**The following Supporting Information is available for this article online:**

*Table S1:* Additional information on method of diet collection, number of food items per

nest, percentage caterpillars in the diet, other important prey types and percentage of

unidentified items for the different areas. NA’s indicate that data on this feature was not

available. ‘Adult Lep.’ is adult Lepidoptera.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Area | Sampling method | Number of food items per nest | Mean % Caterpillars per habitat | Other important prey types (in %) | % of unidentified items |
| Hoge Veluwe, NL | Videos | Range= 25-249, mean= 95.4 | Oak: 34.7Other: 23.3 | NA | NA |
| Drenthe, NL | Photos | Range: 26-141, mean= 71.5  | Oak: 37.5Other: 28.9 | Coleoptera: 18.4Arachnida: 14.4 | 33 |
| Öland, S | Videos | Range=7-123, mean= 35.9 | Oak: 35.3Other: 13.1 | Winged insects: 52.5 | NA |
| North Wales, UK | Videos | Range= 7-600, mean= 112.3 | Oak: 40.4 | NA | NA |
| Kilingi-Nõmme, EST | Videos | Range: 14-98, mean= 44.3 | Other: 38.0 | Coleoptera: 19.5, Adult Lep.: 9.0 | 34 |
| Oslo, N | Videos | Range=7-40, mean=25.1 | Other: 31.2 | Diptera: 60Arachnida: 8.0 | NA |
| Harjavalta, FIN | Videos | Range=8-149, mean= 41.9 | Other: 23.5 | Adult Lep.: 20.0Arachnida: 14.3 | NA |
| Turku, FIN | Photos | Range= 49-262, mean= 116.9 | Oak: 40.6Other: 12.8 | Adult Lep.: 16.9Arachnida: 12.5 | 39 |
| Revda, RUS | Neck-collars | Range= 7-91, mean= 22.7 | Other: 10.6 | Arachnida: 21Diptera: 17 | 0 |

*Appendix S1:* Analysis of seasonal changes in nestling diet in relation to timing of

caterpillars in the environment:

We analysed data on 67 nests from one area, Hoge Veluwe, Netherlands, of which we

had information on the date of the caterpillar peak of oak trees (Visser, Holleman & Gienapp 2006), in order to confirm that a decline of caterpillars in the diet corresponds with an decline in the environment.

We compared two models with proportion of caterpillars in the diet as dependent (y) and either deviation (in days) from median hatching date (model 1) or deviation from the

 caterpillar peak (model 2) as covariates. We used function *lmer* (package *lme4*) in R (R Development Core Team 2010) with binomial error distribution and year as a random intercept (5 years were available).

Model 2 had a clearly lower AIC value (∆AIC = 8.4), suggesting that proportions of

caterpillars in the diet closely reflect timing of caterpillars in the environment.

*Table S2:* Model comparison using AIC, with proportion of caterpillars as dependent and deviations from either hatch date (model 1) or peak date (model2) as covariate.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Linear mixed models (lmer)  | AIC |
| Model 1: y ~ Deviation from median hatch date, random= 1|year | 497.2 |
| Model 2: y ~ Deviation from peak date, random= 1|year | 488.8 |

***Figure S1:* Relationship between proportion of caterpillars in the nestling diet and the deviation from median hatch date (in days, panel A) or the deviation from peak date of caterpillars (in days, panel B). Raw data points (per nest) and predicted curves from two GLM’s are shown.
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