
Paternity loss in contrasting mammalian societies

T.H Clutton-Brock and K Isvaran

Biol. Lett. 2006 **2**, 513-516
doi: 10.1098/rsbl.2006.0531

References

[This article cites 29 articles, 2 of which can be accessed free](#)
<http://rsbl.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/2/4/513.full.html#ref-list-1>

Article cited in:
<http://rsbl.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/2/4/513.full.html#related-urls>

Email alerting service

Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article - sign up in the box at the top right-hand corner of the article or click [here](#)

To subscribe to *Biol. Lett.* go to: <http://rsbl.royalsocietypublishing.org/subscriptions>

Paternity loss in contrasting mammalian societies

T. H. Clutton-Brock* and K. Isvaran

Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, Downing Street, Cambridge CB2 3EJ, UK

*Author for correspondence (thcb@hermes.cam.ac.uk).

Recent genetic analyses show that, in social mammals, loss of paternity by breeding males varies with strategies of mate guarding rather than with the degree of polygyny.

Keywords: paternity; breeding systems; mammals

1. INTRODUCTION

In a large number of birds and a few mammals, breeding adults form monogamous pairs though either one or both partners sometimes mate outside the pair bond (Kleiman 1977; Birkhead & Moller 1996; Brotherton & Komers 2003). In some socially monogamous (SM) species, monogamy may evolve because females require male assistance in rearing young (Komers & Brotherton 1997; Brotherton & Komers 2003). For example, in a number of birds and some mammals, females are either unable to rear young without male assistance or less successful when they have no partner to assist them (Lack 1968; Ligon 1999; Gubernick & Teferi 2000; Burley & Johnson 2002). However, in other species, males make little or no contribution to provisioning or protecting their offspring and it is unlikely that social monogamy is maintained by any benefits associated with the presence of males (Dunbar 1988; Clutton-Brock 1991; Brotherton & Manser 1997). For example, in dik-dik *Madoqua* spp., males spend less time with their mates when females have dependent young than at other times of the year and their presence has no obvious benefits to females (Brotherton & Manser 1997; Brotherton & Komers 2003).

Two hypotheses have been made as to why males should defend single females in monogamous species where they do not contribute to parental care (Brotherton & Komers 2003). First, it may not be feasible for a male to defend the range of more than one female because 'floater' males swiftly occupy temporarily vacant ranges (Brotherton & Manser 1997). Second, the benefits of polygyny to males may not be as large as they appear if paternity certainty declines as the number of females a male defends increases (Dunbar 1988; Brotherton & Komers 2003). While the first argument applies only to species where females hold separate ranges, the second also applies to species where females form groups and suggests that the benefits of large harem size to males may not increase in proportion to the number of females defended.

Until recently, genetic assessments of paternity in mammals have been too scarce for it to be possible to test the hypothesis that paternity certainty is higher in SM systems than in polygynous or polygynandrous

ones. However, the extension of genetic studies to a wider range of species now makes preliminary comparisons feasible. Using genetic estimates of paternity in 24 species, this paper investigates the extent and causes of variation in paternity certainty in mammals and tests the suggestion that paternity certainty is lower in polygynous systems than in SM ones.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

We extracted estimates of paternity certainty for 24 species (nine primates, four rodents, six carnivores, two bats, one insectivore and two ungulates) from published sources. For each study, we calculated the proportion of young born to resident females that were *not* fathered by the resident male or (where more than one breeding male was present) by the most dominant resident male as reported by studies (% extra-dominant paternity, EDP; table 1). We classified breeding systems where a single breeding male is present in each group as SM or socially polygynous (SP), allocating systems where breeding groups included several breeding males to a separate category (multi-male, MM). For monogamous systems where occasionally more than one female breeds (as in *Lycaon pictus* and *Suricata suricatta*), we used values of EDP for the dominant female alone since subordinates are commonly related to the resident male and breed with members of other groups (Griffin *et al.* 2003). Available estimates for *Helogale parvula* (table 1) do not separate data for dominant and subordinate females and are consequently likely to exaggerate EDP. In addition, for SM and SP systems, we distinguished between systems where males were closely associated with breeding females (continuously associated, CA) and those where males were only intermittently associated with the females they defended (intermittently associated, IA). We classified species as CA if females were continuously guarded by males during the period of oestrous (e.g. *Madoqua kirki*), or if males were spatially closely associated with females during active periods (e.g. *Hapalemur griseus*). Species were classified as IA if males did not closely guard females (e.g. *Hypogeomys antimena*), or if males defended territories overlapping female ranges but foraged separately, so that breeding females were frequently out of sight of the dominant male (e.g. *Urocyon littoralis*), or if females commonly moved between groups defended by individual males (e.g. *Cervus elaphus*). We modelled EDP as a function of breeding system and association pattern using linear models with normally distributed errors. EDP was arcsine square-root transformed in all analyses and all estimates shown are back-transformed; standard errors reported are therefore asymmetrical and shown as (estimate – 1 s.e., estimate + 1 s.e.). The taxa in our sample are widely distributed across multiple clades suggesting that phylogenetic correction is not necessary. However, we also ran analyses incorporating phylogenetic information, using phylogenetic generalized least-squares methods (Martins & Hansen 1997), which gave similar results.

3. RESULTS

The proportion of offspring fathered by males other than the resident dominant (%EDP) varies widely in both monogamous and polygynous species, ranging from 0 to over 40% in monogamous species and from 0 to over 80% in polygynous and MM societies (see table 1). Contrary to the hypothesis that polygyny is associated with inevitable reductions in paternity certainty, there is no significant difference in %EDP between SM and SP species, though there is a tendency in this direction (figure 1a). In contrast, where one or more females are defended by a single breeding male, %EDP is significantly higher in systems where males are continuously associated with the females they are defending (CA) than in systems where males forage independently or female groups are unstable (IA; figure 1b). In a linear model with %EDP as the response variable and with both *breeding system* and *association pattern* as explanatory variables, the estimated difference between categories of *breeding system* controlling for *association pattern* was 4.0% (estimate – 1 s.e., estimate + 1 s.e. = –1.2, 12.3;

Table 1. Proportion of offspring not fathered by the dominant or sole male in each group (% EDP) in 24 mammals when paternity has been assessed using genetic techniques. (The sample includes nine primates, four rodents, six carnivores, one insectivore, two bats and two ungulates. Social breeding system: SM, social monogamy; SP, social polygyny; MM, multi-male. Association patterns: CA, continuously associated; IA, intermittently associated. In four species (*Alouatta seniculus*, *Crocidura russula*, *Hapalemur griseus* and *Semnopithecus entellus*), separate estimates were available for the different breeding systems. We have included these as separate points in our analysis (figure 1), but including only one estimate of %EDP for the predominant breeding system does not affect the outcome of the analysis.)

species	social breeding system	association pattern between males and females	%EDP	sources
<i>Peromyscus californicus</i>	SM	CA	0	Ribble (1991)
<i>Hypogeomys antimena</i>	SM	IA	4.2	Sommer (2003)
<i>Marmota marmota</i>	SM	IA	15.9	Arnold (1990) and Cohas <i>et al.</i> (2006)
<i>Hapalemur griseus</i>	SM	CA	8.7	Nievergelt <i>et al.</i> (2002)
<i>Cheirogaleus medius</i>	SM	IA	43.8	Fietz <i>et al.</i> (2000)
<i>Crocidura russula</i>	SM	IA	0	Bouteiller & Perrin (2000)
<i>Madoqua kirkii</i>	SM	CA	0	Brotherton <i>et al.</i> (1997)
<i>Urocyon littoralis</i>	SM	IA	25.0	Roemer <i>et al.</i> (2001)
<i>Lycan pictus</i>	SM	CA	10.3	Girman <i>et al.</i> (1997)
<i>Suricata suricatta</i>	SM	CA	17.0	Griffin <i>et al.</i> (2003)
<i>Helogale parvula</i>	SM	CA	24.0	Keane <i>et al.</i> (1994)
<i>Hapalemur griseus</i>	SP	CA	7.1	Nievergelt <i>et al.</i> (2002)
<i>Alouatta seniculus</i>	SP	CA	0	Pope (1990)
<i>Semnopithecus entellus</i>	SP	CA	0	Launhardt <i>et al.</i> (2001)
<i>Crocidura russula</i>	SP	IA	0	Bouteiller & Perrin (2000)
<i>Mirounga angustirostris</i>	SP	IA	60.0	Hoelzel <i>et al.</i> (1999)
<i>Mirounga leonina</i>	SP	IA	42.0	Hoelzel <i>et al.</i> (1999)
<i>Artibeus jamaicensis</i>	SP	IA	45.0	Ortega <i>et al.</i> (2003)
<i>Sacropteryx bilineata</i>	SP	IA	69.9	Heckel & von Helversen (2003)
<i>Cervus elaphus</i>	SP	IA	37.8	Pemberton <i>et al.</i> (unpublished data)
<i>Cryptomys hottentotus</i>	MM	—	44.9	Bishop <i>et al.</i> (2004)
<i>Semnopithecus entellus</i>	MM	—	43.0	Launhardt <i>et al.</i> (2001)
<i>Alouatta seniculus</i>	MM	—	7.1	Pope (1990)
<i>Macaca fascicularis</i>	MM	—	28.9	de Ruiter <i>et al.</i> (1994)
<i>Macaca mulatta</i>	MM	—	86.7	Berard <i>et al.</i> (1994)
<i>Mandrillus sphinx</i>	MM	—	26.7	Wickings <i>et al.</i> (1993)
<i>Gorilla beringei beringei</i>	MM	—	15.0	Bradley <i>et al.</i> (2005)
<i>Eulemur fulvus rufus</i>	MM	—	33.3	Wimmer & Kappeler (2002)




Figure 1. Mean (± 1 s.e.) %EDP in species with (a) contrasting breeding systems and (b) contrasting patterns of association between males and females. The same 20 EDP estimates (see table 1) were used in both panels. p -values shown are from a linear model with %EDP as the response variable and with both *breeding system* and *association pattern* as explanatory variables (see §3).

$t_{17}=0.712$, $p=0.486$), while the estimated difference between categories of *association pattern* controlling for *breeding system* was 18.3% (8.5, 30.2; $t_{17}=2.293$, $p=0.035$). MM systems show levels of %EDP similar to those in uni-male systems where males are not closely associated with females and significantly higher than those found where a single male is continuously associated with one or more females (%EDP in MM

species: mean = 34.7 (25.8, 44.3), $N=8$; linear model comparing %EDP of MM, CA and IA: $F_{2,25}=5.43$, $p=0.011$; difference in EDP between MM and CA = 30.6% (23.5, 34.3), $t=-3.09$, $p_{\text{adjusted}}=0.005$; difference between MM and IA = 9.1% (-3.2, 19.6), $t=-0.75$, $p_{\text{adjusted}}=0.461$; p -values are adjusted for multiple comparisons using sequential Bonferroni correction on three comparisons).

- Komers, P. E. & Brotherton, P. N. M. 1997 Female space use is the best predictor of monogamy in mammals. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **264**, 1261–1270. (doi:10.1098/rspb.1997.0174)
- Lack, D. 1968 *Ecological adaptations for breeding in birds*. London, UK: Methuen & Co.
- Launhardt, K., Borries, C., Hardt, C., Epplen, J. T. & Winkler, P. 2001 Paternity analysis of alternative male reproductive routes among the langurs (*Semnopithecus entellus*) of Ramnagar. *Anim. Behav.* **61**, 53–64. (doi:10.1006/anbe.2000.1590)
- Ligon, J. D. 1999 *The evolution of avian breeding systems*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Martins, E. P. & Hansen, T. F. 1997 Phylogenies and the comparative method: a general approach to incorporating phylogenetic information into the analysis of interspecific data. *Am. Nat.* **149**, 646–667. (doi:10.1086/286013)
- Nievergelt, C. M., Mutschler, T., Feistner, A. T. C. & Woodruff, D. S. 2002 Social system of the alaostran gentle lemur (*Hapalemur griseus alaostransis*): genetic characterization of group composition and mating system. *Am. J. Primatol.* **57**, 157–176. (doi:10.1002/ajp.10046)
- Ortega, J., Maldonado, J. E., Wilkinson, G. S., Arita, H. T. & Fleischer, R. C. 2003 Male dominance, paternity, and relatedness in the Jamaican fruit-eating bat (*Artibeus jamaicensis*). *Mol. Ecol.* **12**, 2409–2415. (doi:10.1046/j.1365-294X.2003.01924.x)
- Pope, T. R. 1990 The reproductive consequences of cooperation in the red howler monkey: paternity exclusion in multi-male and single-male troops using genetic markers. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **27**, 439–446. (doi:10.1007/BF00164071)
- Ribble, D. O. 1991 The monogamous mating system of *Peromyscus californicus* as revealed by DNA fingerprinting. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **29**, 161–166. (doi:10.1007/BF00166397)
- Roemer, G. W., Smith, D. A., Garcelon, D. K. & Wayne, R. K. 2001 The behavioural ecology of the island fox (*Urocyon littoralis*). *J. Zool.* **255**, 1–14. (doi:10.1017/S0952836901001066)
- Sommer, S. 2003 Social and reproductive monogamy in rodents: the case of the Malagasy giant jumping rat (*Hypogeomys antimena*). In *Monogamy: mating strategies and partnerships in birds, humans and other mammals* (ed. U. H. Reichard & C. Boesch). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wickings, E. J., Bossi, T. & Dixson, A. F. 1993 Reproductive success in the mandrill, *Mandrillus sphinx*: correlations of male dominance and mating success with paternity, as determined by DNA fingerprinting. *J. Zool.* **231**, 563–574.
- Wimmer, B. & Kappeler, P. M. 2002 The effects of sexual selection and life history on the genetic structure of redfronted lemur, *Eulemur fulvus rufus*, groups. *Anim. Behav.* **64**, 557–568. (doi:10.1006/anbe.2002.4003)