



RESEARCH ARTICLE

# Casanovas are liars: behavioral syndromes, sperm competition risk, and the evolution of deceptive male mating behavior in live-bearing fishes [v1; ref status: approved with reservations 3, <http://f1000r.es/pc>]

David Bierbach<sup>1</sup>, Amber M Makowicz<sup>2</sup>, Ingo Schlupp<sup>2</sup>, Holger Geupel<sup>1</sup>, Bruno Streit<sup>1</sup>, Martin Plath<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Evolutionary Ecology Group, University of Frankfurt, Frankfurt am Main, D-60438, Germany

<sup>2</sup>Department of Biology, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019, USA

**v1** First Published: 05 Mar 2013, 2:75 (doi: 10.12688/f1000research.2-75.v1)  
 Latest Published: 12 Aug 2013, 2:75 (doi: 10.12688/f1000research.2-75.v2)

**Abstract**

Mate choice in many species is sensitive to social cues from neighboring individuals; for example, animals can copy mate choice decisions. If males copy other males' choices, sperm of two or more males can compete for fertilization of the female's ova. In the internally fertilizing fish *Poecilia mexicana*, males respond to the presence of rivals with reduced expression of mating preferences (audience effect), thereby lowering the risk of by-standing rivals copying their mate choice. Also, males interact initially more with a non-preferred female when observed by a rival, which has been interpreted in previous studies as a strategy to mislead rivals, again reducing sperm competition risk (SCR). Using a comparative approach, we tested the hypothesis that SCR is indeed a driving force explaining the occurrence of audience-induced changes in poeciliid male mate choice behavior. If this were true, then males of species with higher overall sexual activity — and, thus, higher potential for multiple mating — should show stronger audience effects. We investigated ten poeciliid species (in two cases including multiple populations) and found support for our hypothesis as mean sexual activity correlated positively with the occurrence of potentially deceptive behavior. An alternative explanation for audience effects would be that males attempt to avoid aggressive encounters, which would predict stronger audience effects in more aggressive species, and so we also characterized the examined species for aggressiveness using staged contests of size-matched males. We demonstrate a positive correlation between mean aggressiveness and sexual activity (suggesting a hormonal link as a mechanistic explanation), but we detected no correlation between aggressiveness and audience effects. Suites of correlated behavioral tendencies are termed behavioral syndromes, and our present study provides correlational evidence for the evolutionary significance of SCR in shaping a behavioral syndrome at the species level across poeciliid taxa.

**Article Status Summary**

**Referee Responses**

Referees	1	2	3
<b>v1</b> published 05 Mar 2013	 report 1	 report 1	 report 1
<b>v2</b> published 12 Aug 2013			 report

- 1 **Katja Heubel**, University of Tuebingen Germany
- 2 **Lisa Locatello**, University of Padova Italy
- 3 **Clelia Gasparini**, The University of Western Australia Australia

**Latest Comments**

No Comments Yet

**Corresponding author:** David Bierbach ([david.bierbach@gmx.de](mailto:david.bierbach@gmx.de))

**How to cite this article:** Bierbach D, Makowicz AM, Schlupp I *et al.* (2013) Casanovas are liars: behavioral syndromes, sperm competition risk, and the evolution of deceptive male mating behavior in live-bearing fishes [v1; ref status: approved with reservations 3, <http://f1000r.es/pc>] *F1000Research* 2013, 2:75 (doi: 10.12688/f1000research.2-75.v1)

**Copyright:** © 2013 Bierbach D *et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution Licence](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. Data associated with the article are available under the terms of the [Creative Commons Zero "No rights reserved" data waiver](#) (CC0 1.0 Public domain dedication).

**Grant information:** The present study was financially supported by the research funding program "LOEWE – Landes-Offensive zur Entwicklung Wissenschaftlich-ökonomischer Exzellenz" of Hesse's Ministry of Higher Education, Research, and the Arts (to MP) and the DFG (PI 470/1-3; to MP).

*The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.*

**Competing Interests:** No competing interests were disclosed.

**First Published:** 05 Mar 2013, 2:75 (doi: 10.12688/f1000research.2-75.v1)

## Introduction

Female mate choice and male competition are widely acknowledged as the principal forces of sexual selection<sup>1,2</sup>, while male mate choice has received comparatively little attention (but see<sup>3-5</sup>). Over the past decades however, it has become apparent that males also express mating preferences<sup>3,6-12</sup>, especially if females show pronounced differences in mate quality (e.g., through size–fecundity relationships<sup>13</sup>). Nonetheless, male reproductive biology is clearly influenced by competition over mates<sup>1,14-16</sup>, and, at least in species in which females tend to mate with multiple males, this competition extends well into the period after a successful copulation, as sperm of several males can compete for fertilization of the female's ova<sup>17-19</sup>. Our present study provides novel insights into the presumed role this sperm competition risk (SCR) plays for the occurrence of so-called audience effects<sup>20</sup> during male mate choice, where males alter their mate choice behavior in the presence of a rival, probably as a strategy to reduce SCR<sup>19,21</sup>.

Most communication events in group-living animals take place in front of conspecifics<sup>22-24</sup>, and social information can be used to choose among possible mating partners (social eavesdropping;<sup>25-27</sup>). For example, quail (*Coturnix japonica*) and crayfish (*Procambarus clarkii*) females 'eavesdrop' on the outcome of male contests and choose their mating partners accordingly<sup>28,29</sup>. Furthermore, in various species, both females and males copy other individuals' mate choice decisions (mate choice copying; <sup>30-33</sup>) to reduce their own mate searching effort and possibly to improve on mate quality assessment<sup>34-36</sup>. Male mate choice copying, however, brings about an increased SCR for both the copied male and the copier<sup>10,19,35</sup>.

Theory predicts that males should adjust their mating behavior strategically to imminent SCR threat<sup>19,21,37</sup>, and several studies on species exhibiting frequent multiple mating confirm that perceived SCR affects male mate choice behavior<sup>10,11,18,38-40</sup>. In the livebearing Atlantic molly, *Poecilia mexicana*, for instance, males temporarily decrease their sexual activity and cease showing mating preferences when another male is eavesdropping<sup>9,18,41-43</sup>. It has been hypothesized that those audience-induced changes in male mating behavior prevent rivals from copying mate choice decisions<sup>19,21</sup>. Moreover, focal males initially interact more with a previously non-preferred female in the presence of a rival, which has again been interpreted in the context of mate choice copying — and ultimately, SCR — as males could thus lead the copying male away from the preferred mate ("deceptive mating behavior";<sup>41,42,44</sup>). Using a comparative approach, our present study provides an empirical test of the hypothesis that SCR indeed drives the evolution of behavioral responses to the presence of rivals. Specifically, if SCR plays a role, then males of species with higher overall sexual activity — and thus, higher potential for multiple mating and male mate choice copying — should show stronger audience effects, including deceptive mating behavior.

Theoretical considerations identify avoidance of aggressive interactions as another potential mechanism explaining audience-induced changes in male mating behavior<sup>21</sup>. Specifically, if different males share intrinsic mating preferences (e.g., for large female body size<sup>8,42</sup>), focal males could interact more equally with different females to reduce the risk of injuries resulting from aggressive interactions over commonly preferred female phenotypes<sup>21</sup>. If avoiding aggression plays a role, then the magnitude of audience-induced changes in male mating behavior (at the species level) should correlate positively with mean aggressiveness. To test this hypothesis, we examined the intensity of aggressive interactions in size-matched dyadic (paired) male combats for the set of poeciliid species included herein.

In summary, we assembled a unique data-set comprising ten different poeciliid species (in some cases, several sub-species or ecotypes, or multiple populations) and sought for variation at the taxon level in (1) audience-induced changes in male mate choice, (2) deceptive male mating behavior (previously published data re-analyzed, see Table 1), (3) mean sexual activity, and (4) mean aggressiveness (newly generated data, Table 1), and we tested for correlations of these behavioral tendencies.

## Methods

### Study organisms and their maintenance

The experiments reported here comply with the current laws of Germany (approved by Regierungspräsidium Darmstadt V-54-19c-20/15-F104/Anz.18) and the USA (approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee of the University of Oklahoma; AUS- IACUC approved protocols: R06-026 and R09-023).

Test subjects were lab-reared descendants of wild-caught fish. We included Atlantic mollies from the coastal lagoons around the Central Mexican city of Tampico (belonging to the subspecies *P. mexicana limantouri*); another population was collected in the Río Oxolotan in Tabasco, South México (*P. mexicana mexicana*). Recent phylogenetic analyses argue in favor of full species status of the two subspecies<sup>45</sup>. We further included a locally adapted and genetically differentiated (i.e., independently evolving) ecotype from the *P. mexicana mexicana* clade: the hydrogen sulfide-adapted form inhabiting El Azufre, a tributary to the Río Oxolotan<sup>46,47</sup>. As another representative of short-fin mollies<sup>48,49</sup> we included mangrove mollies (*P. orri*) from Roatán Island, Honduras. Two species of long-fin mollies were tested: sailfin mollies (*P. latipinna*) stemmed from the Comal River in Central Texas, USA, while Tamésí mollies (*P. latipunctata*) were collected near Ciudad Mante in Tamaulipas, México. We further included guppies (*P. reticulata*) from Venezuela and a feral population from the San Antonio River, Texas, USA<sup>50</sup>, as well as Venezuelan swamp guppies (*P. picta*). As representatives of the genus *Limia*, we included *L. tridens* and sulfur limia (*L. sulphurophilia*), both originating from the Dominican Republic. *Gambusia sexradiata* from the Río Teapa, and Grijalva

**Table 1** The mean ( $\pm$  SE) standard length (SL [mm]) of the test fish used in the experiments examining (a) male aggressiveness and (b) male sexual behavior and mate choice. In (a) SL differences between the two opponents are given along with the results from paired *t*-tests comparing winner and loser SL after dominance was established. In (b)  $N_{\text{audience}}$  indicates the number of trials with an audience presented during the second part. \* indicates species imported by “Aquarium Dietzenbach GmbH”.

(a) Aggressive behavior	$N_{\text{dyads}}$	Dyad SL	SL difference	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	Source
<i>G. sexradiata</i>	8	18.6 $\pm$ 0.7	1.3 $\pm$ 0.3	1.09	5	0.33	this study
<i>H. milleri</i>	14	22.5 $\pm$ 0.5	1.2 $\pm$ 0.2	1.41	3	0.25	this study
<i>P. reticulata</i> (feral)	8	16.2 $\pm$ 0.8	1.1 $\pm$ 0.2	0.58	3	0.60	this study
<i>P. reticulata</i> *	11	22.5 $\pm$ 0.7	1.2 $\pm$ 0.3	0.00	6	1.00	this study
<i>P. picta</i> *	9	23.3 $\pm$ 0.6	2.3 $\pm$ 0.4	0.36	6	0.73	this study
<i>L. tridens</i> *	18	24.8 $\pm$ 0.8	1.5 $\pm$ 0.2	0.37	7	0.72	this study
<i>L. sulphurophila</i>	12	32.7 $\pm$ 1.1	1.9 $\pm$ 0.4	2.11	11	0.58	this study
<i>P. latipinna</i>	9	43.6 $\pm$ 2.8	2.2 $\pm$ 0.4	0.01	5	1.00	this study
<i>P. latipunctata</i>	9	25.3 $\pm$ 1.3	1.4 $\pm$ 0.3	1.57	3	0.22	this study
<i>P. orri</i>	9	33.1 $\pm$ 0.7	2.0 $\pm$ 0.4	1.20	8	0.27	this study
<i>P. m. limantouri</i>	12	37.1 $\pm$ 1.8	2.7 $\pm$ 0.4	1.01	10	0.30	[51]
<i>P. m. mexicana</i> (sulfide)	9	28.7 $\pm$ 0.9	2.0 $\pm$ 0.4	2.05	8	0.12	[51]
<i>P. m. mexicana</i>	18	35.7 $\pm$ 1.3	1.4 $\pm$ 0.3	1.06	15	0.27	[51]
(b) Male mating behavior	$N_{\text{trials}}$	Focal male SL	Large female SL	Small female SL	$N_{\text{audience}}$	Audience male SL	Source
<i>G. sexradiata</i>	20	21.4 $\pm$ 0.6	37.9 $\pm$ 0.7	30.3 $\pm$ 0.6	10	21.7 $\pm$ 0.6	[42]
<i>H. milleri</i>	25	22.4 $\pm$ 0.5	33.3 $\pm$ 0.5	25.0 $\pm$ 0.7	14	21.4 $\pm$ 0.5	[58]
<i>P. reticulata</i> (feral)	32	14.9 $\pm$ 0.2	19.3 $\pm$ 0.4	14.8 $\pm$ 0.2	16	14.9 $\pm$ 0.2	[55]
<i>P. reticulata</i> *	47	21.8 $\pm$ 0.4	33.4 $\pm$ 1.1	24.2 $\pm$ 1.0	25	21.2 $\pm$ 0.5	[42]
<i>P. picta</i> *	43	23.0 $\pm$ 0.2	34.0 $\pm$ 0.8	26.7 $\pm$ 0.6	26	22.6 $\pm$ 0.4	[42]
<i>L. tridens</i> *	46	23.6 $\pm$ 0.3	30.2 $\pm$ 0.9	25.6 $\pm$ 0.2	23	22.6 $\pm$ 0.4	[42]
<i>L. sulphurophila</i>	28	31.0 $\pm$ 0.7	38.6 $\pm$ 1.0	31.6 $\pm$ 0.8	14	32.2 $\pm$ 0.8	[42]
<i>P. latipinna</i>	31	36.4 $\pm$ 1.0	45.4 $\pm$ 0.5	33.8 $\pm$ 0.8	18	35.2 $\pm$ 1.0	[42]
<i>P. latipunctata</i>	21	25.9 $\pm$ 0.8	35.0 $\pm$ 0.5	27.6 $\pm$ 0.5	11	25.5 $\pm$ 0.8	[42]
<i>P. orri</i>	18	32.2 $\pm$ 0.8	37.8 $\pm$ 0.8	32.1 $\pm$ 0.7	9	32.4 $\pm$ 1.0	[42]
<i>P. m. limantouri</i>	36	34.0 $\pm$ 0.9	49.9 $\pm$ 0.4	33.8 $\pm$ 0.6	18	35.8 $\pm$ 1.0	[41]
<i>P. m. mexicana</i> (sulfide)	22	29.0 $\pm$ 0.6	47.6 $\pm$ 1.3	35.3 $\pm$ 0.6	11	30.2 $\pm$ 0.7	[42]
<i>P. m. mexicana</i>	39	32.5 $\pm$ 1.0	47.4 $\pm$ 0.8	37.4 $\pm$ 0.8	19	35.2 $\pm$ 1.3	[42]

mosquitofish (*Heterophallus milleri*) from the Río Oxolotán (both Tabasco, México) were included as representatives of mosquito fishes.

Test fish came from large, randomly outbred single-species stocks maintained at the Department of Ecology and Evolution of the University of Frankfurt (*P. m. mexicana*, *P. m. limantouri*, *P. reticulata* from Venezuela, *P. picta*, *L. tridens*), or at the Department of Biology at the University of Oklahoma in Norman (*P. m. mexicana* from El Azufre, *P. latipinna*, *P. latipunctata*, *P. orri*, feral *P. reticulata*, *L. sulphurophila*, *G. sexradiata*, *H. milleri*; Table 1). Fishes were reared as single-species, mixed-sex stocks in 200-l (Frankfurt) or 1,000-l (Norman) tanks at 25–27°C under an 12:12 hours light:dark cycle (Frankfurt) or

under ambient light conditions in a greenhouse (Norman). At the University of Frankfurt, fishes were fed twice daily *ad libitum* with commercial flake food. Stock tanks in Norman contained naturally growing algae as well as a variety of naturally occurring invertebrates such as chironomid larvae, copepods and amphipods, on which the fishes could feed. In addition, fishes were supplied with flake food every two days. However, at least 1 week prior to the behavioral experiments, fishes were fed *ad libitum* at least once daily with flake food.

### Experimental design

**Aggressive behavior.** We determined male aggressive behaviors during dyadic encounters by analyzing contests staged between pairs of males in a small test tank measuring 30 × 20 × 20 cm<sup>51</sup>.

To avoid confounding effects of previously established dominance and/or familiarity<sup>52,53</sup>, males were taken from different stock tanks. Males in a dyad differed by less than 15% in standard length (SL), which has previously been established as the threshold below which fights typically escalate<sup>51</sup>; nevertheless, size difference was included as a covariate in the statistical analyses (see below). We separated males by an opaque filter sponge while three sides of the test tank were taped with gray paper to minimize disturbances from the outside. The bottom of the tank was filled with black gravel, and water was aerated and maintained at 27–29°C. Males could habituate to the test tank overnight, and observations took place the next day between 09:00 and 13:00. To initiate a trial, the sponge divider was gently lifted, and we noted behavioral interactions for a maximum of 10 minutes, starting with the first interaction. We focused on three frequent aggressive behaviors<sup>54</sup>: (1) S-position: this threat display usually initiates a fight. Males swim in a parallel or anti-parallel position and bend their bodies in an S-shaped manner with all unpaired fins erect; (2) tail-beats: S-positions are often followed or superimposed by tail-beats, which are fast movements of head and tail in opposing directions that either touch the opponent's body or send shock waves to the opponent; and (3) bites: we defined all incidences of ramming and bite-like attacks<sup>52</sup> as bites, because both these behaviors occur extremely quickly and thus are indistinguishable to the human eye. For some species examined in this study no formal description of aggressive behavior was available from the literature, and so we confirmed in pre-trials that the aforementioned behaviors are part of their behavioral repertoire.

We also recorded fight duration until dominance was established. Contest outcome could be inferred from behavioral differences between the contestants. Folded fins, head-down posture and a position at the periphery of the tank typically characterize contest losers, while winners constantly chase and further attack the loser with fins fully erect, occasionally performing S-positions or bites<sup>51</sup>. We met all requirements for animal well-being in behavioral experiments. Apart from occasional loss of single scales, no severe injuries were observed, as we separated males immediately once dominance was established. If no dominance was established within 10 minutes of the first interaction, we terminated the fight; those trials were discarded from the analysis of fighting durations, while fight durations were scored as "0" when no aggressive behavior occurred at all (those trials were terminated after a total of 15 minutes of observation). SL of both contestants was taken after a contest by laying the fish flat on plastic foil-covered millimeter paper (Table 1). Afterwards we transferred males back to their respective stock tanks. In total, we successfully completed  $N = 146$  trials (Table 1).

**Male mate choice.** We reanalyzed previously published data on audience-induced changes in male mate choice (Table 1). Focal males were isolated in 25- to 38-l tanks for two to four days

prior to the tests to ensure that they were motivated to mate<sup>12</sup>. We tested each focal male only once; however, owing to the limited number of males available from our stocks, some males were also used as audience males after they had served as a focal male, but never on the same day and not in the same dyadic constellation. As familiarity among males affects the strength of audience effects in *P. mexicana*<sup>9</sup>, focal and audience males were taken from different stock tanks.

Each focal male was tested for its mating preference in a binary choice situation and was then retested with the same stimulus females either without audience (control treatment) or with an audience male present (50% of trials each). We were thus able to examine changes in focal males' behavior from the first to the second part of the tests and could discern between effects induced by the audience and changes that would occur over the course of the experiment even without audience. In theory, we could have used an alternative design of presenting an audience in all trials while starting the tests with or without audience in alternating order; however, in such a design, prior exposure to the audience male (when presented during the first part) could still affect the focal males' behavior during the second part of the tests<sup>55</sup>.

The test tank (50 × 30 × 30 cm, length × width × height) was filled to 20 cm height with aged tap water. Water temperature was maintained at 27–28°C using an aquarium heater. In addition, the water was aerated between trials, but both the heater and the air-stone were removed for all trials. Black plastic covered all sides except the front. Prior to the tests, we choose two different-sized stimulus females (for SL see Table 1) from a stock tank and introduced them into the test tank. Poeciliid males prefer to mate with larger, more fecund females (e.g.,<sup>8,56–58</sup>, but see Ala-Honkola *et al.*<sup>59</sup>). Afterwards, we introduced a focal male into a transparent Plexiglas cylinder (10 cm diameter) located in the center of the tank and left the fish undisturbed for 5 minutes. After the habituation period, we gently lifted the cylinder. During a 10-min observation period, we scored male sexual behaviors directed toward either of the two females and noted with which female the focal male interacted first. We decided *a priori* to terminate trials if the male did not show any sexual behavior during the first part of the test;  $N = 3$  trials with *P. orri*,  $N = 5$  (*P. latipinna*),  $N = 2$  (*P. latipunctata*),  $N = 4$  (*P. reticulata*, Venezuela),  $N = 1$  (*P. picta*),  $N = 1$  (*P. reticulata*, San Antonio), and  $N = 6$  (*H. milleri*) were discarded from the statistical analyses based on this criterion.

Genital nipping is a typical pre-copulatory behavior in poeciliids, whereby the male approaches the female from behind and touches her genital region with his snout<sup>54,60</sup>. During thrusting, males swing their gonopodium forward while attempting to introduce it into the female's gonopore. Courtship behavior is absent in *P. mexicana*<sup>60</sup>, *P. orri*, the examined *Limia* species (authors, personal observation) and *Gambusia* spp.

(<sup>61</sup>for *G. holbrooki*). *Poecilia reticulata* males court in front of females in an S-shaped body posture (sigmoid displays<sup>62,63</sup>), while the primary courtship display of *P. picta* males consists of circling around the female (the so-called ‘orbit’<sup>54,63</sup>), but males also court with their fins raised in front of the female (<sup>63</sup>; D.B., personal observation). *Heterophallus milleri* males circle around the female and swing their gonopodium forward when in the female’s visual field<sup>58</sup>. Large *P. latipinna* and *P. latipunctata* males occasionally court in front of females with raised dorsal fins<sup>54,64</sup>. As not all species examined herein show courtship displays and courtship was by far the least frequent behavioral category, we excluded numbers of courtship displays from our main analyses.

Upon completion of the first preference test, we immediately repeated measurement of male mating preferences, but in one half of the trials, an audience male was presented, while the other half of the trials was repeated without audience (control). To initiate this second part of a trial, we reintroduced the focal male into the acclimatization cylinder. An audience male was placed in another transparent cylinder in the central back of the tank, while for the control only an empty cylinder was presented. The audience male was confined in his cylinder throughout the test. After another 5 minutes of habituation (during which all four fish could interact visually), measurement of male preferences was repeated, as described above. Interactions between males were not quantified, but aggressive displays were not observed. In total, we successfully completed  $N = 408$  trials (Table 1). Once a trial was completed, all fish were measured for SL to the closest millimeter (Table 1).

### Statistical analyses

All statistical analyses were performed in SPSS 13. While “*P. mexicana*” used in our study clearly represent three phylogenetically independent groups (two sub-species and one derived ecotype<sup>45</sup>) and, thus, were treated statistically as independent species, this was not the case for the two populations of the guppy (*P. reticulata*). We thus re-ran all analyses also without data from the feral guppy population (San Antonio), but this did not alter the direction of the results (not shown). Furthermore, in several analyses, body size measures were included as covariates and, since species differed strongly in overall size ranges (see Table 1), we nested all covariates within species (whenever absolute values were used) to account for species-specific size ranges.

**Aggressive behavior.** We tested for variation and compared the magnitude of differences in male aggressiveness across species. First, we employed Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to reduce the number of dependent variables (numbers of S-positions, tail-beats and bites per male dyad) and extracted one independent component (PC1; eigenvalue = 2.47) that explained 82.3% of the variance. The three aggressive behaviors had axis loadings of 0.85 (S-positions), 0.93 (tail-beats) and

0.94 (bites). PC1 was checked for normal distribution using a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and used as a dependent variable in a univariate General Linear Model (GLM) with ‘species’ as a fixed factor. We included ‘mean male SL of a dyad’ (nested within species) as a covariate because larger males tend to be more aggressive<sup>51</sup>. Moreover, the opponents’ body size difference influences fight intensity<sup>51</sup>, and so we included arcsine (square root)-transformed body size difference ( $SL_{small}/SL_{large}$ ) as another covariate as well as its interaction with the fixed factor in our final model. If a covariate had a significant effect, we employed Pearson’s correlation on unstandardized residuals to explore the direction of the effect.

Fight durations were analyzed in a separate univariate GLM with the same factor and covariate structure. Both covariates and the interaction term, however, were removed from the final model since none was significant (‘mean male SL of a dyad’:  $F_{13,67} = 1.62$ ,  $P = 0.24$ ; ‘opponent body size difference’:  $F_{1,80} = 2.84$ ,  $P = 0.09$ ; ‘opponent body size difference × species’:  $F_{12,55} = 1.04$ ,  $P = 0.37$ ).

**Male sexual behavior.** As described for the analysis of aggressive behavior, we first used PCA to condense sexual behavior (genital nipping and thrusting) to one principle component (PC1, eigenvalue = 1.79) that explained 89.7% of the variance. Both variables had equal axis loadings of 0.95. We used PC1 as dependent variable in a univariate GLM and included ‘species’ as a fixed factor. Small males show more sexual behaviors than larger ones in at least some of the species examined here as part of a ‘sneak-like’ alternative mating strategy<sup>65</sup>, and so we included focal males’ SL as a covariate (nested within species). Also, poeciliid males typically prefer to mate with large females (see above), and we thus included the mean SL of each stimulus female dyad (nested within species) as another covariate. However, both covariates had no significant effect (‘focal male SL’:  $F_{13,382} = 1.22$ ,  $P = 0.26$ ; ‘mean stimulus SL’:  $F_{13,369} = 0.97$ ,  $P = 0.48$ ) and were removed from the final model.

**Audience-induced changes in preference expression.** To compare the magnitude of audience-induced changes in individual male mate choice behavior across species, we calculated a preference score<sup>41</sup> as:

(fraction of sexual behaviors with the initially preferred female during the second part of a trial) – (fraction of sexual behaviors with the same female during the first part),

such that negative values would indicate that individual preferences decreased. Scores were included as the dependent variable in a univariate GLM with ‘species’ and ‘treatment’ (with or without audience) as fixed factors. Beside ‘focal male SL’ (nested within species), we also included ‘stimulus female SL difference’ [arcsine (square root)-transformed  $SL_{small}/SL_{large}$ ] since one could predict that males would show stronger audience effects the larger the size difference, as large females represent

high-quality mates. All possible interactions were included in the initial model. However, neither the covariates themselves ('focal male SL':  $F_{13,369} = 0.48$ ,  $P = 0.93$ ; 'stimulus female size difference':  $F_{1,380} = 0.93$ ,  $P = 0.34$ ) nor their interaction terms were significant ( $P > 0.22$  in all cases) and were removed from the final model.

Qualitatively, *H. milleri* did not follow the pattern of reduced preference expression shown by other poeciliids (see also Biberbach *et al.*<sup>58</sup>), so we re-ran all analyses while excluding *H. milleri*, but the direction of the results was not affected (results not shown).

**Deceptive mating behavior.** In the context of deceptive mating behavior, the first sexual approach of focal males is of interest, as interacting first with the previously non-preferred female has been interpreted as an attempt to mislead the rival<sup>41</sup>. Thus, we analyzed the fraction of males that first interacted with the opposite ("1") or same female during the second part ("0") using a binary logistic regression, with 'species', 'treatment' and their interaction term as categorical independent variables. We also included 'focal male SL' and 'female SL difference' as covariates and used a step-wise backwards elimination approach, based on likelihood ratios, to remove effects if  $P > 0.1$ .

**Correlations of behavioral types at the species level.** The central question of our present paper was whether there are correlations between the four aforementioned behaviors at the species level. Owing to the limited sample size ( $N = 13$  groups), we used non-parametric, pair-wise Spearman rank order tests to correlate species means for (1) aggressiveness (sum of all aggressive interactions per fight), (2) sexual activity (sum of nipping and thrusting behavior during the first part of the tests), (3) the strength of changes in preference expression in male mate choice (score from audience treatment minus mean score from control treatment) and (4) the occurrence of deceptive behavior (fraction of males that changed their first interaction in the audience treatment – fraction in the control treatment). To avoid error inflation due to multiple comparisons, we used Bonferroni corrections and inferred statistical significance only if  $P < \alpha = 0.017$ .

## Results

### Male aggressive behavior

There was pronounced variation in aggressive behavior among species (for univariate GLM, see Table 2a; Figure 1a). Both covariates ('mean male dyad SL' and 'opponent body size difference') had significant effects (Table 2a), but species-wise *post hoc* Pearson correlations confirmed the predicted pattern of larger males fighting more intensely only in *P. m. mexicana* (sulfide ecotype, see Table 3). Only in the highly aggressive Atlantic mollies (*P. m. mexicana*, both ecotypes, and *P. m. limantouri*; Figure 1) was the predicted negative relationship between opponent size difference and mean aggressiveness uncovered

**Table 2 Results from univariate GLMs analyzing (a) mean aggression in dyadic male fights, (b) duration of male fights, (c) male sexual behavior in dichotomous choice tests, and (d) changes in male preference expression in the presence of an audience male. Significant effects are indicated by an asterisk.**

	df	F	P
<b>(a) Number of aggressive behaviors (PC1)</b>			
Species	12	3.59	< 0.001*
Mean pair SL (nested within species)	13	1.88	0.042*
Opponent SL difference	1	3.13	0.080
Species × Opponent SL difference	13	3.75	< 0.001*
Error	95		
<b>(b) Fight duration</b>			
Species	12	2.78	0.003*
Error	81		
<b>(c) Number of sexual behaviors (PC1)</b>			
Species	12	34.78	< 0.001*
Error	395		
<b>(d) Change in preference expression (preference score)</b>			
Species	12	2.22	0.011*
Treatment	1	4.78	0.029*
Species × treatment	12	1.33	0.200
Error	382		

(Table 3), *i.e.*, the larger the size difference the less intense fights became.


The GLM on mean fight durations also detected significant species differences (Table 2b; Figure 1b).

### Male sexual behavior

GLM detected a significant effect of the factor 'species' (Table 2c), indicating that male sexual activity also showed pronounced variation among species (Figure 2a).

### Audience-induced changes in preference expression

When comparing the change in individual males' mating preferences from the first to second part of the tests (preference score), we detected a significant main effect of the factor 'treatment', suggesting that focal males responded to an audience male with altered mate choice behavior (Table 2d). No significant effect of the interaction term 'species by treatment' was uncovered (Table 2c), suggesting that species did not overall differ in their response to the audience treatment (Figure 2b). A significant effect of the main factor 'species' (Table 2c), by contrast, can be interpreted as species differing in the consistency of their mate choice over the course of the experiment (note



**Figure 1** Means (+ SE) of (a) numbers of aggressive interactions per male fight and (b) fight duration in the different poeciliid species examined.

that this main effect considers changes in both the audience and control treatments).

### Deceptive mating behavior

When comparing the number of trials in which the focal males first approached the same ("0") or different ("1") female during the second part using logistic regression, the interaction term of 'species by treatment' was excluded already during the first step of the step-wise elimination process ( $B = -0.031$ ,  $SE = 0.06$ ,  $Wald = 0.233$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P = 0.629$ ), indicating that male responses to the audience treatment did not differ among species (Figure 2c). In the final model, only the factors 'treatment' ( $B = 1.39$ ,  $SE = 0.27$ ,  $Wald = 34.76$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ) and 'female body size difference' (not significant:  $B = 1.49$ ,  $SE = 0.83$ ,  $Wald = 3.27$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $P = 0.071$ ) were retained. Thus, focal males were more likely to change their initial interaction when an audience male was presented (Figure 2c).

**Table 3** Results from *post hoc* species-wise Pearson correlations between male aggression in dyadic contests (PC1) and mean dyad standard length (SL; left), as well as the opponents' SL difference (right). Unstandardized residuals were obtained from GLM (see Table 2a). Significant correlations are indicated by an asterisk.

	Mean dyad SL		Opponent SL difference	
	$r_p$	$P$	$r_p$	$P$
<i>G. sexradiata</i>	0.20	0.630	0.19	0.650
<i>H. milleri</i>	0.29	0.300	0.10	0.732
<i>P. reticulata</i> (feral)	-0.34	0.403	-0.33	0.432
<i>P. reticulata</i>	-0.23	0.495	-0.54	0.087
<i>P. picta</i>	-0.43	0.252	0.31	0.414
<i>L. tridens</i>	-0.09	0.707	-0.03	0.905
<i>L. sulphurophila</i>	-0.18	0.570	-0.44	0.153
<i>P. latipinna</i>	-0.18	0.646	-0.33	0.385
<i>P. latipunctata</i>	0.19	0.629	-0.60	0.088
<i>P. orri</i>	0.14	0.713	-0.05	0.898
<i>P. m. limantouri</i>	-0.44	0.102	-0.70	0.003*
<i>P. m. mexicana</i> (sulfide)	0.71	0.032	-0.67	0.048*
<i>P. m. mexicana</i>	-0.54	0.087	-0.65	0.009*

### Correlations of behavioral types at the species level

In line with our prediction derived from the interpretation that SCR explains the occurrence of audience-induced behavioral changes, we found a strong, positive correlation between sexual activity and the amount of deceptive behavior at the species level (Figure 3e). The alternative prediction, that avoidance of aggressive behavior drives audience effects (leading to a positive correlation between both variables), received no support, as the correlation between mean aggression and strength of audience-induced changes in preference expression even yielded a negative correlation coefficient (not statistically significant; Figure 3b). Finally, there was a significant positive correlation between aggression and sexual activity (Figure 3a).

#### Data on dyadic male contests


1 Data File

<http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.427708>

### Discussion

We found pronounced variation among poeciliid taxa in mean aggressiveness and male sexual activity, while variation in audience effects (reduced preference expression and deceptive mating behavior in presence of an audience) was less pronounced. Subsequent correlation analyses uncovered two effects: (a) males of species with high sexual activity are more likely to show deceptive mating behavior, *i.e.*, they initially approached






**Figure 2** (a) Mean (+ SE) numbers of male sexual behaviors during a 10 min observation period. (b) Changes in individual focal males' mate choice behavior in the presence of an audience male. Depicted are mean (+ SE) preference scores (see main text), whereby negative values indicate that male preferences decreased in strength. (c) Proportion of males that first interacted with the opposite female when released from the acclimation cylinder in the second part of the tests. Open bars in (b) and (c) represent the control treatment (no audience) while gray bars represent the audience treatment.

more often the non-preferred female when an audience male was presented, while mean aggressiveness did not predict the occurrence of audience effects. (b) Mean aggressiveness, by contrast, correlated positively with mean sexual activity. Hence, we detected two correlations of behavioral tendencies at the species level.

Consistency in the expression of a certain behavioral type across different environmental contexts at the inter-*individual* level has received considerable scientific interest<sup>66–68</sup>, and suites of correlated behavioral types have been termed 'behavioral syndromes'<sup>66,69</sup>. Réale et al.<sup>70</sup> proposed five different axes of animal personality: shyness–boldness, exploration–avoidance, general activity, aggressiveness, and sociability, and Conrad et al.<sup>69</sup> highlighted several correlations of those behavioral axes in teleost fishes, but audience-induced changes in male mating behavior have not yet been investigated in the context of behavioral syndromes. Recent studies exemplified the importance of population differences in behavioral syndromes<sup>71–73</sup>. Also, the concept of behavioral syndromes was expanded to the comparison of groups of animals or populations; Chapman et al.<sup>73</sup>, for example, demonstrated correlations between mean colony (and caste) behavioral types in *Myrmica* ants. Here, we apply this concept to the comparison of different poeciliid taxa.

One of the behavioral syndromes at the species level we uncovered in our present study — the correlation between aggressiveness and sexual activity — can be partly explained mechanistically through species differences in plasma concentrations of sexual corticosteroids (testosterone and its derivatives<sup>74,75</sup>). Individual androgen concentrations predict aggressiveness in male swordtails, *Xiphophorus hellerii*<sup>76</sup>; furthermore, plasma testosterone levels correlate positively with sexual behavior in male mosquito fish (*G. holbrooki*)<sup>77</sup>, so physiological pleiotropy could also explain species differences in aggression and sexual activity as detected here.

The main focus of our present study was on audience-induced changes in male mating behavior, and we asked if those behaviors can be linked to mean sexual activity and SCR. The rationale behind our prediction was that males of taxa with high overall sexual activity face a higher risk of by-standers making use of socially acquired information when eavesdropping on sexual interactions. It seems reasonable to assume the propensity for male mate choice copying to be a ubiquitous feature of poeciliid mating systems<sup>10,35</sup>, but the likelihood of mate copying in natural systems should correlate positively with mean sexual activity. We found sexual activity (but not aggressiveness — despite some degree of inter-correlation between aggressiveness and sexual activity, see above) to correlate positively with the level of presumed deceptive mating behavior. This finding lends support to our hypothesis that SCR is a driving force behind the evolution of this behavior and is in line with our interpretation that focal males thus attempt to lead the rival



**Figure 3** Correlations between species-level means ( $\pm$  SE) of male aggressiveness (log scale), sexual activity (log scale), the strength of audience-induced changes in preference expression, and the level of deceptive mating behavior. Shown are results from Spearman's rank order tests;  $\alpha'$  indicates the alpha error level after Bonferroni correction.

away from their preferred mate, exploiting male mate choice copying to reduce SCR<sup>19,21,42</sup>.

A general objection to our interpretation of deceptive mating behavior could be that leading the audience away from a preferred mating partner to deceive the rival may increase the

risk of losing the preferred female, as poeciliid females tend to flee from male sexual harassment<sup>60,78,79</sup>. We argue that this male behavior still offers advantages even if the preferred female flees: on the one hand, a pattern of last male sperm precedence was uncovered in guppies<sup>80,81</sup>, which renders mate choice copying a profitable option for the eavesdropping (copying) male<sup>10</sup>.

However, the longer the time between copulations by the first and second male in the mating trials conducted by Evans and Magurran<sup>81</sup>, the higher the proportion of offspring fathered by the first male was. This implies that leading the by-standing rival away from (or at least delaying its approaches toward) a recently inseminated female would indeed be beneficial for the deceiving male even though it risks losing contact with the initially preferred (but already inseminated) female.

Since our analyses were based on population differences in aggressiveness, sexual activity and audience induced changes in male mate choice behavior, we strongly recommend future experiments concentrating on within-population variation (e.g., individual “behavioral types”<sup>70</sup>) that define a male’s response to a by-standing rival. For example, males are very sensitive to the perceived sexual activity of a rival when exhibiting audience effects<sup>9</sup>, and future studies should elaborate on the question of whether also perceived aggressiveness — a correlate of sexual activity — might influence the expression of audience effects.

In summary, using a comparative approach, we found correlational support for the hypothesis that SCR arising from male mate choice copying drives the evolution of audience-induced changes in male mate choice behavior. We argue that taxa with elevated sexual activity face a higher risk of males making use of

socially acquired information (*i.e.*, copying mate choice decisions), and so focal males in those species are more likely to respond to the presence of an audience with altered mate choice behavior.

---

### Author contributions

DB, IS, BS and MP designed the study. DB, AMM and HG conducted the experiments. DB and MP analyzed the data. DB prepared the first draft of the manuscript. All authors were involved in the revision of the draft manuscript and have agreed to the final content.

### Competing interests

No competing interests were disclosed.

### Grant information

The present study was financially supported by the research funding program “LOEWE – Landes-Offensive zur Entwicklung Wissenschaftlich-ökonomischer Exzellenz” of Hesse’s Ministry of Higher Education, Research, and the Arts (to MP) and the DFG (Pl 470/1-3; to MP).

### Acknowledgements

We thank Y Konstantin and D Schenkel for help with data collection.

---

## References

- Andersson M: Sexual selection, (Princeton University Press, Princeton). (1994); 624.
- Kokko H, Johnstone RA: Why is mutual mate choice not the norm? Operational sex ratios, sex roles and the evolution of sexually dimorphic and monomorphic signalling. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.* (2002); **357**: 319–330.
- Bonduriansky R: The evolution of male mate choice in insects: a synthesis of ideas and evidence. *Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc.* (2001); **76**: 305–339.
- Sargent RC, Gross MR, Van Den Berghe EP: Male mate choice in fishes. *Anim Behav.* (1986); **34**: 545–550.
- Edward DA, Chapman T: The evolution and significance of male mate choice. *Trends Ecol Evol.* (2011); **26**: 647–654.
- Sæther SA, Fiske P, Kålås JA: Male mate choice, sexual conflict and strategic allocation of copulations in a lekking bird. *Proc Biol Sci.* (2001); **268**: 2097–2102.
- Wong BBM, Jennions MD, Keogh JS: Sequential male mate choice in a fish, the Pacific blue-eye *Pseudomugil signifer*. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol.* (2004); **56**: 253–256.
- Plath M, Seggel U, Burmeister H, *et al*: Choosy males from the underground: male mating preferences in surface- and cave-dwelling Atlantic mollies (*Poecilia mexicana*). *Naturwissenschaften.* (2006); **93**: 103–109.
- Bierbach D, Girndt A, Hamfler S, *et al*: Male fish use prior knowledge about rivals to adjust their mate choice. *Biol Lett.* (2011); **7**: 349–351.
- Bierbach D, Kronmarck C, Hennige-Schulz C, *et al*: Sperm competition risk affects male mate choice copying. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol.* (2011); **65**: 1699–1707.
- Wronski T, Bierbach D, Czupalla LM, *et al*: Rival presence leads to reversible changes in male mate choice of a desert dwelling ungulate. *Behav Ecol.* (2012); **23**: 551–558.
- Schlupp I, Plath M: Male mate choice and sperm allocation in a sexual/asexual mating complex of *Poecilia*. (Poeciliidae, Teleostei). *Biol Lett.* (2005); **1**: 169–171.
- Riesch R, Plath M, Garcia de Leon FJ, *et al*: Convergent life-history shifts: toxic environments result in big babies in two clades of poeciliids. *Naturwissenschaften.* (2010); **97**: 133–141.
- Howard RD, Martens RS, Innis SA, *et al*: Mate choice and mate competition influence male body size in Japanese medaka. *Anim Behav.* (1998); **55**: 1151–1163.
- Hunt J, Breuker CJ, Sadowski JA, *et al*: Male-male competition, female mate choice and their interaction: determining total sexual selection. *J Evol Biol.* (2009); **22**: 13–26.
- Parker GA: Assessment strategy and the evolution of fighting behaviour. *J Theor Biol.* (1974); **47**: 223–243.
- Parker GA: Sperm competition and its evolutionary consequences in the insects. *Biol Rev.* (1970); **45**: 525–567.
- Ziege M, Mahlow K, Hennige-Schulz C, *et al*: Audience effects in the Atlantic molly (*Poecilia mexicana*)-prudent male mate choice in response to perceived sperm competition risk? *Front Zool.* (2009); **6**: 17.
- Plath M, Bierbach D: Sex and the public: Social eavesdropping, sperm competition risk and male mate choice. *Commun Integr Biol.* (2011); **4**: 276–280.
- Marler P, Dufty A, Pickert R: Vocal communication in the domestic chicken: II. Is a sender sensitive to the presence and nature of a receiver? *Anim Behav.* (1986); **34**: 194–198.

21. Plath M, Schlupp I: Misleading mollies: The effect of an audience on the expression of mating preferences. *Commun Integr Biol.* (2008); 1: 199–203.
22. McGregor PK, Peake TM: Communication networks: social environments for receiving and signalling behaviour. *Acta Ethol.* (2000); 2: 71–81.
23. Peake TM: Eavesdropping in communication networks. In *Animal Communication Networks*, P.K. McGregor, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). (2005); pp. 13–37.
24. Earley RL, Dugatkin LA: Fighting, mating and networking: pillars of poeciliid sociality. In *Animal Communication Networks*, P.K. McGregor, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). (2005); pp. 84–113.
25. Dabelsteen T: Public, private or anonymous? Facilitating and countering eavesdropping. In *Animal Communication Networks*, P.K. McGregor, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). (2005); pp. 38–62.
26. Johnston RE: Eavesdropping and scent over-marking. In *Animal Communication Networks*, P.K. McGregor, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). (2005); pp. 344–371.
27. Earley RL: Social eavesdropping and the evolution of conditional cooperation and cheating strategies. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.* (2010); 365: 2675–2686.
28. Ophir AG, Galef BG Jr: Female Japanese quail that 'eavesdrop' on fighting males prefer losers to winners. *Anim Behav.* (2003); 66: 399–407.
29. Aquiloni L, Buric M, Gherardi F: Crayfish females eavesdrop on fighting males before choosing the dominant mate. *Curr Biol.* (2008); 18: R462–R463.
30. Dugatkin LA: Copying and Mate Choice. In *Social Learning in Animals*, M.H. Cecilia, G.G. Bennett, A.C.M.H. Jr and Bennett G. Galef, Jr., eds. (San Diego: Academic Press), (1996); pp. 85–105.
31. Westneat DF, Walters A, McCarthy TM, et al: Alternative mechanisms of nonindependent mate choice. *Anim Behav.* (2000); 59: 467–476.
32. Valone TJ: From eavesdropping on performance to copying the behavior of others: a review of public information use. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol.* (2007); 62: 1–14.
33. Bonnie KE, Earley RL: Expanding the scope for social information use. *Anim Behav.* (2007); 74: 171–181.
34. Gibson RM, Höglund J: Copying and sexual selection. *Trends Ecol Evol.* (1992); 7: 229–232.
35. Schlupp I, Ryan MJ: Male Sailfin mollies (*Poecilia latipinna*) copy the mate choice of other males. *Behav Ecol.* (1997); 8: 104–107.
36. Witte K: Learning and mate choice. In *Fish cognition and behavior*, L.K. Brown C, Krause J, ed. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd), (2006); pp. 70–95.
37. Wedell N, Gage MJG, Parker GA: Sperm competition, male prudence and sperm-limited females. *Trends Ecol Evol.* (2002); 17: 313–320.
38. Wong BBM, McCarthy M: Prudent male mate choice under perceived sperm competition risk in the eastern mosquito fish. *Behav Ecol.* (2009); 20: 278–282.
39. Jeswiet SB, Lee-Jenkins SSY, Godin JGJ: Concurrent effects of sperm competition and female quality on male mate choice in the Trinidadian guppy (*Poecilia reticulata*). *Behav Ecol.* (2012); 23: 195–200.
40. Dubois F, Belzile A: Audience effect alters male mating preferences in zebra finches (*Taeniopygia guttata*). *PLoS one.* (2012); 7: e43697.
41. Plath M, Richter S, Tiedemann R, et al: Male fish deceive competitors about mating preferences *Curr Biol.* (2008); 18: 1138–1141.
42. Bierbach D, Konstantin Y, Stadler S, et al: Presence of an audience alters mate choice of poeciliid males. In *Social Learning Theory: Phylogenetic Considerations across Animal, Plant, and Microbial Taxa.*, K. Clark, ed. (Hauppauge NY: Nova Science Publishers) (in press)(2013).
43. Plath M, Blum D, Schlupp I, et al: Audience effect alters mating preferences in a livebearing fish, the Atlantic molly, *Poecilia mexicana*. *Anim Behav.* (2008); 75: 21–29.
44. Plath M, Richter S, Schlupp I, et al: Misleading mollies: surface- but not cave-dwelling *Poecilia mexicana* males deceive competitors about mating preferences. *Acta Ethol.* (2010); 13: 49–56.
45. Tobler M, Palacios M, Chapman LJ, et al: Evolution in extreme environments: replicated phenotypic differentiation in livebearing fish inhabiting sulfidic springs. *Evolution.* (2011); 65: 2213–2228.
46. Plath M, Hauswaldt JS, Moll K, et al: Local adaptation and pronounced genetic differentiation in an extremophile fish, *Poecilia mexicana*, inhabiting a Mexican cave with toxic hydrogen sulphide. *Mol Ecol.* (2007); 16: 967–976.
47. Tobler M, Riesch R, Tobler CM, et al: Natural and sexual selection against immigrants maintains differentiation among micro-allopatric populations. *J Evol Biol.* (2009); 22: 2298–2304.
48. Hrbek T, Seckinger J, Meyer A: A phylogenetic and biogeographic perspective on the evolution of poeciliid fishes. *Mol Phylogenet Evol.* (2007); 43: 986–998.
49. Ptacek MB, Breden F: Phylogenetic relationships among the mollies (Poeciliidae: Poecilia: Mollienesia group) based on mitochondrial DNA sequences. *J Fish Biol.* (1998); 53: 64–81.
50. Hubbs C, Lucier T, Garrett GP, et al: Survival and abundance of introduced fishes near San Antonio, Texas. *Texas Journal of Science.* (1978); 30: 369–376.
51. Bierbach D, Klein M, Sassmannshausen V, et al: Divergent evolution of male aggressive behaviour: another reproductive isolation mechanism in extremophile poeciliid fishes. *Int J Evol Biol.* (2012); 2012: 148745
52. Hsu Y, Earley RL, Wolf LL: Modulation of aggressive behaviour by fighting experience: mechanisms and contest outcomes. *Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc.* (2006); 81: 33–74.
53. Beauprand J, Goulet C, Payette D: Outcome of dyadic conflict in male green swordtail fish, *Xiphophorus helleri*: Effects of body size and prior dominance. *Anim Behav.* (1991); 41: 417–424.
54. Parzefall J: Zur vergleichenden Ethologie verschiedener *Mollienesia*-Arten einschließlich einer Höhlenform von *Mollienesia spheonops*. *Behaviour.* (1969); 33: 1–37.
55. Makowicz AM, Plath M, Schlupp I: Male guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*) adjust their mate choice behaviour to the presence of an audience. *Behaviour.* (2010); 147: 1657–1674.
56. Bisazza A, Marconato A, Marin G: Male mate preferences in the mosquitofish *Gambusia holbrooki*. *Ethology.* (1989); 83: 335–343.
57. Herdman EJE, Kelly CD, Godin JGJ: Male mate choice in the guppy (*Poecilia reticulata*): Do males prefer larger females as mates? *Ethology.* (2004); 110: 97–111.
58. Bierbach D, Ziege M, Zimmer C, et al: Male Grijalva mosquitofish (*Heterophallus milleri* Radda, 1987) increase individual mating preferences in front of an audience. *Aqua.* (2012); 18: 199–208.
59. Ala-Honkola O, Sällä L, Lindström K: Males prefer small females in a dichotomous choice test in the poeciliid fish *Heterandria formosa*. *Ethology.* (2010); 116: 736–743.
60. Plath M, Makowicz AM, Schlupp I, et al: Sexual harassment in live-bearing fishes (Poeciliidae): comparing courting and noncourting species. *Behav Ecol.* (2007); 18: 680–688.
61. Evans JP, Pierotti M, Pilastro A: Male mating behavior and ejaculate expenditure under sperm competition risk in the eastern mosquitofish. *Behav Ecol.* (2003); 14: 268–273.
62. Baerends GP, Brouwer R, Waterbolk HT: Ethological studies on *Lebistes reticulatus* (Peters): I. An analysis of the male courtship pattern. *Behaviour.* (1955); 8: 249–334.
63. Liley NR: Ethological isolating mechanisms in four sympatric species of Poeciliid fishes. *Behaviour.* (1966); 13 (suppl.) 1: 197.
64. Niemeitz A, Kreuzfeldt R, Scharl M, et al: Male mating behaviour of a molly, *Poecilia latipunctata*: a third host for the sperm-dependent Amazon molly, *Poecilia formosa*. *Acta ethol.* (2002); 5: 45–49.
65. Plath M: Male mating behavior and costs of sexual harassment for females in cavernicolous and extremophile populations of Atlantic mollies (*Poecilia mexicana*). *Behaviour.* (2008); 145: 73–98.
66. Sih A, Bell A, Johnson JC: Behavioral syndromes: an ecological and evolutionary overview. *Trends Ecol Evol.* (2004); 19: 372–378.

67. **Bell AM:** Future directions in behavioural syndromes research. *Proc Biol Sci.* (2007); **274**: 755–761.
68. **Sih A:** Behavioral syndromes: A behavioral ecologist's view on the evolutionary and ecological implications of animal personalities. In *Personality and Temperament in Nonhuman Primates*, A. Weiss, J.E. King and L. Murray, eds. (New York: Springer), (2011); pp. 313–336.
69. **Conrad JL, Weinersmith KL, Brodin T, et al:** Behavioural syndromes in fishes: a review with implications for ecology and fisheries management. *J Fish Biol.* (2011); **78**: 395–435.
70. **Réale D, Dingemanse NJ, Kazem AJ, et al:** Evolutionary and ecological approaches to the study of personality. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci.* (2010); **365**: 3937–3946.
71. **Bókony V, Kulcsár A, Tóth Z, et al:** Personality traits and behavioral syndromes in differently urbanized populations of house sparrows (*Passer domesticus*). *PLoS ONE.* (2012); **7**: e36639.
72. **Dingemanse NJ, Wright J, Kazem AJN, et al:** Behavioural syndromes differ predictably between 12 populations of three-spined stickleback. *J Anim Ecol.* (2007); **76**: 1128–1138.
73. **Chapman BB, Thain H, Coughlin J, et al:** Behavioural syndromes at multiple scales in *Myrmica* ants. *Anim Behav.* (2011); **82**: 391–397.
74. **Book AS, Starzyk KB, Quinsey VL:** The relationship between testosterone and aggression: a meta-analysis. *Aggress Violent Behav.* (2001); **6**: 579–599.
75. **Breedlove SM, Becker JB, Crews D, et al:** Behavioral endocrinology, 2nd Edition, (Bradford Books). (2002).
76. **Hannes RP:** Blood and whole-body androgen levels of male swordtails correlated with aggression measures in a standard-opponent test. *Aggress Behav.* (1986); **12**: 249–254.
77. **Toft G, Edwards TM, Baatrup E, et al:** Disturbed sexual characteristics in male mosquitofish (*Gambusia holbrooki*) from a lake contaminated with endocrine disruptors. *Environ Health Perspect.* (2003); **111**: 695–701.
78. **Köhler A, Hildenbrand P, Schleucher E, et al:** Effects of male sexual harassment on female time budgets, feeding behavior, and metabolic rates in a tropical livebearing fish (*Poecilia mexicana*). *Behav Ecol Sociobiol.* (2011); **65**: 1513–1523.
79. **Magurran AE:** Sexual coercion. In *Ecology and Evolution of Poeciliid Fishes*, J. Evans, A. Pilastro and I. Schlupp, eds. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), (2011); pp. 209–217.
80. **Evans J, Pilastro A:** Postcopulatory sexual selection. In *Ecology and Evolution of Poeciliid Fishes*, J. Evans, A. Pilastro and I. Schlupp, eds. (Chicago: Chicago University Press), (2011).
81. **Evans JP, Magurran AE:** Patterns of sperm precedence and predictors of paternity in the Trinidadian guppy. *Proc Biol Sci.* (2001); **268**: 719–724.

## Current Referee Status:

---

### Referee Responses for Version 1



**Clelia Gasparini**

Centre for Evolutionary Biology, The University of Western Australia, Crawley, WA, Australia

**Approved with reservations: 16 July 2013**

**Referee Report:** 16 July 2013

The authors present a study in which audience effects on male mating behaviour was analysed in several species of poeciliids (a family of livebearing freshwater fish) and related to mean sexual activity (used as a proxy for sperm competition risk) and aggressiveness. This is an attempt to study if sperm competition risk (SCR) can explain the occurrence of audience effects on male choice in this family. The rationale behind this is that males should adjust their mating behaviour by modulating, or even reversing, their initial mate choice in the presence of a rival. The change in male mate choice in the presence of another male has been mainly interpreted as a deceptive signal to lead competitors away from the preferred females, therefore lowering sperm competition risk. Given the complexity of factors (abiotic or biotic) that can contribute simultaneously to shape male mating decisions, explanations other than SCR (though not necessarily mutually exclusive) are also possible, although SCR is certainly likely to be important. Indeed, sperm competition is pervasive in poeciliids, and it is therefore likely that sperm competition is a major force in shaping the evolution of male mating strategies in this family. The hypothesis tested in this paper is that a higher sperm competition risk (SCR) should positively correlate with stronger audience effects across different species. Aggressiveness was also considered, as males could adjust their mate choice to avoid aggressive rivals.

This is a well written paper, addressing an interesting topic in evolutionary biology. Unfortunately, as the study is only correlative and phylogeny was not accounted for, results can only suggest a general trend, but this can certainly set the stage for future work in this area. No data was collected or analysed to directly quantify SCR in the different species, but total sexual activity (measured in the initial test) was used as a proxy.

**Aggressiveness tests:**

The authors performed aggressiveness tests, controlling for a number of factors that can possibly confound interpretation of results, for example, choosing males from different tanks to prevent previously established dominance. However, would aggressiveness scores differ when males are tested in the presence of a female during these encounters? Indeed, two males may have a lot more reasons to exhibit aggressive behaviour when a potential partner is present.

**Male mate choice tests:**

In these tests the focal male and two females were free to interact. Methods are described in detail, but I wonder if this is the exact protocol used in all experiments. I am guessing that the method used is probably similar across experiments, but it seems unlikely to me that it is exactly as described here for all

of them. Authors also exclude courtship from the sexual activity variable because this behaviour is not present in all species. However, courtship is an important component of sexual behaviour in some of the species considered and including this aspect of male behaviour may therefore change results.

Main conclusions:

The main finding that lead the authors to support the hypothesis “SCR is a driving force behind the evolution of this behaviour” is the positive correlation (depicted in fig 3e) between the intensity of sexual behaviour (proxy for SCR) recorded in the first test and the level (occurrence) of deceptive behaviour (the fraction of males that reverse their first choice, based on the first interaction with female, page 7). I would like to know how well the first sexual interaction reflects a male’s sexual choice in these species; is there any direct evidence? In guppies, for example, researchers have tested whether the time spent in front of a female during a binary dichotomous test is a good predictor of actual mating preference (Jeswiet & Godin 2011). Are there any studies that show that first sexual interaction is a reliable sign of male sexual interest in most of the species considered here?

**I have read this submission. I believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.**

**Competing Interests:** No competing interests were disclosed.

## 1 Comment

### Author Response

**David Bierbach**, Goethe-University of Frankfurt, Germany

Posted: 12 Aug 2013

Thank you very much for the positive view of our paper! The reviewer is right, we did not account for phylogeny in our current paper and the main focus of our study was to provide a general comparison of Poeciliid male reproductive behavior given the strong SCR assumed in this family.

Aggressiveness tests: Your assumptions might be right; in Siamese fighting fish effects of by-standing females on male aggressive behavior has been found (see work by McGregor). However, a recent study showed that Atlantic molly females did not prefer males after they had won a fight ([Bierbach et al. 2013](#)) which could lead to reduced aggressive behavior between males when being observed by a female in Poeciliids.

Male mate choice tests: The described experimental setup was exactly the same in all studies from which we extracted the mate choice data. The reviewer is right, courtship is an important aspect of some of the investigated species’ sexual behavior. Nevertheless, in order to draw general conclusions across a wide range of Poeciliid species that differ in several behavioral and ecological aspects, we focused on sexual behaviors that are directly linked to copulations (thus sperm transfer). Surely, courtship is an aspect that should be investigated in future studies.

Main conclusions: Thank you for this comment! To show that first sexual interactions and mating

preferences are congruent, we added another paragraph to the methods section where we explain that in 76%-100% of the trials the first approached females were also subject to the majority of males' sexual behaviors makes the first sexual approach a good proxy for male preference in all species examined.

**Competing Interests:** no competing interests



**Lisa Locatello**

Evolution and Ecology of Fish Reproduction, Department of Biology, University of Padova, Padova, Italy

**Approved with reservations: 17 June 2013**

**Referee Report:** 17 June 2013

Bierbach and co-authors investigated the topic of the evolution of the audience effect in live bearing fishes, by applying a comparative method. They specifically focused on the hypothesis that sperm competition risk, arising from male mate choice copying, and avoidance of aggressive interactions play a key role in driving the evolution of audience-induced changes in male mate choice behavior. The authors found support to their hypothesis of an influence of SCR on the evolution of deceptive behavior as their findings at species level showed a positive correlation between mean sexual activity and the occurrence of deceptive behavior. Moreover, they found a positive correlation between mean aggressiveness and sexual activity but they did not detect a relationship between aggressiveness and audience effects.

The manuscript is certainly well written and attractive, but I have some major concerns on the data analyses that prevent me to endorse its acceptance at the present stage.

I see three main problems with the statistics that could have led to potentially wrong results and, thus, to completely misleading conclusions.

- First of all the Authors cannot run an ANCOVA in which there is a significant interaction between factor and covariate Tab. 2 (a). Indeed, when the assumption of common slopes is violated (as in their case), all other significant terms are meaningless. They might want to consider alternative statistical procedures, e.g. Johnson—Neyman method.
- Second, the Authors cannot retain into the model a non significant interaction term, as this may affect estimations for the factors Tab. 2 (d). They need to remove the species x treatment interaction (as they did for other non significant terms, see top left of the same page 7).
- The third problem I see regards all the GLMs in which species are compared. Authors entered the 'species' level as fixed factor when species are clearly a random factor. Entering species as fixed factors has the effect of badly inflating the denominator degrees of freedom, making authors' conclusions far too permissive. They should, instead, use mixed LMs, in which species are the random factor. They should also take care that the degrees of freedom are approximately equal to the number of species (not the number of trials). To do so, they can enter as random factor the interaction between treatment and species.

Data need to be re-analyzed relying on the proper statistical procedures to confirm results and conclusions.

A more theoretical objection to the authors' interpretation of results (supposing that results will be confirmed by the new analyses) could emerge from the idea that male success in mating with the preferred female may reduce the probability of immediate female's re-mating, and thus reduce the risk of



sperm competition on the short term. As a consequence, it may be not beneficial to significantly increase the risk of losing a high quality and inseminated female for a cost that will not be paid with certainty. The authors might want to consider also this for discussion.

Lastly, I think that the scenario generated from comparative studies at species level may be explained by phylogenetic factors other than sexual selection. Only the inclusion of phylogeny, that allow to account for the shared history among species, into data analyses can lead to unequivocal adaptive explanations for the observed patterns. I see the difficulty in doing this with few species, as it is the case of the present study, but I would suggest the Authors to consider also this future perspective. Moreover, a phylogenetic comparative study would be aided by the recent development of a well-resolved phylogenetic tree for the genus *Poecilia* (Meredith 2011).

Minor comments:

Page 3: the authors should specify that also part of data on male aggressiveness (3 species from Table 1) come from previous studies, as they do for data on deceptive male mating behavior.

Page 5: since data on mate choice come from other studies is it so necessary to report a detailed description of methods for this section? Maybe the authors could refer to the already published methods and only give a brief additional description.

Page 6: how do the authors explain the complete absence of aggressive displays between the focal male and the audience male during the mate choice experiments? This sounds curious if considering that in all the examined species aggressive behaviors and dominance establishment are always observed during dyadic encounters.

**I have read this submission. I believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.**

**Competing Interests:** No competing interests were disclosed.

## 1 Comment

### Author Response

**David Bierbach**, Goethe-University of Frankfurt, Germany

Posted: 12 Aug 2013

Thank you very much for your overall positive view! In the revised version of our manuscript we rigorously tried to answer all your questions and clear up all points of critique raised. We analyzed our data with the recommended mixed model approach and added a PCA that depicts the species' behavioral characteristics.

Statistics: We re-analyzed all data using mixed models with "species ID" included as a subject grouping factor and random intercepts for each species. We then established whether there was significant between-species variation through likelihood ratio tests (model with random intercepts for species vs. reduced model). In the new analysis, random slopes for 'opponent size difference' were included for each species in our model so that the final analysis appropriately accounts for

species-specific reactions towards this covariate. In the new analysis only significant interaction terms and covariates were retained. For the analysis of the changes in mating preferences (linear mixed model) as well as changed first interactions (generalized linear mixed model) we included 'treatment' as a random factor as suggested.

*“male success in mating with the preferred female may reduce the probability of immediate female’s re-mating”*: This idea opposes our assumption of general “male mate choice copying” which renders recently mated females more attractive to rivals. If we understand correctly, you suggest some kind of “mate guarding” that would delay re-mating. This is however not a feature of any Poeciliidae mating system known so far. In this context, we would like to refer to our paragraph in the discussion dealing with patterns of sperm precedence in Poeciliids. Up to now, last male sperm precedence is at least verified in one of the species investigated here (for guppies) but it was not the focus of investigations into the other species. Thus, as audience-induced changes in preferences are found in all but one species (namely *H. milleri*), we assume the occurrence of last male sperm precedence is one cause that renders the “risk of losing a high quality and inseminated female” beneficial.

Phylogenetics: Phylogenetic analysis may be useful, and we re-ran our analysis while excluding the population of feral guppies that were most closely related to the Venezuelan guppies. However, the results remained unchanged. Furthermore, the new PCA that includes all behaviors investigated in the current study does not show any phylogenetic grouping.

Minor comments: The reviewer is right, the protocol for the mate choice tests as well as the aggression tests are already published but we would like to keep it in the current manuscript for reasons of clarity (also taking advantage of the less restrictive word limits of an online-only journal). In our mate choice tests, focal and audience males were separated as the audience males were fixed in a Plexiglas cylinder. Thus, direct aggression was not observable. Furthermore, a recent study showed that Atlantic molly females did not prefer males after they had won a fight which could have resulted in focal males showing low aggressiveness in front of the two female stimulus fish ([Bierbach et al. 2013](#))

**Competing Interests:** no competing interests



**Katja Heubel**

Department of Biology, Institute for Evolution and Ecology, Animal Evolutionary Ecology, University of Tuebingen, Tuebingen, Germany

**Approved with reservations: 17 June 2013**

**Referee Report:** 17 June 2013

I very much appreciate the effort of putting results together to compile a dataset that makes comparison across taxa possible. The authors could take more advantage of that. See more detailed comments below. Unfortunately, the manuscript does not have line numbers.

**Title:** Your title does not really suit your story. In particular, I am not in favour of your Casanova analogy. It is not clear to me how and in which part of your paper you may have tested the males properties of being “Casanovas” – I would have expected you to test a males multiple mating success – which you did not. Furthermore, the “liar” is not clear to me either. You did not test how

male's fitness correlated traits are dishonest or something like this. Anyways, analogies from the liberal arts always come with the problem of being a bit inaccurate since the definition of such characters are always somewhat blurred (is a "Casanova" a male with many matings? Many mates? High reproductive success? Is also male-male competitive ability part of the syndrome? What about the male aggression level?). I suggest refraining from using such non-scientific terms in your title and rather find a suitable title. Reading the abstract and introduction would suggest a title on sperm competition risk and audience effect.

**Abstract:** your start is a bit odd. You start with what seems to me to be the most exceptional example for the cause of sperm competition. Mate copying and even more specific male mate copying is not required for sperm completion. A simple scenario of multiple mating in a promiscuous mating system is a much more straightforward explanation.

**Article content:** the methods section is well explained. Looking at Table 1, I started wondering how many cases were excluded because a clear winner-loser situation could not be established. Comparing N dyads and the  $d_f$ 's, it seems that some species (*H. milleri*, *P. reticulata feral*, *L. tridens*, *P. latipunctata*) have more difficulties in establishing hierarchies under the given size differences. In the mentioned species, no more than 50% of trials ended with a winner-loser situation (*H. milleri* 4 out of 14 dyads). Thus, the n of trials with established hierarchy is 103, not 146.

Your experimental procedure on male mating behaviour comes with the side-effect that some of the males (and females) got to mate successfully in the first round, but others maybe not. Does this potentially affect their behaviour in front of an audience?

I was wondering whether there would be an alternative and more efficient approach to test species level regressions/correlations? Maybe you can compare regression slopes. Figure 2c may suggest that real deception only occurs in *L. tridens*, *P. mex. lim*, *P. mex sulf*, and *P. mex mex* which have an average likelihood to swap preferences and approach the other female of more than 50%.

**Introduction:** the introduction is a bit weak in underlining the novelty and achievements of the current study compared to the already existing body of articles on SCR and audience effects in poeciliids. A reader skimming through the paper may wonder why another study on SCR and audience in poeciliids would be an interesting read.

I very much appreciate the effort of putting results together to compile a dataset that makes comparison across taxa possible. Take more advantage of that.

In particular, I was wondering how encounter rates and population density may affect SCR and related coping styles. A life-history approach by looking at shifts in the reproductive periods may be interesting. Depending on whether first or last males sperm precedence is applicable, one may predict an advancement of the mating activity on the population level. Nevertheless, I am aware that this is beyond the scope of this paper.

**Discussion:** I am not convinced that your first sentence is supported by your data: where do you show that variation in audience effects is less pronounced among taxa?

Why is personality and behavioural syndromes not touched upon in your introduction? Not sure it really belongs to your story.

There is no real data on SCR in your paper. Your introduction deals with SCR in great detail, but it is not really in your data. Is there any solid data that supports your proposed link between sexual activity and SCR?

Data: having 13 taxa at hand, it would be interesting to see which and how some species cluster together. Could you include multiple contrasts or a factor analysis to illustrate similarity vs dissimilarity among Species?

As it is, Table 2 with “species” being significant, only reports that at least one species is different from the others. Would be useful to add more information. What you really want to show is how the species are clustering and how this relates to their mating system and sperm competition risk.

**I have read this submission. I believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.**

**Competing Interests:** No competing interests were disclosed.

## 1 Comment

### Author Response

**David Bierbach**, Goethe-University of Frankfurt, Germany

Posted: 12 Aug 2013

Thank you for your positive view of our comparative approach! We tried to outline this cross-taxa character in more detail in the new version of the manuscript. I am afraid the lack of line numbers is a feature of the journal’s publishing and editing concept, sorry.

You are right to be wary of analogies from the liberal arts. However, the Oxford dictionary defines a “Casanova” as a man notorious for seducing women. As the most sexually active species in our study readily switch their preferred females, we believe that referring to those males as “Casanovas” is not far from reality. The second part of our title adequately describes our current study from a scientific point of view, also incorporating sperm competition as one of your suggested key words.

Abstract: Thank you for this point! We changed the beginning of the abstract, several parts of the introduction and discussion, as well as the statistical analysis to underpin the comparative approach more precisely.

Article content: The reviewer is right about the number of dyads in which a clear dominance hierarchy was established. Nevertheless, even when no dominance was established we analyzed the number of aggressive behaviors that occurred and counted those trials as successful. We now precisely state how many trials dominance was established in.

The reviewer is right, successful and unsuccessful matings could have influenced the behavior in front of an audience. However, in most Poeciliids it is not possible to discriminate with certainty between a successful mating (defined as a mating with sperm being transferred) and the pure mating attempt. We followed our analysis with a protocol from [Hammond-Tooke \*et al.\* \(2012\)](#) where Spearman’s rank order tests were used to test for behavioral syndromes. We also depict results from PCA to cluster species based on their behaviors (see below). The new analysis found significant between-species variation in the level of deceptive behavior while the general tendency to swap more often between females when confronted with an audience male was found in all but one species. Our current analysis is focused on general behaviors across Poeciliids, more species-based analysis can be found in Bierbach *et al.* (2013) (in press).

Discussion: Our new analysis shows that between-species variation is much smaller in the audience behavior. We have switched the paragraph dealing with personality and behavioral syndromes from the discussion to the introduction so that the reader will be introduced to these considerations at the beginning. Several studies used the presence of a by-standing rival during mate choice to simulate SCR (see introduction) and sexual activity as a proxy for sperm competition in Poeciliids with high rates of multiple matings (which in turn leads to broods normally sired by multiple males). However, quantifying direct sperm competition (e.g., through offspring genotyping) was beyond the scope of our study.

Data: To provide an overview about similarity vs. dissimilarity among species we now provide results from PCA.

**Competing Interests:** no competing interests

---