel M, Muller C. 2013. Insect personality depends on environmental conditions. *Behav*
606 *Ecol.* 24:386 - 392.

607 van de Pol M, Wright J. 2009. A simple method for distinguishing within- versus between-
608 subject effects using mixed models. *Anim Behav.* 77:753-758.

609 Weaver IC, Cervoni N, Champagne FA, D'Alessio AC, Sharma S, Seckl JR, Dymov S, Szyf M,
610 Meaney MJ. 2004. Epigenetic programming by maternal behavior. *Nat Neurosci.* 7:847-
611 854.

612 Weddle CB, Steiger S, Hamaker CG, Ower GD, Mitchell C, Sakaluk SK, Hunt J, 2013. Cuticular
613 hydrocarbons as a basis for chemosensory self - referencing in crickets: a potentially
614 universal mechanism facilitating polyandry in insects. *Ecol Lett.* 16:346-353.

615 West-Eberhard MJ. 2003. Developmental plasticity and evolution: Oxford University Press.

616 Westneat DF, Hatch MI, Wetzel DP, Ensminger AL. 2011. Individual variation in parental care
617 reaction norms: integration of personality and plasticity. *Am Nat.* 178:652-667.

618 Westneat DF, Wright J, Dingemanse NJ. 2015. The biology hidden inside residual within-
619 individual phenotypic variation. *Biol Rev.* 90:729-743.

620 Wilder S, Rypstra A. 2008. Diet quality affects mating behaviour and egg production in a wolf
621 spider. *Anim Behav.* 76:439 - 445.

622 Wilson ADM, Krause J. 2012. Personality and metamorphosis: is behavioral variation consistent
623 across ontogenetic niche shifts? *Behav Ecol.* 23:1316-1323.

624 Wolf M, van Doorn GS, Leimar O, Weissing FJ. 2007. Life-history trade-offs favour the
625 evolution of animal personalities. *Nature.* 447:581-584.

626 Zajitschek F, Hunt J, Jennions M, Hall M, Brooks R. 2009. Effects of juvenile and adult diet on
627 ageing and reproductive effort of male and female black field crickets *Teleogryllus*
628 *commodus*. *Funct Ecol.* 23:602 - 611.

629 Zajitschek F, Lailvaux S, Dessmann J, Brooks R. 2012. Diet, sex, and death in field crickets.
630 *Ecology and Evolution.* 2:1627 - 1636.

631 Zuur AF. 2009. Mixed effects models and extensions in ecology with R. New York; London:
632 Springer.

633

634 **Figures**

635 **Figure 1.** Expected effects generated by changes in diet quality on growth rate,
636 activity/exploration and antipredator response. (a) A low quality diet is expected to reduce
637 growth rate and thus increase risk taking in order to meet energy demands. This should lead to an
638 increase activity/exploration levels as well as a decrease in sensitivity to predator cue (i.e.
639 antipredator response). (b) With a high quality diet, individuals are expected to protect their
640 assets and avoid risky situations. As a result, individuals should decrease their activity levels and
641 increase their antipredator response. At the trait variance level, we expect a low quality diet to
642 reduce among-individual variance (V_{ID}) and repeatability (τ) in body mass due to constraints on
643 energy allocation patterns. We also expect that because plasticity is costly, individuals in the low
644 quality diet should have lower within-individual variation in behavior (V_R) and higher
645 repeatability (τ) as a result. Note that in both diet treatments, these patterns of effects are
646 expected to generate a negative correlation between activity and antipredator response.

647
648 **Figure 2.** Effect of diet quality on behaviors and mass. Diet quality affected growth rate but not
649 behavioral response. Values are presented on their original scales, mass data were fitted with
650 loess smoothed curves. Black squares, dashed line: low quality diet; white circles, solid line:
651 high quality diet.

652
653 **Figure 3.** Effect of diet quality on trait repeatability (τ), among-individual (V_{ID}) and residual
654 (V_R) variance components. Inference is based on the magnitude of the change in repeatability
655 and variance component, $\Delta\tau$ and ΔV , and the probability of observing significant difference, P .
656 Only antipredator response showed significant differences in repeatability.

657

658 **Figure 4.** Effect of diet quality on among (r_{ID}) and within-individual (r_{WI}) correlations. The
659 shape of the ellipse indicates the strength of the correlation, positive correlations are indicated in
660 blue, negative correlations are indicated in red. Bold values indicate significant correlations
661 based on overlap of 95 % CIs with zero.

662 **Tables**

663 **Table 1.** Nutritional composition of the low and high quality diets.

Nutrient content	Low quality diet	High quality diet	Standard laboratory diet
Total energy (cal/g)	1.12	3.35	2.88
Protein (%)	15.33	45.00	18.00
Lipid (%)	3.66	11.00	3.00
Carbohydrate (%)	7.66	23.00	56.90
Non-nutritive fiber (%)	65.00	3.00	5.50

664

665