



HAL
open science

Simulated chorus attracts conspecific and heterospecific Amazonian explosive breeding frogs

Antoine Fouquet, Thomas Tilly, Andrius Pašukonis, Elodie A Courtois,
Philippe Gaucher, Juan Ulloa, Jérôme Sueur

► **To cite this version:**

Antoine Fouquet, Thomas Tilly, Andrius Pašukonis, Elodie A Courtois, Philippe Gaucher, et al.. Simulated chorus attracts conspecific and heterospecific Amazonian explosive breeding frogs. *Biotropica*, 2020, 53 (1), pp.63-73. 10.1111/btp.12845 . hal-03006028

HAL Id: hal-03006028

<https://hal.science/hal-03006028>

Submitted on 18 Nov 2021

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

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

Simulated chorus attracts conspecific and heterospecific Amazonian explosive breeding frogs

Fouquet Antoine ^{1,*}, Tilly Thomas ², Pašukonis Andrius ³, Courtois Elodie A. ⁴, Gaucher Philippe ⁴, Ulloa Juan ^{5,6,7}, Sueur Jérôme ⁵

¹ Laboratoire Evolution et Diversité Biologique (EDB) UMR5174 Toulouse, France

² Studio d'en haut Nantes, France

³ Department of Biology Stanford University Stanford CA, USA

⁴ Laboratoire Ecologie, Evolution, Interactions des Systèmes Amazoniens (LEEISA) Cayenne, French Guiana

⁵ Institut Systématique Evolution Biodiversité (ISYEB) Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle CNRS Sorbonne Université EPHE Paris, France

⁶ Equipe Communications Acoustiques UMR 9197 Neuro-PSI-CNRS Université Paris-Sud Orsay, France

⁷ Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt Bogotá, Colombia

* Corresponding author : Antoine Fouquet, email address : fouquet.antoine@gmail.com

Abstract :

In tropical regions, some anuran species breed "explosively", reproducing in massive and highly diverse aggregations during a brief window of time. These aggregations can serve as acoustic beacons, attracting other anurans toward seasonal ponds. We hypothesize that conspecific and heterospecific calls play a role in navigation toward ponds and synchronization of reproduction among species. We simulated a chorus of two species (*Trachycephalus coriaceus* and *Chiasmocleis shudikarensis*) with contrasting call characteristics (low-frequency vs. high-frequency) and reproductive strategies (strict pond breeder vs. opportunistic) near known explosive breeding sites. We predicted that choruses of *T. coriaceus* are more attractive to heterospecifics than of *C. shudikarensis* because the first provides a more reliable indicator of a suitable breeding pond and a better long-distance signal. We found that both choruses attracted conspecific frogs to the playback outside a natural breeding event. As predicted, heterospecifics were attracted only by low-frequency calls of *T. coriaceus* that breeds exclusively in large ponds, but not by higher frequency calls of *C. shudikarensis* that also breeds in small pools not suitable for other species. Our study presents the first experimental evidence that tropical explosive breeding anurans are attracted to conspecific and heterospecific choruses. The contrasting effect of the playback of the two species on heterospecifics suggests that the attractive effect of a chorus depends on the reproductive strategy of both the sender and the receiver. Given the abundance and diversity of communities in tropical ecosystems, the use of heterospecific acoustic cues may prove widespread and requires further investigation. Abstract in Portuguese is available with online material.

Keywords : Anuran, French Guiana, Neotropics, orientation, phonotaxis, reproduction

51 1. INTRODUCTION

52
53 Social information obtained from conspecifics, and sometimes from heterospecifics, can be used
54 by animals to assess the presence of resources or threats (Danchin *et al.* 2004; Goodale *et al.*
55 2010). Animals forming mixed-species breeding aggregations, such as some birds (Monkkonen *et*
56 *al.* 1999; Thomson *et al.* 2003; Mukhin *et al.* 2004), mammals (McGuire *et al.* 2009; Forsman *et*
57 *al.* 2012) and amphibians (Diego-Rasilla & Luengo 2004, 2007; Pupin *et al.* 2007; Madden &
58 Jehle 2017) can rely on the presence of others that share their habitat requirements to orientate
59 themselves towards these habitats and the information they use can be acoustic (e.g. Magrath *et*
60 *al.* 2005; Phelps *et al.* 2007).

61 Most anuran amphibians (i.e., frogs and toads) need water for breeding, and the ability to
62 orientate and migrate toward aquatic sites is crucial for survival and reproduction (Wells 2007;
63 Pittman *et al.* 2014; Sinsch 2014; Joly 2019). Depending on species and the context, amphibians
64 can use acoustic, magnetic, mechanical, olfactory, and visual directional information (for reviews
65 see Ferguson 1971; Sinsch 1990; 2006). Natal imprinting and spatial memory play a crucial role
66 when returning to known oviposition sites (e.g., Heusser 1960; Shoop 1965; Ishii *et al.* 1995;
67 Pašukonis *et al.* 2016), but social cues are also particularly important when locating new
68 resources, facilitating orientation, and synchronizing breeding activity (e.g., Stamps 1988; Reed
69 *et al.* 1993; Seppänen *et al.* 2007; Buxton *et al.* 2015; 2018; James *et al.* 2015). Acoustic
70 communication, in particular, plays a key role in the reproductive biology of anuran amphibians
71 (Gerhardt & Huber 2002), and male choruses could represent a cue indicating suitable breeding
72 habitat.

73 Despite the fact that most amphibians occur in the tropics (Jenkins *et al.* 2013),
74 experimental studies on cues guiding amphibians to breeding ponds remains limited to only a few
75 temperate-region species. These studies have shown that some but not all anurans are attracted to

76 conspecific chorus (e.g., Gerhardt & Klump 1988; Ryan *et al.* 1981; Wollerman 2002; Bee 2007;
77 Swanson *et al.* 2007; Christie *et al.* 2010; Buxton *et al.* 2015; 2018; James *et al.* 2015; Chang *et*
78 *al.* 2018). Current evidence suggests that species which depend on unpredictable seasonal ponds
79 are more attracted to conspecific playback than species that rely on stable, permanent ponds
80 (Gerhardt & Klum 1988; Buxton *et al.* 2015; 2018 but see Swanson *et al.* 2007). In addition,
81 acoustic cues of sympatric anurans might be used by newts to orientate toward shared breeding
82 sites (Diego-Rasilla & Luengo 2004, 2007; Pupin *et al.* 2007; Madden & Jehle 2017 but see
83 Slabbekoorn & Bouton 2008). Such heterospecific phonotaxis has also been suggested for
84 anurans although direct evidence remains limited, especially under natural conditions (Oldham &
85 Gerhardt 1975, Gerhardt & Klump 1988; Ryan & Rand 1993, Bernal *et al.* 2007). Chang *et al.*
86 (2018) recently used a naturalistic setup to demonstrate that males of a tropical treefrog
87 (*Rhacophorus prasinatus*) approach a chorus of some heterospecific frogs but ignore other
88 sympatric species. Such selective use of heterospecific cues may reflect cost/benefit trade-offs of
89 interspecific interaction requiring further investigation.

90 Some anuran species ‘explosively breed’ (sensu Wells 1977), aggregating in groups
91 numbering hundreds to thousands of individuals and call during a narrow time window of just a
92 few hours or days per breeding season. An explosive breeding strategy may be beneficial, by
93 diluting the predation risk for adults, eggs, and larvae and increase mate attraction (Ryan *et al.*
94 1981; Gerhardt & Huber 2002). In tropical regions such as Amazonia, anuran explosive breeding
95 generally involves highly-diverse communities with sometimes more than ten species breeding
96 simultaneously (Aichinger 1987; Hödl 1990; Gottsberger & Gruber 2004; Prado *et al.* 2005;
97 Ulloa *et al.* 2019). Such phenomena typically occur in ephemeral sparsely distributed ponds
98 (Rodrigues *et al.* 2010) that dry out during periods of low precipitation and thus have relatively
99 few aquatic predators when ponds fill up during the rainy reason. Explosive breeding events are
100 so localized, brief and synchronized that the yet largely unknown cues triggering these events

101 must be spatiotemporally unequivocal across species. Ulloa *et al.* (2019) found that rainfall
102 during the previous 48 hours was the most important factor predicting explosive breeding events
103 in French Guiana, which could also trigger the long distance migration of individuals with
104 previous experience of the breeding sites. However, such environmental triggers are unlikely to
105 explain how dispersers locate new distant breeding sites and how they synchronize their
106 migration for arrival into the pond. The acoustic intensity of the choruses can reach 100 dB SPL
107 measured in the middle of the aggregation and can be heard several hundreds of meters away.
108 We, therefore, hypothesize that intense chorus sound is used by tropical explosive breeding
109 species to both synchronize breeding among species and to orientate toward breeding sites.

110 To test if calls of explosively breeding frogs are attractive to both conspecifics and
111 heterospecifics, we carried out a field playback experiment near known explosive breeding sites
112 in the Amazonian rainforest of French Guiana. We specifically tested whether the chorus
113 produced by two common explosive breeder species with divergent call characteristics and life-
114 histories can attract conspecifics and heterospecifics outside a natural explosive breeding event.
115 The first species, *Trachycephalus coriaceus*, is a large arboreal frog that breeds exclusively in
116 large ephemeral ponds that are suitable for numerous other species of explosive breeders. Thus, *T.*
117 *coriaceus* calls may be used as a reliable acoustic cue indicating suitable breeding habitat by
118 other species. The second species, *Chiasmocleis shudikarensis* is a small terrestrial frog that also
119 uses smaller ephemeral ponds not suitable for other species. Thus, their calls may not be a
120 reliable cue for heterospecifics. If explosive breeders are selectively using social information,
121 then we predict *T. coriaceus* choruses to attract both heterospecifics and conspecifics, and *C.*
122 *shudikarensis* choruses to only attract conspecifics.

123

124 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

125

126 **2.1. Study site**

127
128 Experiments were carried out in three temporary ponds in French Guiana, along the Kaw
129 Mountain (4°36'N; 52°16'W) where explosive breeding events have been irregularly surveyed for
130 the last 15 years (Figure 1A). The climate is characterized by two periods of rainfall: the small
131 rainy season takes place from early December to the end of February while the main rainy season
132 occurs from April to July. Temporary shallow water bodies, or ponds, are flooded during the rainy
133 seasons and then dry out during periods of low rainfall. The study sites corresponded to three
134 temporary ponds named “Blanc”, “Arlesienne” and “Caiman”. These ponds are surrounded by
135 dense tropical forest, located between 236 and 313 m above sea level, covering an area of 399.5
136 m², 672.0 m² and 1192.3 m² respectively.

137

138 **2.2. Playback experiment**

139

140 Four diamond-shaped pitfall stations were deployed at the onset of the rainy season 40 m away
141 from each pond (Figure 1B). Fourteen litre buckets linked with 70 cm high plastic tarp fences
142 were used to trap anurans. Three out of four of pitfall stations were equipped with a speaker (Fun
143 Generation PL 108 A) powered by a generator (Honda EU1000i operating at 50 dB A) placed
144 near the pond i.e. at a similar distance from all the pitfall stations. The fourth pitfall station was
145 used as a silent control to estimate the number of anurans captured accidentally in the area.

146 We used three different playback stimuli: (1) *Chiasmocleis shudikarensis*, (2)
147 *Trachycephalus coriaceus*, and (3) pink noise – a random noise having equal energy per octave
148 similar to the background noise of rainfall (Figure 2). These stimuli were built using Logic pro
149 one (Apple inc.). *Chiasmocleis shudikarensis* emits a continuous series of multipulsed notes (17
150 fused pulses per note) of 0.095-0.099 s in duration and spaced by 0.065-0.010 s pauses. The

151 fundamental frequency (f_0) is at about 1.6 kHz with a positive frequency modulation of about 0.5
152 kHz from the beginning to the end of each note. The dominant frequency, which corresponds to
153 the second harmonic ($2f_0$), is at about 3.5-3.6 kHz. The *C. shudikarensis* stimulus consisted of a
154 42 s recording of an isolated individual of *C. shudikarensis* (Marty & Gaucher 1999), copied 100
155 times within a single track, each copy being successively time-shifted of 0.5 s (Fig. 2B).
156 *Trachycephalus coriaceus* emits long moans of 0.9-1 s in duration irregularly spaced every
157 second or so. These calls are trains of pulses (60 / s) with a fundamental frequency (f_0) around
158 0.35 kHz. The fundamental frequency is the dominant frequency (Fig. 2A). The *T. coriaceus*
159 stimulus consisted of a 52 s recording of a chorus of five individuals of *T. coriaceus* (recorded by
160 Thomas Tilly), copied five times within a single track, each copy being successively time-shifted
161 being successively time-shifted of 0.5 s (Fig. 2B). For this track, sounds of frequency above 1
162 kHz, corresponding to other surrounding species, were removed using a high-pass filter. The time
163 shifting process produces a continuous chorus of overlapping calls that mimics a chorus
164 sequence, and the number of overlapping tracks approximates the abundance of individuals
165 generally observed in the ponds (~ 100 *C. shudikarensis* and ~ 25 *T. coriaceus*). The pink noise
166 was generated by an internal function generator of LogicPro (Fig. 2B). These sequences were
167 looped in order to last the duration of the playback. All sounds had a sampling frequency of 44.1
168 kHz and digitization depth of 16 bits.

169 The playbacks were carried out simultaneously for six successive nights at each pond
170 from 2 to 7 December 2018, seven days after the reproduction of the explosive breeding species.
171 Each station was playing one of the three stimuli between 1900 h and 2200 h. No specimens were
172 found in the pitfalls before each playback. The acoustic level (peak measurement) of the
173 playbacks was measured at a 1 m distance from the speaker at waist height. The level was set at
174 95 dB SPL at 1 m, which corresponded to measurements taken in the same ponds during previous
175 explosive breeding events (AF personal observation). To avoid any spatial habituation, the three

176 stimulus tracks were rotated clockwise between the pitfall stations each night. After 1h30 of
177 playback (that is, at 2030 h), all frogs were counted in the pitfalls, in the trees surrounding each
178 station within the limit of the plastic tarp fences, and on the ground within the same limits (4.5m
179 radius = ~60 m²). A second count was made at the end of the playback session (that is, at 2200 h).
180 Because counted individuals were neither caught nor marked during the playback, only the
181 results of one counting session (that with the highest number of individual frog counts) was used
182 for the analysis. For the same reason the sex of the individuals could not be recorded. The
183 animals were released near the pond, about 5 m away from the fence at the end of the playback.
184 One speaker of the “Blanc” pond failed to play back the pink noise before the second night. No
185 calling activity of the observed species was heard during the experiment.

186

187 **2.3. Data analysis**

188

189 A generalized linear mixed-effects model (GLMM) was used to test whether the number of
190 individuals found around the playback speaker was influenced by the acoustic stimuli. The
191 number of individuals was combined over the three ponds and included individuals found in
192 ground pitfalls (terrestrial species) and on tree branches (arboreal species). The model included
193 the acoustic stimuli and the species as fixed effects, and date and pond as random effects. The
194 model was fitted in R (R core Team 2019) using the function `glmer` of the R-package `lme4` (Bates
195 *et al.* 2014). Since the response variable is a count variable, a Poisson GLMM was first fitted, but
196 the dispersion statistic of the fitted model indicated a slight overdispersion ($\hat{c}=2.67$). Hence,
197 the next model in complexity was fitted with a negative binomial GLMM (Lindén and
198 Mäntyniemi 2011). The Akaike information criterion (AIC; Akaike 1973) computed on both
199 models (the Poisson and the negative binomial models), indicated that the negative binomial
200 model was more suitable. Model stability was checked by excluding ponds and dates, one at a

201 time, from the data. This check did not indicate any influential ponds or dates. Variance Inflation
202 Factors were derived using the function `vif` of the R-package `car` (Fox & Weisberg 2011). When
203 applied to a standard generalized linear model excluding the random effects, it did not indicate
204 collinearity to be an issue. The fitted model was not zero-inflated as revealed with the function
205 ‘`testZeroInflation`’ from the R-package `DHARMA` (Hartig 2017). The full model was compared
206 with the null model (including only the species and the random effects, pond and date) with a
207 likelihood ratio test using the base R function ‘`anova`’, with argument `test` set to ‘`Chisq`’.

208 To compare the counts of each species, two additional models were fitted, one for *C.*
209 *shudikarensis* and one for *T. coriaceus*. Since the counts for *O. leprieurii* were zero on three of
210 the four experiments, no model was fitted for this species. As for the previous analysis, model
211 stability and the absence of zero inflation were checked. Then, a Tukey test was performed as a
212 post-hoc procedure to examine pairwise comparisons for each species between treatments. The
213 post-hoc test was computed with the function ‘`glht`’ from the R package `multcomp` (Hothorn *et al.*
214 2008).

215 The data that support our findings are openly available in Dryad at
216 <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.8w9ghx3jr>.

217

218 **3. RESULTS**

219

220 We observed a total of fourteen species around the playback stations. Among these fourteen
221 species, six were explosive breeding species (see below), five were prolonged arboreal breeding
222 species (*Dendropsophus minutus*, *D. sp. 1*, *Callimedusa tomopterna*, *Phyllomedusa vaillanti*,
223 *Scinax sp. 2*) and four were terrestrial breeding species (*Adenomera andreae*, *Rhinella*
224 *castaneotica*, *Leptodactylus mystaceus*). Out of these fourteen species, only six were detected in
225 the pitfalls (*Chiasmocleis shudikarensis*, *Trachycephalus coriaceus*, *Osteocephalus leprieurii*, *R.*

226 *castaneotica*, *Ceratophrys cornuta*, *A. andreae*). Among the explosive breeding species, half
227 were detected in too low numbers (< 6 individuals) to draw any conclusion (*O. taurinus*, *C.*
228 *cornuta*, *Scinax* sp. 3). However, males and females belonging to three species (*C. shudikarensis*,
229 *T. coriaceus* and *O. lepriurii*) were found frequently at playback stations. None were observed
230 calling, but *T. coriaceus* were observed in amplexus on two occasions, and *O. lepriurii* on one
231 occasion.

232 Overall, the full GLMM was significant compared to the null model ($\chi^2=49.71$, $df=3$,
233 $p<0.001$), revealing that there was a clear effect of the acoustic stimuli and species on the
234 probability of attracting individuals using the playback. More specifically, the stimulus "*T.*
235 *coriaceus*" had the stronger effect in attracting individuals when compared with the other stimuli.
236 The stimuli "*C. shudikarensis*" and pink noise also had a positive effect of attracting individuals,
237 however the pink noise stimulus was not significant (Table 2).

238 Post-hoc test on the species *C. shudikarensis* revealed significant differences between the
239 silent and the "*C. shudikarensis*" stimuli ($x= 1.3218$, $p<0.01$), and between the silent and "*T.*
240 *coriaceus*" stimuli ($x=1.1802$, $p=0.032$). Differences between the silent and pink stimuli were not
241 significant. For the species *T. coriaceus*, the post-hoc test revealed a significant difference
242 between the silent and "*T. coriaceus*" stimuli ($x= 4.2195$, $p<0.001$) and between the pink and the
243 "*T. coriaceus*" stimuli ($x=2.5078$, $p<0.001$). "*C. shudikarensis*" stimulus for *T. coriaceus* was not
244 analyzed statistically since it only had zero values. It is noteworthy that *O. lepriurii* were only
245 found with the "*T. coriaceus*" playback. *Osteocephalus taurinus*, *Ceratophrys cornuta* and *Scinax*
246 sp. 3 was also attracted by the "*T. coriaceus*" track and the pink noise and but unfrequently and in
247 low numbers.

248

249 **4. DISCUSSION**

250

251 Our study presents the first experimental evidence that tropical explosive breeding anurans are
252 attracted to conspecific and heterospecific choruses. As expected, males and females of
253 *Chiasmocleis shudikarensis* and *Trachycephalus coriaceus* were attracted to conspecific calls.
254 Moreover, the call of *T. coriaceus* also attracted heterospecific *C. shudikarensis* and
255 *Osteocephalus leprieurii* as well as other species in low numbers. The traps used were not set
256 within natural breeding sites but were still effective at attracting a number of explosive breeding
257 anuran species, suggesting that explosive breeders use heterospecific calls to locate new breeding
258 sites and synchronize their reproduction.

259 A variety of animals use heterospecific cues and signals as ‘public information’, through
260 which they are able to assess the presence of resources or potential risks (Goodale *et al.* 2010).
261 For example, male túngara frogs, *Engystomops pustulosus*, adjust their calling behaviour to the
262 calls of other species - probably as an indicator of predation risk (Phelps *et al.* 2007). Many
263 migrating species rely on the presence of heterospecifics that share their habitat requirements to
264 orientate themselves towards these habitats, a pattern that occurs in marine crustaceans (Stanley
265 *et al.* 2012), marine molluscs (Lillis *et al.* 2013), marine fish (Simpson *et al.* 2005), birds
266 (Mukhin *et al.* 2004; Thomson *et al.* 2004), frogs (Chang *et al.* 2018) and newts (Diego-Rasilla &
267 Luengo 2004; Pupin *et al.* 2007, Madden & Jehle 2017). Our study suggests that such ‘public
268 information’ produced by male mating calls may also play a role in the breeding ecology of
269 tropical explosively breeding frogs.

270 As predicted, only the vocalization of *Trachycephalus coriaceus*, but not those of
271 *Chiasmocleis shudikarensis*, attracted other species. Being an exclusively explosive breeder and
272 arboreal, *T. coriaceus* might be able to detect the accumulation of water faster than other species
273 and trigger the migration of other conspecifics and heterospecifics toward ponds of sufficient
274 size. Individuals of *T. coriaceus* were observed at the speaker only a few minutes after the start of
275 the playback, even though the natural explosive breeding had occurred days before the

276 experiment. This observation suggests high mobility and opportunistic readiness of this species to
277 reproduce. The call of *T. coriaceus* is also notably lower in frequency compared to other
278 explosive breeding species (Ulloa *et al.* 2019). Low frequency sounds propagate further than
279 higher frequency sounds in dense habitats (Larsen & Radford 2018), making the calls of *T.*
280 *coriaceus* a more suitable long-distance cue for other species. In contrast, the calls of *C.*
281 *shudikarensis* did not attract heterospecific frogs suggesting that this species does not play a role
282 in the emergence of explosive breeding events. The call of this species might not be a reliable cue
283 since *C. shudikarensis* is a small-bodied opportunistic breeder that also calls from small puddles
284 that are not suitable for larger species. The differential effects of the calls of these two species on
285 heterospecifics suggests that the attractive effect of a chorus depends both on the reproductive
286 strategy of the sender and the receiver, as recently shown in another tropical treefrog (Chang *et*
287 *al.* 2018). Nevertheless, an experiment in a controlled environment would be needed to tease
288 apart detectability and ecological relevance of heterospecific cues.

289 The anuran peripheral auditory system display enhanced sensitivity to frequency range of
290 conspecific calls (Simmons 2013). Tuning of the auditory perception is particularly expected in
291 environments with high levels of social background noise, the “cocktail party problem”, such as
292 those experienced by explosive breeding frogs (Velez *et al.* 2013). In the absence of data on the
293 auditory perception of the species involved in our experimentation, we cannot rule out that the
294 higher frequency of the *C. shudikarensis* stimulus (3.6 kHz) was simply not perceived by
295 *Trachycephalus coriaceus* and *Osteocephalus leprieurii* which emit lower dominant frequencies
296 about 0.3 and 1.6 kHz respectively. Nevertheless, even if tuned toward conspecific frequency,
297 frogs most likely remain able to perceive a wide bandwidth from their environment such as rain
298 and fire (Grafe *et al.* 2002, Penna *et al.* 2005) but also heterospecific individuals (Gerhardt &
299 Schwartz 1995).

300 Suitable breeding sites are often patchy and limited for anuran species, and several studies
301 have demonstrated that conspecific choruses allow frogs to locate ponds (e.g. Gerhardt & Klump
302 1988; Bee 2007; Buxton *et al.* 2015; 2018; James *et al.* 2015; Chang *et al.* 2018). The use of
303 acoustic cues presumably increases the chance of encountering mates and helps in searching for a
304 suitable habitat while minimizing energetic expenditure. Since mixed-specific choruses are
305 common in the tropics, heterospecific calls could often be used as indicators of suitable breeding
306 sites. Moreover, the calls of the species in the explosive breeding community vary greatly in call
307 intensity. Some species produce relatively loud calls (e.g., *C. cornuta*, *T. coriaceus*) but other,
308 such as *O. lepreurii* and *Scinax* spp., individually call at much lower intensities. The ability of
309 the later to use loud heterospecific calls may allow them to find breeding sites and provide a
310 timing cue without having to invest energy and exposing themselves to the risks related to loud
311 conspicuous calls. In this context, lower intensity calls may have either been selected for
312 heterospecific phonotaxis, or were the consequence of selection for minimizing energy
313 expenditure when heterospecific calls can be used to find the breeding sites. If multiple anuran
314 species rely on the calls of only a few species (such as *T. coriaceus*) to find suitable breeding
315 sites, then this would also suggest they could represent keystone species for the explosive
316 breeding community.

317 Anurans with prolonged breeding seasons typically face strong competition for food
318 availability, calling territories, oviposition sites, and acoustic space with conspecifics and
319 heterospecifics (Robertson 1986; Wogel *et al.* 2006; Wells 2007; Amézquita *et al.* 2011; Chang *et*
320 *al.* 2018). These species show a variety of derived reproductive strategies, such as terrestrial
321 oviposition and parental care, and males may avoid overcrowded breeding sites investing instead
322 in searching for suitable long-term territories (Wells 1977; Duellman & Trueb 1994; Wells 2007).
323 In contrast, explosive breeding events occur very rapidly and gather multiple species, all
324 depositing eggs directly in the water suggesting limited competition for food, territory,

325 oviposition sites, and acoustic space; the benefits seem to outweigh the cost of intra- and
326 interspecific competition. Competition among larvae is poorly understood, but distinct
327 ecomorphological guilds (e.g. suspension feeder, nektonic, benthic) (Altig & Johnston 1989;
328 Schulze *et al.* 2015) and niche partitioning might limit competition among heterospecific larvae
329 (Inger *et al.* 1986; Alford 1999). Moreover, the benefits of explosive breeding system have been
330 claimed to depend on the dilution effect toward predators favouring large aggregations (Wrona &
331 Dixon 1991). Explosive breeding is thus particularly favourable to the emergence of
332 heterospecific interactions. Heterospecific audiences could be beneficial to loud callers because
333 the increased number of individuals decreases the predation risk per individual. Therefore, the
334 trade-off between increased competition and the predator dilution effect might favour the co-
335 evolution of heterospecific eavesdropping in explosive breeders.

336 Heterospecific eavesdropping is widespread across animals (Goodale *et al.* 2010), but the
337 empirical evidence of acoustic interactions among amphibian species is scarce and limited to
338 prolonged breeders and species assemblages with low diversity (e.g. Diego-Rasilla & Luengo
339 2004, 2007; Pupin *et al.* 2007; Madden & Jehle 2017; Chang *et al.* 2018). Our study shows that
340 tropical explosive breeding anurans are attracted to heterospecific acoustic signals that indicate a
341 potential breeding opportunity, which is extremely circumscribed in space and time. Given the
342 abundance and diversity of communities in tropical ecosystems, the use of heterospecific acoustic
343 cues could prove to be widespread and requires further investigation. Moreover, the use of
344 conspecific signals to attract animals to suitable habitats is a management strategy used for birds
345 and frogs (Buxton *et al.* 2015; 2018). Our results suggest that in tropical systems, playbacks of
346 the calls of certain species could be used in a conservation context at a community scale.

347

348 Table 1: Mean number of individuals per stimulus (*C. shudikarensis*, *T. coriaceus*, pink noise,
 349 silent) averaged over six nights, and over the three ponds. The three most abundant species are
 350 underlined in grey, and the explosive breeding species are in bold (the other ones are prolonged
 351 breeder; *A. andreae* and *R. castaneotica* do not breed in the pond).
 352

Stimulus	Mean number of individuals per night/pond				Total
	<i>C. shudikarensis</i>	<i>T. coriaceus</i>	Pink	Silent	
<u><i>C. shudikarensis</i></u>	3.1	2.4	2.3	0.8	143
<u><i>T. coriaceus</i></u>	0.0	3.8	0.3	0.2	73
<u><i>O. lepriurii</i></u>	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	20
<i>O. taurinus</i>	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.0	5
<i>C. cornuta</i>	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	2
<i>S. sp. 3</i>	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	1
<i>S. sp. 2</i>	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	2
<i>D. sp. 1</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	1
<i>D. minutus</i>	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	6
<i>L. mystaceus</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	5
<i>P. vaillanti</i>	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	3
<i>C. tomopterna</i>	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.0	8
<i>R. castaneotica</i>	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	2
<i>A. andreae</i>	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	1
Total	62	140	39	31	272

353

354

355 Table 2: Parameter estimates and 95% confidence intervals for best fit model predicting number
 356 of individuals found on the traps as a function of playback stimuli in tropical explosive breeding
 357 species. Parameter estimates are shown as differences with respect to the first category (Intercept)
 358 in each variable (silent playback stimulus and species *Chiasmocleis shudikarensis*).

Predictor	Estimate	Confidence intervals	z value	Pr(> z)
(Intercept)	-0.67	-1.64 0.30	-1.345	0.1785
<i>Osteocephalus leprieuri</i>	-2.54	-3.51 -1.57	-5.141	2.74E-07 ***
<i>Trachycephalus coriaceus</i>	-1.76	-2.53 -0.99	-4.483	7.35E-06 ***
Stimulus Pink noise	0.97	-0.01 1.96	1.940	0.0523
Stimulus <i>C. shudikarensis</i>	1.00	0.07 1.93	2.116	3.43E-02 *
Stimulus <i>T. coriaceus</i>	3.07	2.09 4.06	6.102	1.05E-09 ***

359
 360
 361
 362




Figure 1

363


364 **Site location and experimental setup.** (A) Map of French Guiana and the Kaw Mountain with

365 the location of the three temporary ponds, the access road (D6 dotted grey line). (B) The diagram


366 of the experimental setup deployed at each pond depicting the four positions where acoustic

367 stimuli were played back. Each loudspeaker was surrounded by diamond-shaped fence and pitfall

368 traps.



369
 370 **Figure 2 Acoustic stimuli.** (A) One-second spectrograms and waveforms of the recordings used
 371 to build the *C. shudikarensis* call and the *T. coriaceus* call signals after high-pass filtering. (B)
 372 One-second spectrograms and waveforms of the generated stimuli mimicking choruses of *C.*
 373 *shudikarensis* (~ 100 individuals) and *T. coriaceus* (~ 25 individuals) and the pink noise used in
 374 the playback experiments. Short-term Fourier transform parameters: sampling frequency of 44.1
 375 kHz, Hanning window of 500 samples with an overlap of 90 %, 30 dB dynamic range. Obtained
 376 with Seewave R package (Sueur *et al.* 2008). Pictures show males of each species while calling.
 377 Note the inflated vocal sacs. Pictures by Antoine Fouquet.



378
 379 Figure 3 **Boxplot of the mean number of individuals** over the three ponds (summed for the 6
 380 nights) of the most abundant species found with the four stimuli (*C. shudikarensis*, *T. coriaceus*,
 381 pink noise and silent control). Note that *Osteocephalus leprieurii* is a species that does not breed
 382 in the pond “Blanc”.

383

384 **Acknowledgements** We warmly thank the people who loaned some equipment, helped for the
385 set-up of the pitfalls and the survey: Vincent Rufroy, Mael Dewynter, Amélie Beillard, Alexandra
386 Le Manchec, Morgane Sineau, Florie Delfour, Joris Grenon, Yvon Guenescheau, Bastien Moisan,
387 Martin Bonhomme, Lois Bouchet, Hugo Reizine, Laetitia Proux, Julien Clozeau, Pierre Leclerc,
388 Julien Morand, Anais Bonnefond, Benoit Villette, Elven Remerand, Timothée Lepape, Mathilde
389 Segers, Audric Broux, Vincent Premel, Bettina Lê, Sevahnee Pyneeandy, Yannick Lima, Michel
390 Blanc, Mathias Fernandez, IRD Cayenne, the GEPOG (Groupe d'Etude et de Protection des
391 Oiseaux de Guyane) and the CERATO herpetological society. We are grateful to the USR3456
392 LEEISA (Laboratoire Ecologie, Evolution, Interactions des Systèmes amazoniens) in Cayenne,
393 the Reserve Naturelle des Marais de Kaw-Roura (Jean Olivier and Yannick Lima), the DEAL
394 Guyane (the Direction de l'Environnement, de l'Aménagement et du Logement). We also thank
395 Anthony Taillard, Pierre Judon, Jason Iescalleet and Gildas Houdebine for their contributions in
396 the processing of the media related to the study and Julian Donald for proof-reading the English
397 of this manuscript. We are grateful to two anonymous referees for their very helpful and
398 constructive comments on the submitted manuscript.

399

400 **Funding** This study benefited from an “Investissement d'Avenir” grant managed by the Agence
401 Nationale de la Recherche (CEBA, ref. ANR-10-LABX-25-01).

402 **Animal Welfare Note** This study was approved by the “Direction de l'Environnement, de
403 l'Aménagement et du Logement de la Guyane” (arrêté préfectoral R03_2018_10_25_002)
404 following the positive recommendation of the “Conseil Scientifique Régional du Patrimoine
405 Naturel” and the committee of the “Reserve Naturelle des Marais de Kaw-Roura” where the
406 experiment took place. This study was permitted after careful consideration of its impacts. We
407 also adhere to the “Guidelines for use of live amphibians and reptiles in field and laboratory

408 research” by the Herpetological Animal Care and Use Committee (HACC) of the American
409 Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists. The study took place after the main breeding event
410 of the study species therefore minimizing the lasting effect on the population. Our experiment
411 attracted several species to the sound source during the playback, but it did not trigger breeding
412 and the animals dispersed after the playback. Any potential disturbance to other fauna by the
413 playback, the noise due to the generator powering the speakers, and the presence of the
414 experimenters in the area lasted for three hours each night, was temporary and localized to small
415 areas. The manipulation of animals was limited to very brief displacements of a few meters. The
416 study required digging of holes (16 per pond, 4 stations of 4 traps) for pitfall traps but these were
417 refilled at the end of the experiment.

418

419 **References**

420

421 Aichinger, M. (1987). Annual activity patterns of anurans in a seasonal neotropical

422 environment. *Oecologia* 71(4), 583–592.

423 Akaike, H. (1973). Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle.

424 In: B. N. Petrov & F. Caski (Eds.) *Proceedings of the Second International Symposium*

425 *on Information Theory* (pp. 267–281). Budapest: Akademiai Kiado.

426 Alford, R. A. (1999). Ecology: resource use, competition, and predation. In: R. W.

427 McDiarmid, & R. Altig (Eds.) *Tadpoles: The Biology of Anuran Larvae* (pp. 240–278).

428 Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

429 Altig, R., & Johnston, G.F. (1989). Guilds of anuran larvae: relationships among

430 developmental modes, morphologies, and habitats. *Herpetological Monographs* 1, 81–

431 109.

432 Amézquita, A., Flechas, S.V., Lima, A.P., Gasser, H., & Hödl, W. (2011). Acoustic

433 interference and recognition space within a complex assemblage of dendrobatid frogs.

434 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108(41), 17058–17063.

435 Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2014). Fitting linear mixed-effects models

436 using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* 67, 1–48.

437 Bee, M. A. (2007). Selective phonotaxis by male wood frogs (*Rana sylvatica*) to the sound of

438 a chorus. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 61(6), 955–966.

439 Bernal, X. E., Rand, A. S., & Ryan, M. J.. (2007). Sex differences in response to

440 nonconspecific advertisement calls: receiver permissiveness in male and female

441 túngara frogs. *Animal Behaviour* 73(6), 955–964.

442 Buxton, V. L., Ward, M. P., & Sperry, J. H. (2015). Use of chorus sounds for location of
443 breeding habitat in 2 species of anuran amphibians. *Behavioral Ecology* 26(4), 1111–
444 1118.

445 Buxton, V. L., Ward, M. P., & Sperry, J. H. (2018). Evaluation of conspecific attraction as a
446 management tool across several species of anurans. *Diversity* 10(1), 6.

447 Chang, C., Cheng, Y. C., & Lin, S. M. (2018). Influence of conspecific and heterospecific
448 cues on phonotaxis behavior in a polyandrous treefrog. *Behavioral Ecology and*
449 *Sociobiology* 72(11), 179.

450 Christie, K., Schul, J., & Feng, A. S. (2010). Phonotaxis to male's calls embedded within a
451 chorus by female gray treefrogs, *Hyla versicolor*. *Journal of Comparative Physiology*
452 A 196(8), 569–579.

453 Danchin, E., Giraldeau, L. A., Valone, T. J., & Wagner, R. H. (2004). Public information: from
454 nosy neighbors to cultural evolution. *Science* 305(5683), 487–491.

455 Diego-Rasilla, F. J., & Luengo, R. M. (2004). Heterospecific call recognition and phonotaxis
456 in the orientation behavior of the marbled newt, *Triturus marmoratus*. *Behavioral*
457 *Ecology and Sociobiology* 55(6), 556–560.

458 Diego-Rasilla, F. J., & Luengo, R. M. (2007). Acoustic orientation in the palmate newt,
459 *Lissotriton helveticus*. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 61(9), 1329–1335.

460 Ferguson, D. E. (1971). The sensory basis of orientation in amphibians. *Annals of the New*
461 *York Academy of Sciences* 188, 30–36.

462 Forsman, J. T., Mönkkönen, M., Korpimäki, E., & Thomson, R. L. (2012). Mammalian nest
463 predator feces as a cue in avian habitat selection decisions. *Behavioral Ecology* 24(1),
464 262–266.

465 Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2011). *Multivariate linear models in R. An R Companion to Applied*
466 *Regression*. Los Angeles, CA: Thousand Oaks.

467 Gerhardt, H. C., & Huber, F. (2002). Acoustic communication in insects and anurans:
468 common problems and diverse solutions. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

469 Gerhardt, H. C., & Klump, G. M. (1988). Phonotactic responses and selectivity of barking
470 treefrogs (*Hyla gratiosa*) to chorus sounds. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A*
471 163(6):795–802.

472 Gerhardt HC, Schwartz JJ (1995) Interspecific interactions and species recognition. In: H.
473 Heatwole & B. K. Sullivan (Eds.). *Amphibian Biology*, vol 2. Social Behavior (pp
474 603–632). Surrey Beatty, Chipping Norton, UK.

475 Goodale, E., Beauchamp, G., Magrath, R. D., Nieh, J. C., & Ruxton, G. D. (2010).
476 Interspecific information transfer influences animal community structure. *Trends in*
477 *Ecology and Evolution* 25(6), 354–361.

478 Gottsberger, B., & Gruber, E. (2004). Temporal partitioning of reproductive activity in a
479 neotropical anuran community. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* 20(3), 271–280.

480 Grafe, T.U., Döbler, S. & Linsenmair, K.E., 2002. Frogs flee from the sound of fire.
481 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*,
482 269(1495), pp.999-1003.

483 Hartig, F. (2017). DHARMA: residual diagnostics for hierarchical (multi-level/mixed)
484 regression models. R package version 0.1.

485 Heusser, H. (1960). Über die Beziehungen der Erdkröte (*Bufo bufo* L.) zu ihrem Laichplatz II.
486 *Behaviour* 16, 93–109.

487 Hödl, W. (1990). Reproductive diversity in Amazonian lowland frogs. *Fortschritte der*
488 *Zoologie* 38, 41–60.

489 Hothorn T, Bretz F, Westfall P (2008). “Simultaneous Inference in General Parametric
490 Models.” *Biometrical Journal*, 50(3), 346–363.

491 Inger, R. F., Voris, H. K., & Frogner, K. J. (1986). Organization of a community of tadpoles in
492 rain forest streams in Borneo. *Journal of Tropical Ecology* 2(3), 193–205.

493 Ishii, S., Kubokawa, K., Kikuchi, M., & Nishio, H. (1995). Orientation of the toad *Bufo*
494 *japonicus* toward the breeding pond. *Zoological Science* 12, 475–484.

495 James, M. S., Stockwell, M. P., Clulow, J., Clulow, S., & Mahony, M. J. (2015). Investigating
496 behaviour for conservation goals: Conspecific call playback can be used to alter
497 amphibian distributions within ponds. *Biological Conservation* 192, 287–293.

498 Jenkins, C. N., Pimm, S. L., & Joppa, L. N. (2013). Global patterns of terrestrial vertebrate
499 diversity and conservation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110(28),
500 E2602–E2610.

501 Joly, P. (2019). Behavior in a changing landscape: using movement ecology to inform
502 amphibian conservation. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 7, 155.

503 Larsen, O. N., & Radford, C. (2018). Acoustic conditions affecting sound communication in
504 air and underwater. In: H. Slabbekoorn, R. J Dooling, A. N. Popper, & R. R. Fay Eds.).
505 *Effects of anthropogenic noise on Animals* (pp. 109–144), New York: Springer New
506 York.

507 Lillis, A., Eggleston, D. B., & Bohnenstiehl D. R. (2013). Oyster larvae settle in response to
508 habitat-associated underwater sounds. *PLoS ONE* 8, 1–10.

509 Lindén, A., & Mäntyniemi, S. (2011). Using the negative binomial distribution to model
510 overdispersion in ecological count data. *Ecology* 92(7), 1414–1421.

511 Madden, N., & Jehle, R. (2017). Acoustic orientation in the great crested newt (*Triturus*
512 *cristatus*). *Amphibia-Reptilia* 38, 57–65.

513 Magrath, R.D., Haff, T.M., Fallow, P.M. and Radford, A.N., 2015. Eavesdropping on
514 heterospecific alarm calls: from mechanisms to consequences. *Biological Reviews*,
515 90(2), pp.560-586.

- 516 Marty, C., & Gaucher, P. (1999). Guide sonore des Amphibiens Anoures de Guyane. CD
517 audio. Mens: CEBA.
- 518 McGuire, B., Oli, M. K., & Getz, L. L. (2009). Effects of conspecific and heterospecific
519 residents on patterns of immigration in two species of voles. *Acta theriologica* 54(4),
520 321–332.
- 521 Mönkkönen, M., Härdling, R., Forsman, J. T., & Tuomi, J. (1999). Evolution of heterospecific
522 attraction: using other species as cues in habitat selection. *Evolutionary Ecology* 13(1),
523 93–106.
- 524 Mukhin, A., Chernetsov, N., & Kishkinev, D. (2008). Acoustic information as a distant cue for
525 habitat recognition by nocturnally migrating passerines during landfall. *Behavioral*
526 *Ecology* 19(4), 716–723.
- 527 Mullet, T. C., Farina, A., & Gage, S. H. (2017). The acoustic habitat hypothesis: an
528 ecoacoustics perspective on species habitat selection. *Biosemitotics* 10, 319–336.
- 529 Oldham, R. S., & Gerhardt, H. C. (1975). Behavioral isolating mechanisms of the treefrogs
530 *Hyla cinerea* and *H. gratiosa*. *Copeia* 23, 223–231.
- 531 Pašukonis, A., Trenkwalder, K., Ringler, M., Ringler, E., Mangione, R., Steininger, J.,
532 Warrington, I., & Hödl, W. (2016). The significance of spatial memory for water
533 finding in a tadpole-transporting frog. *Animal Behaviour* 116, 89–98.
- 534 Penna, M., Pottstock, H. and Velasquez, N., 2005. Effect of natural and synthetic noise on
535 evoked vocal responses in a frog of the temperate austral forest. *Animal Behaviour*,
536 70(3), pp.639-651.
- 537 Phelps, S. M., Rand, A. S., & Ryan, M. J. (2007). The mixed-species chorus as public
538 information: túngara frogs eavesdrop on a heterospecific. *Behavioral Ecology* 18(1),
539 108–114.

- 540 Pittman, S. E., Osbourn, M. S., & Semlitsch, R. D. (2014). Movement ecology of amphibians:
541 a missing component for understanding population declines. *Biological Conservation*
542 169, 44–53.
- 543 Prado, C., Uetanabaro, M., & Haddad, C. (2005). Breeding activity patterns, reproductive
544 modes, and habitat use by anurans (Amphibia) in a seasonal environment in the
545 Pantanal, Brazil. *Amphibia-Reptilia* 26(2), 211–221.
- 546 Pupin, F., Sacchi, R., Gentili, A., Galeotti, P., & Fasola, M. (2007). Discrimination of toad
547 calls by smooth newts: support for the heterospecific attraction hypothesis. *Animal*
548 *Behaviour* 74(6), 1683–1690.
- 549 Reed, J. M., & Dobson, A. P. (1993). Behavioural constraints and conservation biology:
550 conspecific attraction and recruitment. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 8(7), 253–
551 256.
- 552 Robertson, J. G. (1986). Male territoriality, fighting and assessment of fighting ability in the
553 Australian frog *Uperoleia rugosa*. *Animal Behaviour* 34(3), 763–772.
- 554 Rodrigues, D. J., Lima, A. P., Magnusson, W. E., & Costa, F. R. 2010. Temporary pond
555 availability and tadpole species composition in Central Amazonia. *Herpetologica*
556 66(2), 124–130.
- 557 Ryan, M. J., & Rand, A.S. (1993). Species recognition and sexual selection as a unitary
558 problem in animal communication. *Evolution* 47(2), 647–657.
- 559 Ryan, M. J., Tuttle, M. D., & Taft, L. K. (1981). The costs and benefits of frog chorusing
560 behavior. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 8(4), 273–278.
- 561 Schulze, A., Jansen, M., & Köhler, G. (2015). Tadpole diversity of Bolivia's lowland anuran
562 communities: molecular identification, morphological characterisation, and ecological
563 assignment. *Zootaxa* 4016(1), 1–11.

564 Seppänen, J. T., Forsman, J. T., Mönkkönen, M., & Thomson, R. L. (2007). Social
565 information use is a process across time, space, and ecology, reaching heterospecifics.
566 Ecology 88(7), 1622–1633.

567 Shoop, C. R. (1965). Orientation of *Ambystoma maculatum*: movements to and from breeding
568 ponds. Science 149, 558–559.

569 Simmons AM (2013) “To Ear is Human, to Frogive is Divine”: Bob Capranica’s legacy to
570 auditory neuroethology. J Comp Physiol A 199:169–182

571 Simpson, S. D., Meekan, M., Montgomery, J., McCauley, R., & Jeffs, A. (2005). Homeward
572 Sound. Science 308, 221.

573 Sinsch, U. (1990). Migration and orientation in anuran amphibians. Ethology Ecology and
574 Evolution 2(1), 65–79.

575 Sinsch, U. (2006). Orientation and navigation in Amphibia. Marine and Freshwater Behaviour
576 and Physiology 39, 65–71.

577 Sinsch, U. (2014). Movement ecology of amphibians: from individual migratory behaviour to
578 spatially structured populations in heterogeneous landscapes. Canadian Journal of
579 Zoology 92(6), 491–502.

580 Slabbekoorn, H., & Bouton, N. (2008). Soundscape orientation: a new field in need of sound
581 investigation. Animal Behaviour 76(4), e5–e8.

582 Stamps, J. A. (1988). Conspecific attraction and aggregation in territorial species. American
583 Naturalist 131(3), 329–347.

584 Stanley, J. A., Radford, C. A., & Jeffs, A. G. (2012). Location, location, location: finding a
585 suitable home among the noise. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological
586 Sciences 279, 3622–3631.

587 Sueur, J., Aubin, T., & Simonis, C. (2008). Seewave: a free modular tool for sound analysis
588 and synthesis. Bioacoustics 18, 213–226

- 589 Swanson, E. M., Tekmen, S. M., & Bee, M. A. (2007). Do female frogs exploit inadvertent
590 social information to locate breeding aggregations? *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 85,
591 921–932
- 592 Thomson, R. L., Forsman, J. T., & Mönkkönen, M. (2003). Positive interactions between
593 migrant and resident birds: testing the heterospecific attraction hypothesis. *Oecologia*
594 134(3), 431–438.
- 595 Ulloa, J. S., Aubin, T., Llusia, D., Courtois, E. A., Fouquet, A., Gaucher, P., Pavoine, S., &
596 Sueur, J. (2019). Explosive breeding in tropical anurans: environmental triggers,
597 community composition and acoustic structure. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 19, 28.
- 598 Vélez, A., Schwartz, J.J. and Bee, M.A., 2013. Anuran acoustic signal perception in noisy
599 environments. In *Animal communication and noise* (pp. 133-185). Springer, Berlin,
600 Heidelberg.
- 601 Wells, K. D. (1977). The social behaviour of anuran amphibians. *Animal Behaviour* 25, 666–
602 693.
- 603 Wells, K. D. (2007). *The ecology and behavior of amphibians*. University of Chicago Press.
- 604 Wogel, H., Abrunhosa, P. A., & Pombal, J. P. (2006). Chorus organization of the leaf-frog
605 *Phyllomedusa rohdei* (Anura, Hylidae). *Herpetological Journal* 16(1), 21–27.
- 606 Wollerman, L., & Wiley, R. H. (2002). Background noise from a natural chorus alters female
607 discrimination of male calls in a Neotropical frog. *Animal Behaviour* 63(1), 15–22.
- 608 Wrona, F. J., & Dixon, R. J. (1991). Group size and predation risk: a field analysis of
609 encounter and dilution effects. *American Naturalist* 137(2), 186–201.