

Metabolic reduction after long duration flight is not related to fat-free mass loss or flight duration in a migratory passerine.

Authors

Alexander R. Gerson^{1*}, Joely G. DeSimone¹, Elizabeth C. Black¹, Morag F. Dick², Derrick J. Groom¹

¹Department of Biology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Amherst, MA 01003 USA

²Advanced Facility for Avian Research, Department of Biology, University of Western Ontario, Canada

* Corresponding author.

Dr. Alexander Gerson
Department of Biology
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Amherst, MA 01003 USA
argerson@bio.umass.edu

Keywords: Avian Migration, Basal Metabolic Rate, Peak Metabolic Rate, Metabolic scope, flight

Summary Statement

Long duration flight in a migratory bird did result in reduced overnight resting metabolic rate, but not peak metabolic rate, and metabolic reduction was not related to flight duration or change in lean body mass.

Abstract

Migratory birds catabolize large quantities of protein during long flights, resulting in dramatic mass reductions of organs and muscles. One of the many hypotheses to explain this phenomenon is that decreased lean mass could reduce resting metabolism, saving energy after flight during refueling. However, the relationship between lean body mass and resting metabolic rate remains unclear. Furthermore, the coupling of lean mass to resting metabolic rate and to peak metabolic rate before and after long duration flight have not previously been explored. We flew migratory yellow-rumped warblers (*Setophaga coronata*) in a wind tunnel under one of two humidity regimes to manipulate the rate of lean mass loss in flight, decoupling flight duration from total lean mass loss. Before and after long duration flights, we measured resting and peak metabolism, and also measured fat mass and lean body mass using quantitative magnetic resonance. Flight duration ranged from 28 to 600 min, and birds flying under dehydrating conditions lost more fat-free mass. After flight there was a 14% reduction in resting metabolism but no change in peak metabolism. Interestingly, the reduction in resting metabolism was unrelated to flight duration or to change in fat-free body mass, indicating protein metabolism in flight is unlikely to have evolved as an energy saving measure to aid stopover refueling, but metabolic reduction itself is likely beneficial to migratory birds arriving in novel habitats.

Introduction

Each year, billions of songbirds (*Passeriformes*) travel extraordinary distances between their wintering grounds and their more temperate breeding grounds (Dokter et al., 2018; Horton et al., 2019). In songbirds, migration typically comprises a series non-stop flights lasting from 6-12 h in the case of overland migration, but non-stop flight duration in songbirds can exceed 60 h when crossing ecological barriers such as the Gulf of Mexico (DeLuca et al., 2019; Deppe et al., 2015; McKinnon et al., 2017). During flight, metabolic rate is approximately 10-fold higher than basal levels and rates of water loss can exceed 4% of body mass per hour, which is similar to that of birds exposed to high temperatures at rest in the hottest deserts on earth (Butler, 1991; Butler et al., 2000; Engel et al., 2006; Smith et al., 2017; Wikelski et al., 2003). Therefore, it is clear that non-stop migratory flight places extreme demands on the ability of birds to manage energy and water budgets (Carmi et al., 1995; Klaassen, 1995; Klaassen, 1996).

In preparation for migration, birds accumulate large fat stores and it was long thought that fat was the sole fuel for long duration flights (Odum et al., 1964). Because fat has the highest energy density of all the metabolic fuels (37.6 kJ g^{-1} wet mass) it is the best possible fuel for volant animals, and migratory birds seasonally upregulate fat transporters and enzymes that allow for rapid mobilization and catabolism of fats (Guglielmo, 2010; Guglielmo et al., 2002; McFarlan et al., 2009). Protein was long thought to be spared during flight because of its functional role in organs, tissues, and enzymes, however there is now a large and convincing body of evidence showing that migratory birds display dramatic reductions in lean mass (fat-free mass consisting of muscle and organ masses) during flight, which then must be rebuilt between flights during refueling at stopovers (Battley, 2000; Bauchinger et al., 2001; Biebach and Biebach, 1998; Piersma, 1990; Schilch et al., 2002). Therefore, 80-90% of the energy for flight is derived from fat, and the remaining 10-20% comes from the breakdown and oxidation

of proteins, which occurs simultaneous to fat metabolism (Gerson and Guglielmo, 2011b; Gerson and Guglielmo, 2013; Jenni and Jenni-Eiermann, 1998). Carbohydrates contribute very little during long duration flight, and only during the initial minutes of flight (Rothe et al., 1987).

The catabolism of lean tissues during flight can result in dramatic reductions in organ masses upon arrival at stopover destinations, imposing a physiological limit on stopover refueling. Yet, birds must rebuild the organs that were catabolized in flight before they can replenish the fat deposits required to complete the next flight (Gannes and Gannes, 2002; Karasov and Pinshow, 2000). As a consequence, the magnitude of protein catabolized aloft could constrain refueling rate, extending stopover duration and potentially delaying arrival to the breeding or wintering grounds (Alerstam and Lindstrom, 1990; Moller, 1994). However, numerous benefits to protein catabolism during flight have been proposed (Bauchinger et al., 1998; Klaassen, 1996), one of which is that lower lean mass upon arrival would result in lower metabolism (Battley, 2000; Battley et al., 2001b; Biebach and Bauchinger, 2003). For example, Biebach and Bauchinger (Biebach and Bauchinger, 2003) estimated metabolic savings of reduced lean mass in a migratory songbird, resulting from both reduced flight costs and mass dependent reductions in BMR, to be 21%. Battley (Battley, 2000; Battley et al., 2001b) empirically found a 42% reduction in BMR after a long distance migratory flight in great knots (*Calidris tenuirostris*) and these savings were attributed to reduced lean body mass, although these birds displayed mass specific metabolic reduction as well. It has been widely assumed that the breakdown of tissues does not result in functional deficits to the organ or to whole animal metabolism, and that by reducing lean body mass, BMR reductions would simply follow allometric scaling principles. However, the basic premise, that lean mass loss is directly and primarily responsible for reductions in metabolism, has not been evaluated. Furthermore, impacts of lean mass loss in flight on peak metabolic rate have not been evaluated, and would

provide insight into the costs of lean mass loss to high intensity exercise while also investigating the coupling of overnight resting metabolic rate (RMR) to peak metabolic rate (PMR) in this context.

Peak metabolic rate (PMR) is typically defined as the maximal metabolic rate of an animal and can be used as a proxy for performance related traits, such as predator avoidance or flight performance in birds. PMR has been shown to be correlated to BMR in inter-individual and interspecies comparisons, but this is not always the case (Barcelo et al., 2016, Chappell et al., 1999, Wiersma et al., 2007). Nonetheless, the potential impact of lean mass breakdown during long duration migratory flight on performance after flight has not been evaluated, and therefore measuring PMR before and after long duration flight may shed light on performance deficits that may arise due to lean mass catabolism. Furthermore, in order to evaluate the proposed adaptive benefit of lean mass catabolism to migratory birds, it is essential to measure both RMR and PMR before and after flight within individuals, while also investigating the basic premise that metabolic changes demonstrated after flight are, in fact, linked to changes in lean tissue mass.

Flight under low-humidity conditions have been shown to result in increased rates of protein breakdown in flight in migratory songbirds, and this phenomenon has been replicated in multiple studies in numerous species of birds, both in flight and at rest (Gerson and Guglielmo, 2011a; Gerson and Guglielmo, 2011b; Groom et al., 2019). The costs and benefits of this metabolic response to the environment are still being evaluated, but shifting the fuel mixture to include a greater proportion of protein increases the rate of endogenous water production by up to 20% (Gerson and Guglielmo, 2011b). Nonetheless, this approach has provided a means by which the rate of protein metabolism can be manipulated independent of flight duration, allowing the effects of lean mass loss to be decoupled, to a degree, from effects of long duration flight.

Here we measured overnight resting metabolism under standard BMR conditions and PMR using a hop-hover wheel in Yellow-rumped warblers (*Setophaga coronata*), a Nearctic migratory passerine bird, before and after long duration flight (up to 10h) in a wind tunnel. We used Quantitative Magnetic Resonance body composition analysis (QMR) (Guglielmo et al., 2011) to measure changes in fat and lean body mass in flight in order to determine the influence of changes in lean body mass and flight duration on changes in metabolism that may occur after long flight in migratory birds while also investigating intra-individual coupling of overnight resting metabolism and PMR, and how this may change after long duration flight in a wind tunnel.

Materials and Methods

Bird capture and care.

Yellow-rumped warblers (*Setophaga coronata*) were captured near Long Point Bird Observatory (Long Point, ON, Canada) during their southbound migration in early October 2016, banded with a unique color band combination for identification in captivity, and transported to the Advanced Facility for Avian Research at Western University, London, ON, Canada. Birds were held on a 12L:12D photoperiod (lights on at 06:00) at 20°C and ~60% relative humidity in indoor free-flight aviaries (2.3 x 2.4 x 3.5 m) or individual cages (121cm x 68cm x 185cm). A synthetic diet (Dick and Guglielmo, 2019; Guglielmo et al., 2017) and water was provided ad libitum, and approximately 2-3 *Tenebrio* mealworms per bird were provided daily. Birds were held for at least two weeks before beginning experimental procedures. All procedures were approved by the University of Massachusetts, Amherst IACUC (2015-0019) and the Western University Animal Use Subcommittee (2010-216) and collected under Canadian Wildlife Service permit # CA-0256.

Experimental design.

Birds were moved to individual cages three days before experimental procedures. We measured overnight resting metabolic rate (RMR) under thermoneutral conditions to approximate BMR. Since birds were in migratory disposition, and the post-flight birds were recovering from a long duration flight, we likely did not measure true BMR in these birds, but repeated measures of RMR under controlled repeatable conditions allowed us to investigate changes in resting metabolism due to changes in lean mass and flight duration. We measured peak metabolic rate (PMR) two days before the scheduled long duration flight. PMR was measured in the morning, after which birds were returned to their cages until evening when RMR measurements began (see below). Birds were then allowed 2 days of recovery before being flown in the wind tunnel. Birds were flown in the wind tunnel (see below) for up to 10 h during the evening and into the night. After flight, birds were returned to their cages for the remainder of the night and provided with fresh food and water. At approximately 10:00 the morning after flight, PMR was measured (post-flight). Birds were then allowed to feed the rest of the day, and in the evening RMR was measured. All RMR and PMR measurements were performed on at least 1h post absorptive animals (Afik and Karasov 1995). Body condition was determined using QMR to determine body composition before and after flight and RMR, but only before PMR.

Flight protocol

Birds were flown in the wind tunnel at the Advanced Facility for Avian Research (for a description of the wind tunnel, see (Gerson and Guglielmo, 2011b; Pennisi, 2011). Birds were flown at 8 ms^{-1} at 18°C in either $12 \text{ g H}_2\text{O m}^{-3}$ (low evaporative water loss; LEWL) or $2 \text{ g H}_2\text{O m}^{-3}$ (high evaporative water loss; HEWL) humidity as in (Gerson and Guglielmo, 2011b; Groom et al., 2019). Individual birds were randomly assigned to flight treatments. All flights began 30 minutes after lights off, since Yellow-rumped warblers are nocturnal migrants.

Birds were fasted for 1 hour before flight, with only access to fresh water. Immediately before flight, the first candidate flight bird was weighed (to the nearest 0.001 g), and body composition was determined using QMR, which measures fat mass, lean body mass, and total body water. The second candidate bird was also scanned with the QMR but was then placed into a covered cage within the plenum of the wind tunnel, and the flight bird was released into the air stream. We aimed for each bird to achieve steady state flight for a minimum of 30 minutes. If a bird was unable to achieve steady state flight during this time, the bird was removed from the wind tunnel and replaced with the second candidate flier that was weighed and QMR scanned immediately prior to its release into the air stream.

Once a bird achieved steady flight, we followed a “three strikes” rule to determine maximum voluntary flight duration (Dick et al., 2019), where a flight was ended if a bird stopped flying three times within 5 minutes. Birds were allowed to fly up to a maximum flight duration of 10 hours. Upon completion of the flight, the bird was weighed, QMR scanned, blood sampled and returned to its cage. Blood sampling occurred within 10 minutes of the conclusion of the flight. Plasma was separated by centrifugation at 2000 x g for 10 min., and frozen at -80°C.

Overnight resting metabolic rate

Since RMR was measured overnight, all recordings started at lights off similar to (Dick et al., 2019). Following a one-hour fast to ensure that the birds were post-absorptive before lights off, birds were scanned in the QMR, weighed, and placed on a perch in 1.3 L sealable chamber. The bottom of the respirometry chambers were lined with ~1cm of mineral oil to prevent feces from adding water vapor to the excurrent air, and the birds were separated from the mineral oil by a metal grate. The chambers were housed in 30°C incubator (Sanyo Incubator MIR-154, Sanyo Scientific) for the duration of the RMR measurement. Incurrent air was dried with a peltier gas dryer (PC-4, Sable Systems International, North Las Vegas, NV, USA) followed by

passage through two Drierite columns (W.A. Hammond Drierite, Zenia, OH, USA). The dried air was split into 8 streams, and flow rate into the chambers was controlled and measured by a flow meter (FB-8, Sable Systems International) at ~700 mL/min. Excurrent flow was directed by an 8-channel multiplexer (MUX, Sable Systems International), which switched chambers in 5 minute intervals with a baseline once every cycle and was subsampled at 250 mL/min to measure water vapor (RH-300, Sable Systems International), CO₂ (CA-2A, Sable Systems International), and O₂ (FC-1B, Sable Systems International). Data was logged using Expedata at 1 sample second⁻¹ (v1.8.4). VO₂ and VCO₂ were calculated using standard push-respirometry equations (eq 10.6 and 10.7 from Lighton 2008), after mathematical corrections for the presence of water vapor were applied (eq. #6 and eq. #7 from Ch 9 Lighton 2008) and the lowest consecutive VO₂ mean over a 60 second interval was taken as RMR (Lighton and Halsey 2011). Respiratory quotient was calculated as the ratio of VCO₂/VO₂, and watts using an oxyjoule equivalent of $[16 + 5.164*(RQ)]$ (Lighton, 2008).

Peak metabolic rate

PMR was measured using a hop-hover wheel, as described in (Dick et al., 2019). Briefly, birds were placed in a 7.7 L wheel receiving 1.5 l min⁻¹ of air and the wheel was covered for 5 minutes to allow birds to adjust to their new environment and to measure resting VO₂. The wheel was then manually spun until the bird was unable to maintain hovering flight, which usually occurred within 10 minutes. The O₂, CO₂, and water signals were Z-transformed following smoothing as described in (Bartholomew et al., 1981, Lighton, 2008, Lighton and Halsey 2011) and VO₂ and VCO₂ were calculated as described above after mathematically scrubbing water. PMR was taken as the highest consecutive 60 seconds of recorded VO₂ after the instantaneous transform. Data was recoded using expedata (Sable systems, Las Vegas USA) as above, except sampling rate was increased to 10 samples second⁻¹.

Statistical analysis

All statistics were performed in R (R Development Core Team, 2018) with significance of $\alpha = 0.05$. All comparisons of body composition before and after flight, changes in body composition with flight duration and those due to humidity treatments were evaluated using general linear models. For body composition, we used the fat measurement from the QMR, as this value can be easily calibrated and was validated using precisely weighed canola oil standards before and after each scan. We then calculated fat-free mass instead of using the lean measure from the QMR by subtracting fat mass from total mass. This provided a more accurate and validated measure of lean body mass. Flight costs were calculated using the change in fat mass and fat-free mass during flight, as determined using QMR assuming 37.6 kJ g^{-1} for fat and 5.3 kJ g^{-1} for wet lean (Jenni and Jenni-Eiermann 1998). Changes in RMR and PMR from before to after flight were assessed using general linear mixed models using the nlme package (Pinheiro et al., 2001) in R to account for repeated measures on individuals in an unbalanced design, since not all animals that were tested before flight completed a flight of sufficient length to warrant post-flight testing, and some individuals that did complete a flight were not measured post-flight. This approach allowed all tests to be included in the analysis, even if they did not have a corresponding measurement (pre or post flight). For change in RMR and PMR, only individuals with paired measurements were included in the analysis. For metabolic measurements, initial models included body size (wing and tarsus) and mass as a covariate as well as the main effects of flight duration or change in body composition and all two way interactions. Non-significant terms were removed until only significant terms remained using backward stepwise model selection (Crawley, 2005).

Results

Flights

Birds successfully completed 20 flights (11 HEWL, 9 LEWL) ranging in duration from 28 min to 600 min (10 hours) and flight durations were not significantly different ($t = -0.30$, $df = 16.56$, $P = 0.77$) between the treatment groups (HEWL: mean 246 min (47 min- 600 min); LEWL: mean 373.7 min (28 min- 600 min)).

Body Composition changes in flight

Before flight, birds had an average mass of 12.67 ± 1.33 (SD) g (10.37 – 15.04 g) with average fat load of 1.98 ± 0.98 g (0.533 – 3.68 g) which corresponds to a mean percent fat of 15.16 % (4.84% - 26.40%) and an average fat-free mass of 10.68 ± 0.77 g (9.66 – 12.19 g). There were no significant differences in mass ($F_{1,18} = 0.448$, $P = 0.512$), fat mass ($F_{1,18} = 0.858$, $P = 0.367$), or fat-free mass between treatment groups prior to flight ($F_{1,18} = 0.001$, $P = 0.991$). After flight, birds had an average mass of 11.53 ± 1.24 g (10.04 – 14.19 g) with an average fat load of 1.32 ± 0.91 g (0.26 – 3.59 g) which corresponds to a mean percent fat of 11.50% (2.60 – 26.75%), and an average fat free mass of 10.12 ± 0.70 g (9.04 – 11.40 g).

During flight, birds under the HEWL conditions lost significantly more mass than birds under the LEWL ($F_{1,17} = 6.99$, $P = 0.017$) and mass losses increased with flight duration ($F_{1,17} = 128.57$, $P < 0.001$). Total fat loss increased with flight duration ($F_{1,17} = 282.58$, $P < 0.001$), and there were no significant differences between humidity treatments ($F_{1,17} = 0.410$, $P = 0.530$). Total fat-free mass loss increased with increasing flight duration overall ($F_{1,17} = 10.27$, $P = 0.005$) and birds under the HEWL treatment lost more fat-free mass than those under the LEWL ($F_{1,17} = 9.75$, $P = 0.006$; Figure 1; post fat free HEWL = 10.05 g; post fat-free LEWL =

10.26 g). Birds under the HEWL lost fat-free mass at a rate of $0.249 \pm 0.16 \text{ g h}^{-1}$ whereas birds under the LEWL conditions lost fat-free mass at a rate of $0.227 \pm 0.27 \text{ g h}^{-1}$. Overall the rate of fat mass loss was $0.144 \pm 0.05 \text{ g/h}$. Mean flight costs were $1.85 \text{ W} \pm 0.58$ ($1.19 - 3.36 \text{ W}$) and there were no significant differences in flight costs between treatments ($F_{1,17} = 0.176$, $P = 0.680$) but flight costs did decrease with increasing flight duration ($F_{1,17} = 6.043$, $P = 0.024$).

Overnight Resting Metabolic Rate

There was a significant reduction in whole-animal RMR after flight ($F_{1,9} = 8.04$, $P = 0.020$) and fat-free mass was a significant covariate ($F_{1,9} = 5.79$, $P = 0.039$; Figure 2), while structural size was not significant ($P = 0.628$). Before flight, birds had an average RMR of $0.256 \pm 0.038 \text{ W}$ which is greater than that predicted allometrically (0.189 W ; McKechnie and Wolf 2004); and there was no significant relationship with mass ($P = 0.23$), fat-free mass ($P = 0.49$), or structural size ($P = 0.80$). After flight, RMR was $0.220 \pm 0.034 \text{ W}$, which represents a 14.35% reduction compared to pre-flight levels (Figure 2), and corresponds with a 9.0% reduction in total mass, and a 4-6% loss of fat-free mass (see above). Post-flight RMR was significantly related to mass ($F_{1,12} = 12.968$ $P = 0.004$) and to fat-free mass ($F_{1,12} = 8.07$ $P = 0.015$; $\log\text{RMR} = -4.633 + 1.27 \log(\text{Mb})$; $\log\text{RMR} = -4.423 + 1.23 \log(\text{fat-free})$). The reduction in RMR was not related to flight duration ($F_{1,9} = 1.61$, $P = 0.236$; Figure 3a), did not differ between humidity treatments ($F_{1,9} = 2.67$, $P = 0.136$) and was not related to change in fat-free mass ($F_{1,9} = 1.41$, $P = 0.265$; Figure 3b).

Peak Metabolic Rate

Before flights, birds had a mean PMR of $1.54 \pm 0.33 \text{ W}$ and after flight, birds had a mean PMR of $1.49 \pm 0.31 \text{ W}$ which were not significantly different ($F_{1,17} = 0.23$, $P = 0.637$; Figure 4). There was no effect of humidity treatment on PMR ($F_{1,18} = 0.42$, $P = 0.525$), and overall PMR

was related to fat-free mass ($F_{1,18} = 22.638$, $P < 0.001$). Change in PMR was unaffected by flight duration ($F_{1,15} = 0.50$, $P = 0.4877$), humidity ($F_{1,15} = 0.006$, $P = 0.940$), or by change in fat free mass during flight ($F_{1,15} = 0.129$, $P = 0.725$).

Relating PMR to RMR

PMR was 6.27 ± 1.25 fold higher than RMR before flight, and 6.91 ± 1.67 fold higher after flight, but this difference was not significant ($F_{1,10} = 0.90$, $P = 0.366$) and differences in scope after flight were not explained by flight duration, humidity treatment, change in mass, or change in fat-free mass (all $P > 0.05$).

PMR was significantly related to RMR overall ($F_{1,10} = 25.79$, $P < 0.001$; $\text{PMR (W)} = 5.98^* (\text{RMR W}) + 0.157$; Figure 5) and there was no difference in slope or intercept from before flight to after flight ($P > 0.05$), indicating a functional linkage between RMR and PMR.

Discussion

Here we clearly demonstrate a significant reduction in metabolism after long duration flight that is not solely explained by reductions in fat-free body mass, indicating mass independent metabolic reduction, and the lack of relationship between change in fat-free body mass and change in RMR indicates that protein catabolism in flight is unrelated to post-flight metabolic reduction *per se*. Therefore it is unlikely that protein metabolism in flight has been selected for as a mechanism to reduce metabolism during refueling after long duration flight. We manipulated the rate of fat-free body mass loss in flight by varying humidity in the wind tunnel, successfully de-coupling changes in fat-free body mass loss from flight duration, allowing us to investigate the impact of changes in body composition on both peak and resting metabolism under thermal neutral conditions, independent from the impact of flight duration.

Through this novel approach we clearly demonstrate that reduced RMR (measured under BMR conditions) after long duration flight is independent of both changes in fat-free body mass and flight duration. However, this reduction in RMR did not correspond with a reduced PMR. We show a strong correlation between RMR and PMR, although PMR is not significantly impacted by flight among individuals, while RMR is reduced. This indicates a context-dependent regulation of metabolism, where metabolism is suppressed at rest, perhaps through reduced metabolism of tissues associated with digestion, without a concomitant suppression of peak metabolism, which may be governed by muscle metabolism (Barcelo et al., 2016). This response could result in substantial energy savings during rest phase, at night, when animals are unable to forage, while not compromising predator escape, foraging, or settling movements within a stopover habitat that would require high metabolism to power flight.

After long duration flight, the birds in the present study demonstrated a 14% reduction in RMR, on average, which is less than what was observed in great knots after a ~ 4 day flight, where birds showed dramatic reductions in both body mass and lean mass specific BMR (~33%) (Battley et al., 2001a). The substantial reduction in whole animal BMR in these ultra-long distance migrants was explained by both a dramatic reduction in lean body mass, and active metabolic suppression, as indicated by reduction in mass specific metabolic rate as well. A separate study (Lindstrom et al., 1999) did not measure pre-flight BMR, but tracked the recovery of BMR over 3 days after a 12h flight in two birds and showed a recovery of BMR of about 20%, which was mostly explained by recovery of mass. In contrast to these two studies, we show comparable reduction in resting thermal neutral metabolism, but we demonstrate that metabolic suppression under these condition occurs in response to migratory flight, regardless of reduction in fat-free body mass or flight duration.

Metabolic suppression after flight could be mechanistically explained by a reduction in body temperature (T_b) setpoint, followed by Q_{10} effects on metabolic processes, or could be

driven by tissue level metabolic inhibition, which would then lead to reduced T_b . We did not measure T_b , but Wojciechowski and Pinshow (Wojciechowski and Pinshow, 2009) found T_b as low as 33°C in Blackcaps (*Sylvia atricapilla*) during migratory stopover through the Negev desert. Assuming a Q_{10} of 2, and no changes in conductance due to the change in metabolism, the metabolic suppression we measured in our animals would coincide with a maximum reduction in T_b of 5.62°C and a mean reduction of $2.65 \pm 1.94^\circ\text{C}$. This reduction in T_b based on our measured metabolic suppression could range from $4.5 \pm 1.9^\circ\text{C}$ at a Q_{10} of 1.5 to $1.68 \pm 1.22^\circ\text{C}$ at a Q_{10} of 3 overall. Given the recent and growing literature on heterothermy in birds (Gerson et al., 2019; McKechnie and Lovegrove, 2002; Smit et al., 2013), our data on post-flight metabolic suppression in migratory birds bolsters the idea that rest-phase metabolic suppression and the associated hypothermia could be an important physiological mechanism to assist migratory refueling (Wojciechowski and Pinshow, 2009). During stopover bats and hummingbirds, both of which are heterothermic, use torpor to save energy while roosting to minimize the use of fat in a migratory strategy termed *torpor assisted migration* (Baloun and Guglielmo, 2019; McGuire et al., 2014; Carpenter and Hixon, 1988). This physiological adaptation helps solve the time conflict that arises between active nocturnal migratory flight in and nocturnal foraging in bats, and offsets the high cost of foraging hummingbirds. By entering torpor, these animals minimize the costs of thermoregulation, sparing vital energy reserves to be used in migratory flight. Being diurnal foragers and nocturnal migrants, most migratory birds do not have the same time conflict as bats, but during a multi-day stopover, birds must rely on fat accrued during the day to fuel nighttime thermoregulation, while the pressure still exists to accrue significant fat during the day. This creates a two-steps-forward, one-step-back refueling strategy as birds accumulate fat during the day, only to lose substantial quantity overnight due to thermoregulatory costs, the magnitude of which depends on environmental temperatures. Therefore, there is significant pressure to minimize thermoregulatory costs at

night during stopover, which may account for more than half of the total cost of migration in some species (Wikelski et al., 2003), and rest phase hypothermia or torpor could therefore result in significant energy savings. How hypothermia impacts other physiological processes at night during rest, such as digestion and tissue repair, if occurring at all, within migratory birds remains an important question.

Although the prospect of daily hypo-metabolism would seem to make sense from an energetics perspective, given the ecological conditions requiring stopover refueling to occur quickly, it does pose challenges from a physiological perspective. Although energy saving, hypo-metabolism could also suspend critical anabolic processes, such as cell proliferation, as is known to occur in daily torpor (Heldmaier et al., 2004). Such processes are required to rebuild tissues such as the epithelial tissue of the intestinal brush border, that is known to be damaged after long duration fast in passerines (Karasov et al., 2004), or other organs that are so dramatically reduced after flight. Therefore, there appears to be a potential tradeoff between the energy savings afforded by hypometabolism, and the anabolism of lean tissues during stopover refueling. As such, hypo-metabolism could, in fact, prolong the initial period of stopover when internal organs are being rebuilt, slowing refueling since these essential organs would also not be operating optimally. Although it has been shown that migratory birds with compromised digestion compensate by increasing paracellular absorption of carbohydrates, and increased retention time, it is unclear how these processes are important to protein digestion and amino acid absorption, which is of the utmost importance during initial refueling (Bauchinger et al. 2009, Gannes 2002, Tracy et al., 2010). How this actually affects the rebuilding of tissues and refueling rate depends on how compromised the system is due to the post-flight reduction in the function of particular organs, and the circadian rhythms of tissue anabolism. With this in mind, it is possible that metabolic suppression we have shown here only occurs within 24h of the completion of long duration flight, but does not persist further

into the refueling period. This would allow birds energy savings initially upon arrival at a new site, and then allow the rebuilding of tissues once a novel habitat has been explored and food sources acquired. With this in mind, a multi-day metabolic phenotyping approach would be most beneficial to understand the energetics of migratory birds after completing long duration flight.

Total lean mass reduction in migratory birds is due to significant reductions in organ mass, and the magnitude of the organ mass reduction is determined, in part, by tissue turnover rates (Bauchinger and McWilliams, 2010), but also by environmental conditions experienced (Groom et al., 2019). With this in mind, it is likely that high turnover tissues, such as intestine and liver, show the greatest reduction in mass, and also likely have the greatest contribution to BMR (Chappell et al., 1999; Vezina et al., 2017). Pectoralis muscle on the other hand contributes most to PMR and reductions in muscle mass in fasting and migrating birds are generally small compared to splanchnic organs. Thus, the reduction in RMR without a reduction in PMR could simply be explained by differential organ reduction, but this explanation is insufficient given the data presented here since the metabolic suppression was independent from changes in fat-free body mass. It is possible that there is differential suppression of oxidative metabolism among tissues after flight, where the suppression occurs primarily in visceral organs and not in muscle. Such a mechanism could be detected by investigating changes in oxidative metabolism in permeabilized tissues or isolated mitochondrial preparations after flight in multiple tissue types, but this has not been widely explored in migratory birds. It is noteworthy that PMR was substantially lower than flight MR, and many studies that measure PMR are doing so as a comparative exercise test, but given the fact that PMR in this study was 20% lower than calculated flight costs, it is important to keep in mind the PMR is unlikely to be a measure of maximal metabolic rate.

Metabolic reduction after long duration high intensity exercise is also unique in the context of exercise physiology in mammalian systems. Flight requires high intensity long duration exercise, which is precisely the type of exercise that results in high excess post-exercise oxygen consumption (EPOC) in mammals, which is thought to aid in recovery from oxygen debt (Børsheim and Bahr, 2003). Long duration high intensity exercise in humans consistently results in a post-exercise metabolic increase, the magnitude of which increases with increasing duration and intensity of the exercise, and can last for hours to days (Børsheim and Bahr, 2003). The ability of migratory birds to sustain high intensity exercise for extreme durations aerobically while relying on fat as the primary fuel could help explain why birds do not show a post-exercise increase in oxygen consumption, but to show a metabolic suppression instead is noteworthy, and warrants further investigation. Sustained flight costs of our birds averaged 1.85 watts, which is approximately 8-fold higher than our measured RMR, yet despite flying at such high intensity for 6-10 hours, our birds show significant metabolic suppression rather than metabolic increase after flight, while also undergoing substantial tissue anabolism.

In conclusion, we clearly show that metabolic suppression after flight is independent of fat-free mass losses and flight duration for flights up to 10 h, indicating a metabolic adaptation that would impact thermoregulatory costs, or minimize metabolic costs early during stopover and during non-feeding periods, possibly as a mechanism to maximize overall refueling rates. Furthermore, this metabolic response to high intensity exercise is unique when compared to alternate exercise models, and investigation into the mechanistic basis for this suppression, as well as further understanding of avian metabolism, could broaden our understanding of heterothermy and post-exercise metabolic processes in vertebrates.

Acknowledgements

This work could not have been completed without help from Dr. Chris Guglielmo, the exceptional staff at the Advanced Facility for Avian Research including Andrew Gould, Michaela Rubeli, Delaney Schofer, Kevin Young, and Alexander Macmillan. We also thank Stu Mackenzie and staff and volunteers at Long Point Bird Observatory for their help.

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing interests

Funding

This work was funded by NSF IOS #1656726 awarded to ARG, and by funds from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst awarded to ARG.

Data Availability.

Data available in supplementary materials.

References

- Afik, D. and Karasov, W. H.** (1995). The Trade-Offs Between Digestion Rate and Efficiency in Warblers and Their Ecological Implications. *Ecology* **76**, 2247–2257.
- Alerstam, T. and Lindstrom, A.** (1990). Optimal Bird Migration: The Relative Importance of Time, Energy, and Safety. In *Bird Migration*, pp. 331–351. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Baloun, D. E. and Guglielmo, C. G.** (2019). Energetics of migratory bats during stopover: a test of the torpor-assisted migration hypothesis. *J Exp Biol* **222**, jeb196691–9.
- Barceló, G., Love, O. P. and Vezina, F.** (2017). Uncoupling Basal and Summit Metabolic Rates in White-Throated Sparrows: Digestive Demand Drives Maintenance Costs, but Changes in Muscle Mass Are Not Needed to Improve Thermogenic Capacity. *Physiol Biochem Zool* **90**, 153–165.
- Bartholomew, G. A., Vleck, D. and Vleck, C. M.** (1981). Instantaneous measurements of oxygen consumption during pre-flight warm-up and post-flight cooling in sphingid and saturniid moths. *J Exp Biol* **90**, 17–32.
- Battley, P. F.** (2000). Empirical evidence for differential organ reductions during trans-oceanic bird flight. *Proc R Soc B* **267**, 191–195.
- Battley, P. F., Dekinga, A., Dietz, M. W., Piersma, T., Tang, S. and Hulsman, K.** (2001a). Basal metabolic rate declines during long-distance migratory flight in great knots. *The Condor* **103**, 838–845.
- Battley, P. F., Dekinga, A., Dietz, M. W., Piersma, T. and Tang, S.** (2001b). Basal metabolic rate declines during long-distance migratory flight in great knots. *Condor* **103**, 838.
- Bauchinger, U. and McWilliams, S. R.** (2010). Extent of phenotypic flexibility during long- distance flight is determined by tissue- specific turnover rates: a new hypothesis. *J Avian Biol* **41**, 603–608.
- Bauchinger, U. and Biebach, H.** (1998). The role of protein during migration in passerine birds. *Biol Conserv Fauna* **102**, 299–305.
- Bauchinger, U. and Biebach, H.** (2001). Differential catabolism of muscle protein in garden warblers (*Sylvia borin*): flight and leg muscle act as a protein source during long-distance migration. *J Comp Physiol B* **171**, 293–301.
- Bauchinger, U., Kolb, H., Afik, D., Pinshow, B. and Biebach, H.** (2009). Blackcap warblers maintain digestive efficiency by increasing digesta retention time on the first day of migratory stopover. *Physiol Biochem Zool* **82**, 541–548.
- Biebach, H. and Bauchinger, U.** (2003). Energetic Savings by Organ Adjustment During Long Migratory Flights in Garden Warblers (*Sylvia borin*). In *Avian Migration* (eds.

- Berthold, P., Gwinner, E., and Sonnenschein, E., pp. 269–280. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Biebach, H. and Biebach, H.** (1998). Phenotypic organ flexibility in Garden Warblers *Sylvia borin* during long-distance migration. *J Avian Biol* **29**, 529–535.
- Butler, P. J.** (1991). Exercise in Birds. *J Exp Biol* **160**, 233–262.
- Butler, P. J., Woakes, A. J., Bevan, R. and Stephenson, R.** (2000). Heart rate and rate of oxygen consumption during flight of the barnacle goose, *Branta leucopsis*. *Comp Biochem Physiol B*.
- Børsheim, E. and Bahr, R.** (2003). Effect of exercise intensity, duration and mode on post-exercise oxygen consumption. *Sports Med* **33**, 1037–1060.
- Carmi, N., Pinshow, B., Porter, W. and Jaeger, J.** (1995). Reply to Klaassen's Commentary concerning Water and Energy Limitations on Flight Range. *Auk* **112**, 263.
- Carpenter, F. L. and Hixon, M. A.** (1988). A New Function for Torpor: Fat Conservation in a Wild Migrant Hummingbird. *Condor* **90**, 373–378.
- Chappell, M., Bech, C. and Buttemer, W.** (1999). The relationship of central and peripheral organ masses to aerobic performance variation in house sparrows. *J Exp Biol* **202**, 2269.
- Crawley, M. J.** (2005). *Statistics: an introduction using R*. Wiley.
- DeLuca, W. V., Woodworth, B. K., Mackenzie, S. A., Newman, A. E. M., Cooke, H. A., Phillips, L. M., Freeman, N. E., Sutton, A. O., Tauzer, L., McIntyre, C., et al.** (2019). A boreal songbird's 20,000 km migration across North America and the Atlantic Ocean. *Ecology* **100**, e02651–4.
- Deppe, J. L., Ward, M. P., Bolus, R. T., Diehl, R. H., Celis-Murillo, A., Zenzal, T. J., Jr., Moore, F., Benson, T. J., Smolinsky, J. A., Schofield, L. N., et al.** (2015). Fat, weather, and date affect migratory songbirds' departure decisions, routes, and time it takes to cross the Gulf of Mexico. *PNAS* 201503381–8.
- Dick, M. F. and Guglielmo, C. G.** (2019). Flight muscle protein damage during endurance flight is related to energy expenditure but not dietary polyunsaturated fatty acids in a migratory bird. *J Exp Biol* **222**, jeb187708–9.
- Dick, M. F. and Guglielmo** 2019 (2019). Dietary polyunsaturated fatty acids influence flight muscle oxidative capacity, but not endurance flight performance in a migratory songbird. *Am. J. Physiol* **316**, R362–R375.
- Dokter, A. M., Farnsworth, A., Fink, D., Ruiz-Gutierrez, V., Hochachka, W. M., La Sorte, F. A., Robinson, O. J., Rosenberg, K. V. and Kelling, S.** (2018). Seasonal abundance and survival of North America's migratory avifauna determined by weather radar. *Nat Ecol Evol* **2**, 1603–1609.
- Engel, S., Suthers, R. A., Suthers, R., Biebach, H., Visser, G. and Visser, G. H.** (2006). Respiratory water loss during rest and flight in European Starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*). *Comp Biochem Physiol A* **145**, 423–432.

- Gannes, L.** (2002). Mass change pattern of blackcaps refueling during spring migration: evidence for physiological limitations to food assimilation. *Condor* **104**, 231–239.
- Gerson, A. R. and Guglielmo, C. G.** (2011a). House sparrows (*Passer domesticus*) increase protein catabolism in response to water restriction. *Am J Physiol* **300**, R925–30.
- Gerson, A. R. and Guglielmo, C. G.** (2011b). Flight at low ambient humidity increases protein catabolism in migratory birds. *Science* **333**, 1434–1436.
- Gerson, A. R. and Guglielmo, C. G.** (2013). Energetics and metabolite profiles during early flight in American robins (*Turdus Migratorius*). *J Comp Physiol B* **183**, 983–991.
- Gerson, A. R., McKechnie, A. E., Ben Smit, Whitfield, M. C., Smith, E. K., Talbot, W. A., McWhorter, T. J. and Wolf, B. O.** (2019). The functional significance of facultative hyperthermia varies with body size and phylogeny in birds. *Funct Ecology* **33**, 597–607.
- Groom, D. J. E., Deakin, J. E., Lauzau, M. C. and Gerson, A. R.** (2019). The role of humidity and metabolic status on lean mass catabolism in migratory Swainson's thrushes (*Catharus ustulatus*). *Proc R Soc B* **286**, 20190859–9.
- Guglielmo, C. G.** (2010). Move that fatty acid: fuel selection and transport in migratory birds and bats. *Integr Comp Biol* **50**, 336–345.
- Guglielmo, C. G., Gerson, A. R., Price, E. R. and Hays, Q. R.** (2017). The effects of dietary macronutrients on flight ability, energetics, and fuel metabolism of yellow-rumped warblers *Setophaga coronata*. *J Avian Biol* **48**, 133–148.
- Guglielmo, C. G., Haunerland, N. H., Hochachka, P. W. and Williams, T. D.** (2002). Seasonal dynamics of flight muscle fatty acid binding protein and catabolic enzymes in a migratory shorebird. *Am J Physiol Regul. Integr. Comp. Physiol.* **282**, R1405–R1413.
- Guglielmo, C. G., McGuire, L. P., Gerson, A. R. and Seewagen, C. L.** (2011). Simple, rapid, and non-invasive measurement of fat, lean, and total water masses of live birds using quantitative magnetic resonance. *J Ornithol* **152**, 75–85.
- Heldmaier, G., Ortman, S. and Elvert, R.** (2004). Natural hypometabolism during hibernation and daily torpor in mammals. *Respir Physiol Neurobiol* **141**, 317–329.
- Horton, K. G., Van Doren, B. M., La Sorte, F. A., Cohen, E. B., Clipp, H. L., Buler, J. J., Fink, D., Kelly, J. F. and Farnsworth, A.** (2019). Holding steady: Little change in intensity or timing of bird migration over the Gulf of Mexico. *Global Change Biol.* **7**, 1–14.
- Jenni, L. and Jenni-Eiermann, S.** (1998). Fuel supply and metabolic constraints in migrating birds. *J Avian Biol* **29**, 521–528.
- Karasov, W. H. and Pinshow, B.** (2000). Test for physiological limitation to nutrient assimilation in a long-distance passerine migrant at a Springtime stopover site. *Physiol Biochem Zool* **73**, 335–343.
- Karasov, W. H., Pinshow, B., Starck, J. M., Afik, D. and Afik, D.** (2004). Anatomical and histological changes in the alimentary tract of migrating blackcaps (*Sylvia atricapilla*): a

- comparison among fed, fasted, food-restricted, and refed birds. *Physiol Biochem Zool* **77**, 149–160.
- Klaassen, M.** (1995). Water and energy limitations on flight range. *Auk* **112**, 260–262.
- Klaassen, M.** (1996). Metabolic constraints on long-distance migration in birds. *J Exp Biol* **199**, 57–64.
- Lighton, J. R. B.** (2008). *Measuring metabolic rates*. New York: Oxford Univ Press.
- Lighton, J. R. B. and Halsey, L. G.** (2011). Flow-through respirometry applied to chamber systems: Pros and cons, hints and tips. *Comp Biochem Physiol A* **158**, 265–275.
- Lindstrom, A., Lindstrom, A., Klaassen, M. and Kvist, A.** (1999). Variation in energy intake and basal metabolic rate of a bird migrating in a wind tunnel. *Funct Ecology* **13**, 352–359.
- McFarlan, J. T., Bonen, A. and Guglielmo, C. G.** (2009). Seasonal upregulation of fatty acid transporters in flight muscles of migratory white-throated sparrows (*Zonotrichia albicollis*). *J Exp Biol* **212**, 2934–2940.
- McGuire, L. P., Jonasson, K. A. and Guglielmo, C. G.** (2014). Bats on a Budget: Torpor-Assisted Migration Saves Time and Energy. *PLoS ONE* **9**, e115724.
- McKechnie, A. E. and Lovegrove, B. G.** (2002). Avian Facultative Hypothermic Responses: A Review. *Condor* **104**, 705–724.
- McKechnie, A. E. and Wolf, B. O.** (2004). The allometry of avian basal metabolic rate: good predictions need good data. *Physiol Biochem Zool* **77**, 502–521.
- McKinnon, E. A., Artuso, C. and Love, O. P.** (2017). The mystery of the missing warbler. *Ecology* 1–3.
- Moller, A. P.** (1994). Phenotype-dependent arrival time and its consequences in a migratory bird. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* **35**, 115–122.
- Odum, E., Rogers, D. and Hicks, D.** (1964). Homeostasis of the Nonfat Components of Migrating Birds. *Science* **143**, 1037–1039.
- Pennisi, E.** (2011). Going the Distance. *Science* **331**, 395–397.
- Piersma, T.** (1990). Pre- migratory “fattening” usually involves more than the deposition of fat alone. *Ringing and Migration* **11**, 113–115.
- Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D.R Development Core Team** (2001). nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models.
- R Development Core Team** (2018). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Rothe, H., Biesel, W. and Nachtigall, W.** (1987). Pigeon flight in a wind tunnel. II. Gas exchange and power requirements. *J Comp Physiol B* **157**, 99–109.

- Schwilch, R., Grattarola, A., Spina, F. and Jenni, L.** (2002). Protein loss during long-distance migratory flight in passerine birds: adaptation and constraint. *J Exp Biol* **205**, 687–695.
- Smit, B., Harding, C. T., Hockey, P. A. R. and McKechnie, A. E.** (2013). Adaptive thermoregulation during summer in two populations of an arid-zone passerine. *Ecology* **94**, 1142–1154.
- Smith, E. K., O’Neill, J. J., Gerson, A. R., McKechnie, A. E. and Wolf, B. O.** (2017). Avian thermoregulation in the heat: resting metabolism, evaporative cooling and heat tolerance in Sonoran Desert songbirds. *J Exp Biol* **220**, 3290–3300.
- Tracy, C. R., McWhorter, T. J., Wojciechowski, M. S., Pinshow, B. and Karasov, W. H.** (2010). Carbohydrate absorption by blackcap warblers (*Sylvia atricapilla*) changes during migratory refuelling stopovers. *J Exp Biol* **213**, 380–385.
- Vezina, F., Gerson, A. R., Guglielmo, C. G. and Piersma, T.** (2017). The performing animal: causes and consequences of body remodeling and metabolic adjustments in red knots facing contrasting thermal environments. *Am J Physiol* **313**, R120–R131.
- Wiersma, P., Wiersma, P., Muñoz-Garcia, A., Munoz-Garcia, A., Walker, A., Walker, A. and Williams, J. B.** (2007). Tropical birds have a slow pace of life. *PNAS* **104**, 9340–9345.
- Wikelski, M., Tarlow, E., Raim, A., Diehl, R., Larkin, R. P., Visser, G. H., et al.** (2003). Avian metabolism: Costs of migration in free-flying songbirds. *Nature* **423**, 704–704.
- Withers, P. C.** (1992). *Comparative Animal Physiology*. Cengage Learning
- Wojciechowski, M. S. and Pinshow, B.** (2009). Heterothermy in small, migrating passerine birds during stopover: use of hypothermia at rest accelerates fuel accumulation. *J Exp Biol* **212**, 3068–3075.

Figures




Figure 1. Reduction in mass (A), fat mass (B), and fat-free mass (C) with increasing flight duration. Mass loss and fat-free mass loss were significantly greater in the HEWL ($P < 0.05$; Red; $n = 11$ individuals) treatment group compared to the LEWL (blue; $n = 9$ individuals) treatment group, but there was not a significant interaction in (C) and there is no significant difference in fat mass loss between treatments.




Figure 2. Whole animal resting metabolic rate (RMR; A) and mass-specific RMR were significantly reduced ($P < 0.05$) after long duration flight in a wind tunnel (pre-flight $n = 12$, post-flight $n = 14$). Grey lines connect measurements within each individual. There is a significant reduction in RMR after flight (see text for details). Boxplots represent the 95% confidence interval (whiskers), the box represents the interquartile range, and the line represents the median.




Figure 3. The reduction (post-flight RMR – Pre-flight RMR) in RMR after flight was not explained by flight duration (A), or changes in fat-free mass (B) after long duration flight in a wind tunnel (n = 13 total, n = 9 LEWL; n = 4 HEWL).




Figure 4. Pre-flight whole animal (A) and mass-specific (B) peak metabolic rates were not different after long duration flight in a wind tunnel (pre $n = 19$; post $n = 20$). Grey lines connect measurements within each individual. Boxplots represent the 95% confidence interval (whiskers), the box represents the interquartile range, and the line represents the median.




Figure 5. Peak metabolic rate was significantly related to resting metabolic rate overall ($P < 0.001$; see text for statistics and parameter estimates), but the response of peak metabolic rate was highly variable among individuals. Grey dot-dashed lines connect pre and post measures within individuals ($n = 15$ groups).

Readme.txt for “Metabolic reduction after long duration flight is not related to fat-free mass loss or flight duration in a migratory passerine”

Description of Data Columns

Flight_data_JEB.csv

birdid – Unique bird identifier

pre_meanfat – mean fat mass before flight (in grams), as determined by quantitative magnetic resonance

pre_mass – mean body mass before flight (in grams)

pre_fatfree – mean fat-free mass before flight (in grams)

post_meanfat – mean fat mass after flight (in grams), as determined by quantitative magnetic resonance

post_mass – mean body mass after flight (in grams)

post_fatfree – mean fat-free mass after flight (in grams)

del_fat – difference between pre- and post-flight fat mass (in grams)

del_fatfree – difference between pre- and post-flight fat-free mass (in grams)

del_mass – difference between pre- and post-flight body mass (in grams)

humidity_treatment – ambient humidity of the wind tunnel during flight, either HEWL (2 grams of water per cubic meter of air) or LEWL (12 grams of water per cubic meter of air)

flight_length – duration of flight in the wind tunnel (in minutes)

mass_rate – average rate of body mass lost during flight (in grams per hour)

fat_rate – average rate of fat mass lost during flight (in grams per hour)

fatfree_rate – average rate of fat-free mass lost during flight (in grams per hour)

fatfree_energy – amount of energy derived from fat-free mass during flight, assuming 5.3 kJ of energy per gram of fat-free mass lost (in kilojoules)

total_energy – amount of total energy derived from fat-free mass during flight (in kilojoules). It is the sum of fat-free energy (as described above) and energy from fat, assuming 37.6 kJ of energy per gram of fat mass lost.

percent_lean – percentage of energy derived from fat-free sources during flight

watts – metabolic power calculated from the total energy expended during flight in the wind tunnel, divided by flight duration (in Watts)

YRWA16_BMR_JEB

birdid – unique bird identifier

meanfat – mean fat mass before entry into the respirometry chamber (in grams), as determined by quantitative magnetic resonance

fatfree – fat-free mass before entry into the respirometry chamber (in grams)

mass – body mass of the bird before entry into the respirometry chamber (in grams)

humidity_treatment – ambient humidity of the wind tunnel during flight, either HEWL (2 grams of water per cubic meter of air) or LEWL (12 grams of water per cubic meter of air)

stage – indicates whether BMR was measured before (pre) or after (post) flight in the wind tunnel

mean_VO2_1 – lowest recorded rate of oxygen consumption (in mL per min)

mean_VCO2_1 – lowest recorded rate of carbon dioxide production (in mL per min)

mean_VH2O_1 – rate of water loss during the lowest recorded oxygen consumption period (in mL per min)

mean_RQ_1 – respiratory quotient (unitless)

YRWA16_PMR_JEB

birdid – unique bird identifier

stage – indicates whether BMR was measured before (pre) or after (post) flight in the wind tunnel

humidity_treatment – ambient humidity of the wind tunnel during flight, either HEWL (2 grams of water per cubic meter of air) or LEWL (12 grams of water per cubic meter of air)

meanfat – mean fat mass before entry into the flight wheel (in grams), as determined by quantitative magnetic resonance

fatfree – fat-free mass before entry into the flight wheel (in grams)

mass – body mass of the bird before entry into the flight wheel (in grams)

mean_VO2_1 – peak recorded rate of oxygen consumption (in mL per min)

mean_VCO2_1 – peak recorded rate of carbon dioxide production (in mL per min)

mean_VH2O_1 – rate of water loss during the peak recorded oxygen consumption period (in mL per min)

mean_RQ_1 – respiratory quotient (unitless)

vo2W.z – peak recorded metabolic rate, expressed as watts, using equation $[16 + 5.164 \cdot RQ]$ as described in Lighton (2008)

Table S1

[Click here to Download Table S1](#)

Table S2

[Click here to Download Table S2](#)

Table S3

[Click here to Download Table S3](#)

Table S1. Flight data.

[Click here to Download Table S1](#)

birdid – Unique bird identifier

pre_meanfat – mean fat mass before flight (in grams), as determined by quantitative magnetic resonance

pre_mass – mean body mass before flight (in grams)

pre_fatfree – mean fat-free mass before flight (in grams)

post_meanfat – mean fat mass after flight (in grams), as determined by quantitative magnetic resonance

post_mass – mean body mass after flight (in grams)

post_fatfree – mean fat-free mass after flight (in grams)

del_fat – difference between pre- and post-flight fat mass (in grams)

del_fatfree – difference between pre- and post-flight fat-free mass (in grams)

del_mass – difference between pre- and post-flight body mass (in grams)

humidity_treatment – ambient humidity of the wind tunnel during flight, either HEWL (2 grams of water per cubic meter of air) or LEWL (12 grams of water per cubic meter of air)

flight_length – duration of flight in the wind tunnel (in minutes)

mass_rate – average rate of body mass lost during flight (in grams per hour)

fat_rate – average rate of fat mass lost during flight (in grams per hour)

fatfree_rate – average rate of fat-free mass lost during flight (in grams per hour)

fatfree_energy – amount of energy derived from fat-free mass during flight, assuming 5.3 kJ of energy per gram of fat-free mass lost (in kilojoules)

total_energy – amount of total energy derived from fat-free mass during flight (in kilojoules). It is the sum of fat-free energy (as described above) and energy from fat, assuming 37.6 kJ of energy per gram of fat mass lost.

percent_lean – percentage of energy derived from fat-free sources during flight

watts – metabolic power calculated from the total energy expended during flight in the wind tunnel, divided by flight duration (in Watts)

Table S2. RMR data.

[Click here to Download Table S2](#)

birdid – unique bird identifier

meanfat – mean fat mass before entry into the respirometry chamber (in grams), as determined by quantitative magnetic resonance

fatfree – fat-free mass before entry into the respirometry chamber (in grams)

mass – body mass of the bird before entry into the respirometry chamber (in grams)

humidity_treatment – ambient humidity of the wind tunnel during flight, either HEWL (2 grams of water per cubic meter of air) or LEWL (12 grams of water per cubic meter of air)

stage – indicates whether BMR was measured before (pre) or after (post) flight in the wind tunnel

mean_VO2_1 – lowest recorded rate of oxygen consumption (in mL per min)

mean_VCO2_1 – lowest recorded rate of carbon dioxide production (in mL per min)

mean_VH2O_1 – rate of water loss during the lowest recorded oxygen consumption period (in mL per min)

mean_RQ_1 – respiratory quotient (unitless)

Table S3. RMR data.

[Click here to Download Table S3](#)

birdid – unique bird identifier

stage – indicates whether BMR was measured before (pre) or after (post) flight in the wind tunnel

humidity_treatment – ambient humidity of the wind tunnel during flight, either HEWL (2 grams of water per cubic meter of air) or LEWL (12 grams of water per cubic meter of air)

meanfat – mean fat mass before entry into the flight wheel (in grams), as determined by quantitative magnetic resonance

fatfree – fat-free mass before entry into the flight wheel (in grams)

mass – body mass of the bird before entry into the flight wheel (in grams)

mean_VO2_1 – peak recorded rate of oxygen consumption (in mL per min)

mean_VCO2_1 – peak recorded rate of carbon dioxide production (in mL per min)

mean_VH2O_1 – rate of water loss during the peak recorded oxygen consumption period (in mL per min)

mean_RQ_1 – respiratory quotient (unitless)

vo2W.z – peak recorded metabolic rate, expressed as watts, using equation $[16 + 5.164 \cdot \text{RQ}]$ as described in Lighton (2008)