

Supplementary material

APPENDIX 1

Table A1. Results of ANCOVAs testing for differences in moult onset and duration between two populations of Carolina Chickadees: one in a contiguous forest habitat and one in a fragmented forest habitat. Comparisons were made in three feather tracts: primary (wing), secondary (wing), and rectrix. A significant effect ($\alpha = 0.05$) of habitat or year indicates a difference in moult onset (y-intercept), while a significant interaction between habitat or year and percent moult complete indicates a difference in moult duration (slope of the best-fit line).

Tract	Factor	Error		
Factor	DF	DF	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Primaries		38		
Habitat (fragmented or contiguous)	1		0.1	0.81
Year (2010, 2012, or 2013)	2		15.0	<0.0001
% Moult complete	1		187.8	<0.0001
Habitat x Year	2		0.4	0.66
Habitat x % Moult complete	1		0.2	0.64
Year x % Moult complete	2		0.5	0.63
Habitat x Year x % Moult complete	2		1.1	0.35
Secondaries		18		
Habitat (fragmented or contiguous)	1		0.8	0.39
Year (2010 or 2012)	1		1.0	0.34
% Moult complete	1		51.0	<0.0001
Habitat x Year	1		0.1	0.75
Habitat x % Moult complete	1		0.2	0.63
Year x % Moult complete	1		0.2	0.63
Habitat x Year x % Moult complete	1		0.3	0.57
Rectrices		15		
Habitat (fragmented or contiguous)	1		0.2	0.63
Year (2010 or 2012)	1		2.4	0.14
% Moult complete	1		40.0	<0.0001
Habitat x Year	1		0.1	0.92
Habitat x % Moult complete	1		0.1	0.98
Year x % Moult complete	1		0.8	0.40
Habitat x Year x % Moult complete	1		0.1	0.75

Table A2. Results from three full-factorial ANCOVAs testing for differences in moult onset and duration between two populations of Carolina chickadees: one in the forest (contiguous and fragmented habitats combined) and one in an urban location. Comparisons were made in three feather tracts: primary (wing), secondary (wing), and rectrix. A significant effect ($\alpha = 0.05$) of location or year indicates a difference in moult onset (y-intercept), while a significant interaction between location or year and percent moult complete indicates a difference in moult duration (slope of the best-fit line). For rectrix moult, “pair” was included in the model as a random factor because statistical significance of the “population” term in this model differed from the same model without “pair” included as a random factor.

Tract	Factor	Factor DF	Error DF	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Primaries			67		
	Population (forest or urban)	1		10.1	<0.01
	Year (2010, 2012, or 2013)	2		12.2	<0.0001
	% Moult complete	1		407.3	<0.0001
	Population x Year	2		4.7	0.01
	Population x % Moult complete	1		0.1	0.91
	Year x % Moult complete	2		1.3	0.28
	Population x Year x % Moult complete	2		0.9	0.40
Secondaries			39		
	Population (forest or urban)	1		7.3	0.01
	Year (2010, 2012, or 2013)	2		4.4	0.02
	% Moult complete	1		93.3	<0.0001
	Population x Year	2		1.0	0.38
	Population x % Moult complete	1		0.1	0.91
	Year x % Moult complete	2		1.0	0.39
	Population x Year x % Moult complete	2		0.4	0.66
Rectrices			31		
	Population (forest or urban)	1		3.0	0.10
	Year (2010, 2012, or 2013)	2		4.3	0.02
	% Moult complete	1		42.7	<0.0001
	Population x Year	2		1.2	0.32
	Population x % Moult complete	1		0.3	0.62
	Year x % Moult complete	2		3.1	0.06
	Population x Year x % Moult complete	2		0.5	0.59

Table A3. Results of three ANCOVAs that ignore inter-annual variation in moult dynamics (by pooling 2010, 2012, and 2013; see Table S1, above) within populations of Carolina chickadees: one in a contiguous forest habitat and one in a fragmented forest habitat. Comparisons were made in three feather tracts: primary (wing), secondary (wing), and rectrix. A significant effect ($\alpha = 0.05$) of habitat indicates a difference in moult onset (y-intercept), while a significant interaction between habitat and percent moult complete indicates a difference in moult duration (slope of the best-fit line). As in other species, molt timing varies significantly among years in this species. The model reported in Table A1 both shows this effect and controls for it as a factor influencing population differences in moult dynamics; the model below does not.

Tract	Factor	Factor DF	Error DF	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Primaries			46		
	Population (fragmented or contiguous)	1		0.1	0.86
	% Moult complete	1		159.6	<0.0001
	Population x % Moult complete	1		0.2	0.65
Secondaries			28		
	Population (fragmented or contiguous)	1		0.1	0.99
	% Moult complete	1		76.5	<0.0001
	Population x % Moult complete	1		0.4	0.56
Rectrices			24		
	Population (fragmented or contiguous)	1		0.1	0.83
	% Moult complete	1		42.0	<0.0001
	Population x % Moult complete	1		1.2	0.29

Table A4. Results of three ANCOVAs that ignore significant inter-annual variation in moult dynamics (by pooling 2010, 2012, and 2013; see Table S2, above) within and between two populations of Carolina Chickadees: one in the forest (contiguous and fragmented habitats combined) and one in an urban location (all three years of the study combined). Comparisons were made in three feather tracts: primary (wing), secondary (wing), and rectrix. A significant effect ($\alpha = 0.05$) of location indicates a difference in moult onset (y-intercept), while a significant interaction between location and percent moult complete indicates a difference in moult duration (slope of the best-fit line). For secondary moult, “pair” was included in the model as a random factor because statistical significance of the “population” term in this model differed from the same model without “pair” included as a random factor. As in other species, molt timing varies significantly among years in this species. The model reported in Table A2 both shows this effect and controls for it as a factor influencing population differences in moult dynamics; the model below does not.

Tract	Factor	Factor DF	Error DF	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Primaries			75		
	Population (forest or urban)	1		5.9	0.02
	% Moult complete	1		328.0	<0.0001
	Population x % Moult complete	1		0.1	0.76
Secondaries			46		
	Population (forest or urban)	1		3.3	0.08
	% Moult complete	1		100.5	<0.0001
	Population x % Moult complete	1		0.1	0.87
Rectrices			40		
	Population (forest or urban)	1		3.6	0.07
	% Moult complete	1		76.5	<0.0001
	Population x % Moult complete	1		0.9	0.35