

This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Boratynski, Zbigniew; Koskela, Esa; Mappes, Tapio; Mills, Suzanne; Mökkönen, Mikael

Title: Maintenance costs of male dominance and sexually antagonistic selection in the wild

Year: 2018

Version: Accepted version (Final draft)

Copyright: © 2018 The Authors. Functional Ecology © 2018 British Ecological Society.

Rights: In Copyright

Rights url: <http://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/?language=en>

Please cite the original version:

Boratynski, Z., Koskela, E., Mappes, T., Mills, S., & Mökkönen, M. (2018). Maintenance costs of male dominance and sexually antagonistic selection in the wild. *Functional Ecology*, 32(12), 2678-2688. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13216>

Functional Ecology

DR ZBYSZEK BORATYNSKI (Orcid ID : 0000-0003-4668-4922)

Article type : Research Article

Section: Animal Physiological Ecology

Editor: Dr Adam Siepielski

Maintenance costs of male dominance and sexually antagonistic selection in the wild

Zbyszek Boratyński^{1,2}, Esa Koskela², Tapio Mappes², Suzanne C. Mills^{2,3,4} and Mikael Mokkonen^{2,5,6}

¹ CIBIO/InBIO, Research Center in Biodiversity and Genetic Resources, University of Porto, Vairão, PT-4485–661 Vairão, Portugal

² Department of Biological and Environmental Science, P.O. Box 35, FI-40014 University of Jyväskylä, Finland

³ PSL Université Paris: EPHE-UPVD-CNRS, USR 3278 CRIOBE, BP 1013, 98729 Papetoai, Moorea, French Polynesia

⁴ Laboratoire d'Excellence "CORAIL", France

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/1365-2435.13216

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

⁵ Department of Biological Sciences, Simon Fraser University, 8888 University Drive,
Burnaby, British Columbia, V5A 1S6, Canada

⁶ Department of Biology, Kwantlen Polytechnic University, 12666 72 Avenue, Surrey, British
Columbia, V3W 2M8, Canada

Corresponding author: Zbyszek Boratyński, CIBIO/InBIO, Research Center in Biodiversity and
Genetic Resources, University of Porto, Vairão, PT-4485–661 Vairão, Portugal,
boratyns@cibio.up.pt

Authors are in alphabetical order.

Abstract

1. Variation in dominance status determines male mating and reproductive success, but natural selection for male dominance can be detrimental or antagonistic for female performance, and ultimately their fitness. Attaining and maintaining a high dominance status in a population of competing individuals is physiologically costly for males. But how male dominance status is mediated by maintenance energetics is currently not well understood, nor are the corresponding effects of male energetics on his sisters recognized.

2. We conducted laboratory and field experiments on rodent populations to test whether selective breeding for male dominance status (dominant vs. subordinate breeding lines) antagonistically affected basal metabolic rate (BMR) and fitness of females under wild conditions.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

3. Our results showed elevated BMR in females, but not in males, from the dominant breeding line. However, phenotypically dominant males from the subordinate breeding line had the highest BMR.

4. Males from the dominant line with low BMR sired the most litters and offspring in the field. Similarly, females from the dominant selection line tended to have more offspring if they had lower BMR, while the opposite trend was found in females from the subordinate selection line. Females with high and low BMR reproduced most often, as indicated by a significant quadratic selection gradient.

5. The increased female BMR resulting from selection for male dominance suggests genetic incompatibility between sexes in metabolism inheritance. Elevated BMR in behaviourally dominant males, but not in males from the dominant breeding line, suggests physiological costs in males not genetically suited for dominance.

6. Fitness costs of elevated maintenance costs (measured as BMR) shown here support the energetic compensation hypothesis where high BMR is selected against as it would trade-off energy required for other important life history attributes.

Keywords: antagonistic selection, basal metabolic rate (BMR), dominance behaviour, energetics, sexual conflict, testosterone.

Introduction

Intralocus sexual conflict can drive males and females from their sex specific life-history optima, thereby compromising lifetime fitness (Bonduriansky, Maklakov, Zajitschek, &

Brooks, 2008; Mokkonen, Koskela, Mappes, & Mills, 2016). Such conflict occurs when the same alleles have opposing fitness between males and females that, unless there is sex-limited gene expression, impedes adaptive evolution (Bonduriansky & Chenoweth, 2009; Mills, Koskela, & Mappes, 2012; Van Doorn & Fe, 2009). Intralocus conflict has the potential to generate sexually antagonistic selection affecting fitness through survival and the reproductive components of fitness, such as mating and reproductive success. However, male success in mating and reproduction is physiologically costly (Vehrencamp, Bradbury, & Gibson, 1989). Currently, the maintenance energetics mediating male fitness are not clear, nor is the presence of sexual antagonism for such maintenance costs.

Behavioural dominance often defines a male's access to mates (Qvarnström & Forsgren, 1998). Testosterone, which mediates the dominance hierarchy in males, can impose differential expression of many physiological pathways between males and females (Peterson et al., 2014). Testosterone can affect mating behaviour (Mills, Koskela, & Mappes, 2012; Mokkonen, Koskela, Mappes, & Mills, 2012) and fitness: e.g. red deer male calves born to first-time mothers were less likely to survive if they had high neonatal testosterone level (Pavitt, Walling, Mcneilly, Pemberton, & Kruuk, 2014). Male dominance is also directly influenced by the tactics of other males in the population, showing negative frequency-dependent selection in the wild, i.e. being costly for males when common in the population (Mokkonen et al., 2011). Dominance status and testosterone level can both be heritable, and respond to selection (Pavitt, Walling, Mcneilly, Pemberton, & Kruuk, 2014; Schroderus et al., 2010), but, the evolution of sex-specific testosterone levels can be constrained by cross-sex genetic correlation (Pavitt, Walling, Pemberton, & Kruuk, 2014). The status of a

highly dominant male, with a high testosterone level, can reveal physiological costs (Bryant & Newton, 1994; Røskaft, Järvi, Bakken, Bech, & Reinertsen, 1986). However, selection for testosterone level can differentially associate with son versus daughter reproductive success, causing a negative correlation in fitness between siblings (Mills, Koskela, & Mappes, 2012; Mokkonen, Koskela, Mappes, & Mills, 2012). Testosterone may differentially affect overall gene expression between males and females, affecting many metabolic and physiological traits (Peterson et al., 2014). Yet, currently it is unclear how selection for dominance in males affects maintenance costs in both sexes, females in particular, or whether frequency-dependent selection on dominance promotes or constrains adaptations in metabolic traits (Buchanan, Evans, Goldsmith, Bryant, & Rowe, 2001).

Many studies have been carried out to explain intra- and interspecific variation observed in the lower limit of energy metabolism, the basal metabolic rate (Boratyński, Jefimow, & Wojciechowski, 2016; Keil et al., 2012; Polymeropoulos, Oelkrug, White, & Jastroch, 2017; Sadowska et al., 2015; Tieleman, Williams, & Bloomer, 2003). The level of basal metabolic rate relative to its body mass (hereafter BMR) is invoked to reflect an individual's maintenance costs (Konarzewski & Książek, 2012). According to two main competing models, a high BMR reflects either energetic predisposition to support costly behaviours, such as reproduction (the “increased intake” hypothesis; Nilsson, 2002), or that a high BMR trades-off with other important life functions (the “compensation” or “allocation” hypothesis; Gadgil & Bossert, 1970; Pettersen, Marshall, & White, 2018). It is already known that variation in BMR can influence fitness (Boratyński, Koskela, Mappes, & Schroderus, 2013; Careau et al., 2013; Møller, 2009; Nilsson & Nilsson, 2016; Pettersen, Marshall, &

White, 2018) and that both of its genetic and fitness consequences can be sex specific (Boratyński, Koskela, Mappes, & Oksanen, 2010; Boratyński, Ketola, Koskela, & Mappes, 2016; Rønning et al., 2016). Nevertheless, the cross-sex genetic correlation can constrain independent evolution of BMR between males and females, thereby providing a potential opportunity for intralocus sexual conflict in maintenance energetics (Bonduriansky & Chenoweth, 2009; Rand, Clark, & Kann, 2001).

BMR and testosterone can be involved in the expression of life-history traits linked to fitness (Moore & Hopkins, 2009). For example, females with higher metabolism can transfer more testosterone to eggs (Tschirren et al., 2016), while the close physiological association between testosterone level and metabolic rate can result in testosterone mediated honest sexual signaling in males (Buchanan, Evans, Goldsmith, Bryant, & Rowe, 2001). But it is still unclear how BMR affects the evolution of sexually antagonistically selected life-history traits and if it links to frequency dependent selection on male tactics (Mills et al., 2009; Mills, Koskela, & Mappes, 2012; Morkkonen et al., 2011). Bateman's principle predicts that male fitness is primarily shaped by mating success, whereas female fitness is primarily shaped by longevity to optimize their life-time reproductive effort (Rolff, 2002). As mating and reproductive success can be affected by energetic physiology (Boratyński & Koteja, 2010), selection for increased male fitness would theoretically affect physiological performance of both sexes as well as their level of BMR (i.e. maintenance costs). In particular, according to the parental care concept of the evolution of endothermy, which provides an adaptive explanation for the evolution of a high level of BMR, selection for increased reproductive output should result in a correlative response in increase of the level of maintenance

metabolism, at least in females (Bacigalupe, Moore, Nespolo, Rezende, & Bozinovic, 2017; Koteja, 2004). However, it is unclear if the cross-sex genetic correlation of metabolism can constrain responses to antagonistic selection between males and females.

We would predict that (1) if the cross-sex genetic correlation for BMR is relatively low in our study species (Boratyński, Koskela, Mappes, & Schroderus, 2013), males and females can theoretically approach their optimal levels of maintenance metabolism. Being dominant is energetically costly, and thus according to the “increased intake” hypothesis, we would predict (2) metabolic performance, rather than size alone, along with the level of expressed testosterone, can constrain expression of male dominance (Buchanan, Evans, Goldsmith, Bryant, & Rowe, 2001). Alternatively, and according to the “allocation” hypothesis, low BMR might release resources to invest in behavioral performance such as dominance. We would therefore predict that (3) energetic costs for individuals expressing high dominance status might be different between males whose fathers were dominant versus those whose fathers were subordinate. Males not genetically predisposed to high dominance might manifest higher energetic costs (sensu “increased intake” hypothesis) of expression of such status, than those males which inherited genes of dominance (sensu “allocation” hypothesis). Theories predicting the evolution of a high level of BMR (Angilletta Jr. & Sears, 2003; Farmer, 2000) postulate that individuals with a higher metabolic capacity can sustain elevated energetic demands of reproduction (e.g. males maintaining larger territories, females providing their pups with more food). However, information is lacking on the fitness costs of high versus low maintenance physiology, and BMR, for males and females selected for high versus low reproductive output. Theoretically, we predict that (4) a high BMR could

result from correlative selection for high reproductive output and physiological capacity.

However, previous studies have shown that not only can the direction of selection on BMR differ between males and females, and among seasons (Boratyński, Koskela, Mappes, & Oksanen, 2010; Boratyński & Koteja, 2009, 2010), but a low BMR can generally be beneficial for fitness (Boratyński, Koskela, Mappes, & Schroderus, 2013).

We experimentally tested these hypotheses in a field study on bank voles subjected to artificial selection in the laboratory, that resulted in the selection lines of behaviorally dominant males with sisters of low fecundity, and subordinate males with sisters of high fecundity (Mokkonen et al., 2011). We tested if selective breeding of male bank voles with high and low dominance status influenced their BMR and whether any associated sexually antagonistic effects can be observed in female metabolic performance. We tested if BMR is inflated in males due to inherited correlational line specific selection effects or if they are related to behavioural (dominance) and physiological (testosterone level) phenotypic status. We also estimated if male dominance status is primarily determined by testosterone level or whether it is constrained by BMR. Ultimately, we tested if BMR influenced the main reproductive fitness components, mating and reproductive success, and whether frequency dependent selection operated on male dominant vs. subordinate breeding lines in the field.

Methods

Study species and artificial selection for male dominance

The bank vole is a Palearctic species with a polygynandrous mating system. Bank voles have

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Accepted Article

been shown to experience sexually antagonistic selection for testosterone: artificial selection for testosterone is associated differentially with son versus daughter reproductive success, causing a negative correlation in fitness between full siblings (Mills, Koskela, & Mappes, 2012; Mokkonen, Koskela, Mappes, & Mills, 2012). To further investigate phenotypic traits related to sexually antagonistic relationship between son and daughter fitness, we artificially selected bank voles in the lab based on male dominance, the details of which are described elsewhere (Mokkonen et al., 2011). Briefly, two selection lines were created for this experiment using artificial selection; high-dominance males, M, were mated with females of low fertility, f (Mf line) and low-dominance (subordinate) males, m, were mated with females of high fertility, F (mF line). Male dominance was tested in non-repeated male-male competition trials where a high-dominance line male and a low-dominance line male competed in an arena with each other to mate with a wild female in estrus, until the successful males out-competed opponent males and mated with the female. We used a total of 168 males in the male-male competition trials reported in this study. Matings were conducted by pairing a chosen male with a female in a standard cage for a period of 2 weeks, after which the male was separated from the female, and gravidity of the female assessed. Approximately 3 weeks after initial pairing with a sire, pregnant females gave birth. Within 24 hours of birth, common litter characteristics were measured, including: body mass of each offspring and mother, sex of offspring (based on visual cues and ano-genital distance; Koskela, Mappes, Niskanen, & Rutkowska, 2009) and litter size (number of offspring). Offspring were kept with mothers until they were weaned 21 days after birth. Study individuals were fourth and fifth generation descendants of wild individuals. Males and females in the laboratory were housed at 22°C in standard cages measuring 43 x 26 x15 cm with wood shavings and hay for bedding, *ad libitum* water and

food (Labfor 36; Lactamin AB, Stockholm, Sweden) and kept on a 16:8 L:D photoperiod.

Physiological measurements

We measured plasma testosterone levels of 164 adult males (mean±SD age of: 306±55 days) by sampling individuals prior to their release to field enclosures. A 75 µl intra-orbital blood sample was taken from each individual, and then analysed using the radio-immunoassay technique (TESTO-CTK, DiaSorin, Byk-Sangtec Diagnostica GmbH & Co, Germany). Further details of the protocol are described elsewhere (Mills et al., 2009; Mills, Grapputo, Koskela, & Mappes, 2007). To measure maintenance costs we estimated basal metabolic rate (BMR) on the resting, post-absorptive, non-reproductive and exposed to thermoneutral temperature (30.0 ± 0.5 °C) individuals (Labocha, Sadowska, Baliga, Semer, & Koteja, 2004; White & Kearney, 2013). We used open positive flow respirometry system with multiple (7) animal and one control chambers (Sable Systems, Henderson, NV, U.S.A.) equipped with oxygen analyser (Fc-1B, Sable Systems). Seven and half hours of trials, with this system, gave reliable O₂ data for estimating repeatable and heritable BMR in a study organism (Boratyński et al., 2011; Boratyński, Ketola, Koskela, & Mappes, 2016; Šíchová, Koskela, Mappes, Lantová, & Boratyński, 2014). We estimated BMR for 40 males and 30 females from the dominant male (Mf) line and 34 males and 32 females from the subordinate male (mF) line.

Field selection experiment

To measure strength and form of natural selection on the phenotype, we used a total of 91 females and 91 males in a field experiment. In total, 20 populations were created in 2 replicates (11 and 9 populations) using 11 field enclosures measuring 40 m x 50 m each (Mokkonen et al., 2011). Each population consisted of an equal number of males to females, and contained 1 male and 1 female from a given selection line with 4 (1st) or 3 (2nd replicate) males and females from the other selection group (e.g. population A: 1 Mf male + 1 Mf female + 4 mF males + 4 mF females; population B: 4 Mf males + 4 Mf females + 1 mF male + 1 mF female) to test for the frequency dependent selection on breeding lines (Mokkonen et al., 2011). Individuals were randomly assigned to enclosures, however sibling assignments to the same enclosure were avoided. Each enclosure contained 20 Ugglan live traps in a 4 x 5 grid pattern, and were spaced 10 m apart. Sheet metal fencing (1.0 m above, 0.5 m below ground) surrounded each enclosure, preventing escape of study individuals while at the same time allowing possible predators to enter the enclosures. Study individuals relied on natural field conditions and resources to survive. Initially, females were released to enclosures. After 4 days, males were then released and all individuals were left to survive and breed in the field enclosures. Eighteen days after males were introduced, all study individuals were trapped out of the enclosures and brought to the laboratory for females to give birth. In the laboratory, pregnant females were monitored every 24 hours. After a birth, tissue samples were taken from each offspring individual and common litter characteristics were recorded. Each offspring was genotyped by extracting DNA using the Qiagen DNeasy Tissue kit and KingFisher magnetic particle processor, and then Cervus 3.0 software was used to assign paternity (Kalinowski, Taper, & Marshall, 2007). The use of study animals and

all above protocols adhered to ethical guidelines for animal research in Finland (Finnish National Animal Experiment Board, permission numbers: ESLH-2008-04660/Ym-23 and ESLH-2009-09663/Ym-23).

Statistical analysis

Correlative responses in BMR. We used a generalized mixed model (GLMM) procedure to test for female and male correlative responses (maternal and heritable effects) in BMR to artificial selection for male dominance status. Log-transformed BMR was included as the dependent variable (Gaussian family function), male selection line affiliation (dominant vs. subordinate line) and sex as fixed cofactors, (log-transformed) age and body mass at metabolic trials as covariates. Due to a significant effect of sex on dependent variables, models were also run separately for males and females.

Dominance phenotype and BMR. To tests if maintenance metabolism constrains a male's dominance phenotype (dominant vs. subordinate status), we ran a GLMM model with male dominance status as the dependent variable (binomial family function), line affiliation as fixed cofactors and (log-transformed) age, body mass at metabolic trials, BMR and testosterone level as covariates.

BMR, dominance phenotype and genotype. To test for energetic costs between dominance phenotypes and genotypes of male bank voles we ran a GLMM model including log-

transformed BMR as the dependent variable (Gaussian family function), dominance status (dominant vs. subordinate status) and selection line affiliation (dominant vs. subordinate line) as fixed cofactors, (log-transformed) testosterone level, age and body mass at metabolic trials as covariates.

All models included mother ID and respirometry chamber ID as random factors (to control for common early environment/relatedness among individuals and variation in respirometry machine) and tested factorial interactions (those insignificant were sequentially excluded). Effect sizes are presented as percentages of differences between back transformed least-squares means predicted from above models. Statistical tests from models with residual BMR (from linear regression of BMR on age and body mass) as the dependent variable (or covariate) are presented in the main text for simplicity.

Selection analyses. The strength and form of selection on phenotype in the wild was tested with generalized mixed modelling (GLMM) with separate models for dependent variables: (1) number of sired litters (Poisson family function) and (2) number of sired offspring (Poisson family function, zero inflated), for male fitness components, and (3) probability to reproduce (binomial family function) and (4) litter sizes (Poisson family function), for fitness components of females. The strength and form of natural selection was tested in GLMM models including independent variables of line type (dominant vs. subordinate line) and its frequency as fixed cofactors, and (log transformed) BMR, body mass and age at the onset of experiment as covariates. We tested factorial interactions between all characters while

controlling for maternal, common environmental and replication effects (random factors of: mother ID, population ID and replication of experiment). Linear and quadratic effects and interactions between BMR, age and body mass were tested to account for directional, stabilizing/disruptive and correlational selections, respectively (due to limited power, interactions were first tested in separate models per interaction type, and finally significant terms were included in one model; Artacho, Saravia, Ferrandière, Perret, & Le Galliard, 2015; Rønning et al., 2016). Age did not affect fitness components and it was excluded from final tests. To remove the correlation between linear and quadratic terms, continuous predictors were standardized within datasets. Statistical modelling with GLMM was performed with “glmmADMB” (<http://glmmadmb.r-forge.r-project.org/>) and “lme4” packages in R (www.r-project.org). For comparison of strength and form of selection with other studies standardized selection gradients were estimated (Artacho & Nespolo, 2009; Lande & Arnold, 1983; Pettersen, White, & Marshall, 2016; Schluter, 1988). Linear (β) and nonlinear (γ ; quadratic, correlational) selection gradients were estimated by means of coefficients from multiple regression analyses, separately for females and males, and within selection lines, with relative fitness as dependent variable and standardized quantitative traits (BMR and body mass) as predictors. Linear effects (β) were estimated in multiple regression models including only main effects, while nonlinear effects (γ) were estimated in models including also quadratic or correlational terms along the linear effects. Coefficients for quadratic terms were multiplied by two (Fairbairn & Reeve, 2001). The 95% confidence intervals of the coefficients were estimated with 1000 bootstrapping.

Results

Correlative responses in BMR

Residual values were calculated from a multiple linear regression with BMR as the dependent variable and body mass and age as independent variables to account for significant correlations of BMR with age ($t = 2.86$, $p = 0.005$) and body mass ($t = 8.60$, $p < 0.001$). We used BMR residuals to test for statistical differences between groups (results for absolute BMR values from models that included age and body mass were qualitatively similar; Table 1, and S1-S2). Females (Fig. 1a), and individuals from lines selected for male dominance (Fig. 1b), had on average 6.5 and 4.7% higher BMR than males, and individuals from the male subordinate line, respectively (Table 1 and S2). The difference in BMR between lines (Fig. 1b) was generated by the significant differences in BMR between females (6.8%), not males (2.3% of difference; Fig. 1c), with females from the male dominance line having the highest BMR (despite a non significant sex-by-line interaction, $p > 0.1$; Table 1 and S2). In the male dominance line, BMR was higher in females than in males by 7.3% ($z = 2.61$, $p = 0.009$; Fig. 1c), whereas the difference in BMR between the sexes did not meet significance in the male subordinate line (5.6%, $z = 0.95$, $p = 0.34$; Fig. 1c).

Dominance phenotype and BMR

In male-male competition trials, males were 81.4% more likely dominant in the line selected for dominance status. When analysed over both selection lines, phenotypically dominant males have 8.8% higher BMR than subordinate males (line-by-BMR interaction was insignificant, $z = 0.14$, $p = 0.89$; Table 2 and S3). However, phenotypically dominant males

from the subordinate selection line have the highest BMR (Fig. 1d). BMR was 11.6% higher than in phenotypically subordinate males from the same line ($z = 2.49$, $p = 0.013$) and 8.4% higher than in phenotypically dominant males from the dominant line (Fig. 1d). There was no significant difference in BMR between phenotypically dominant and subordinate males from the dominant selection line (7.1%, $z = 0.58$, $p = 0.30$; Fig 1d).

BMR, dominance phenotype and genotype

We found that variation in male BMR was explained by the interactions between selection line and testosterone level, and between dominance status and testosterone level (but line by testosterone by dominance status interaction was insignificant: $z = 0.71$, $p = 0.48$; Table 3 and S4). The BMR of males that behaved phenotypically dominant, tended to decrease with increasing testosterone levels, whereas the BMR of males that behaved phenotypically subordinate, tended to increase with increasing testosterone levels (Fig. 2a). On the other hand, the BMR of males from the male dominant line tended to increase with increasing testosterone, whereas the BMR of males from the male subordinate line tended to decrease with increasing testosterone (Table 3 and S4, Fig. 2b).

Fitness costs

Sired litters and offspring. In our initial analysis, we found a significant interaction between frequency (rare or common) and line (dominant vs. subordinate line) on reproductive success, in accordance with reported negative frequency-dependent selection on male reproductive morphs in bank voles ($z = 2.35$, $p = 0.019$, line: $z = -1.11$, $p = 0.27$, frequency: z

= -3.84, $p = 0.0001$; Mokkonen et al., 2011). Rare males from lines selected for high dominance sired the highest number of offspring ($z = -3.57$, $p = 0.0004$), but frequency did not have a significant effect on the siring success of subordinate line males ($z = 0.19$, $p = 0.85$).

After including phenotypic data (body mass and BMR), stabilizing selection on BMR and frequency dependent selection on body mass were suggested in overall analyses of number of sired litters (Table 4), but not in separate tests within selection lines. Instead, dominant line males with the lowest BMR values sired on average 1.4 more litters than males with the highest BMR values (on average 1.5 vs. 0.1 litters; Fig. 3a), but a non-significant opposite trend was found between males from the subordinate selection line (average difference in number of litters was 0.6; Table 4, see Table S5 for selection gradients). Furthermore, we found that the BMR-by-line interaction significantly explained variation in the number of sired offspring (Table 4). Males in the dominant line with the lowest BMR values sired on average 5.0 more offspring than males with the highest BMR values (on average 5.5 vs. 0.5 sired offspring; Fig. 3a). But an opposite trend of BMR on number of sired offspring was not significant for males from the subordinate line (average difference in number of offspring was 2.7; Table 4).

Frequency dependent selection on body mass was significant in our overall tests for the number of sired litters and offspring, and in the test within the dominant line for the number of sired offspring (Table 4). Males from the dominant line sired 3.6 more offspring if

they were rare than if they were common in the population (5.8 vs. 2.2 offspring sired; Table 4).

Female mating success and litter size. Females that reproduced were 13.0% heavier than females that did not reproduce, but the trend was not significant ($p = 0.059$; Table 5).

Females from around the median of the BMR distribution tended to reproduce less often than both females with the lowest (16.7%) and highest (55.1%) BMR (Table 5). The number of pups raised by females from the subordinate line increased as their BMR values increased (2.8 more pups: 6.4 vs. 3.6 pups from females with the highest vs. lowest BMR, Fig. 3b), whereas the number of pups raised by females from the dominant line decreased as their BMR values increased (1.9 fewer pups: 3.75 vs. 5.6 pups from females with the highest vs. lowest BMR). However, this contrasting effect of BMR between lines (BMR-by-line interaction on litter sizes: $p = 0.015$) did not meet significance in our within-line tests ($p \geq 0.13$; Table 5; see also results for selection gradients in Table S6).

Discussion

Selective breeding on male dominance status resulted in a significant elevation of maintenance costs for females, characterized by a higher basal metabolic rate (BMR; Figs 1a-c). Phenotypically dominant males from the subordinate selection line have the highest BMR (Fig. 1d). However, the interactions between dominance (behavioural and that related to selection lines) and testosterone with respect to the response variable of BMR, point to

an uncoupling of the genetic and the phenotypic components of dominance status (Figs 2a, b). Males from the dominant selection line with high BMR suffered decreased fitness (negative linear selection gradients) in the natural environment, as the males with low BMR sired the greatest number of litters and offspring (Fig. 3a; Table S5). Similarly, the sisters of these males from the dominant line tended to suffer fitness disadvantages of high BMR, characterized by smaller litter sizes (Fig. 3b; Table S6). However, a positive trend of BMR on fitness components did not meet significance for individuals from the subordinate selection line (Table 4 and 5).

Increased maintenance costs, characterized by elevated BMR, in females compared to males in the line selected for male dominance (Fig. 1), suggests linkage between male fitness and female energetics (Hayward & Gillooly, 2011; Watson, Arnqvist, & Stallmann, 1998), or more specifically, genetic mito-nuclear incompatibility between the sexes (Hill, 2018; Rand, Clark, & Kann, 2001). As the inheritance of mitochondria, the 'energetic factories' of the cells, in mammals is mostly via females, selection on a male's energetic performance might be ineffective. However, such selection may promote nuclear genomic variation toward male (and not female) fitness optima due to counter-adaptation in males and an imperfect match between (male) nuclear and (female) mitochondrial co-expressed genes (Boratyński, Ketola, Koskela, & Mappes, 2016; Hill & Johnson, 2013). As low maintenance costs can be, in general, considered selectively beneficial (Boratyński, Koskela, Mappes, & Schroderus, 2013), the increased BMR in sisters of males selected for high dominance may suggest unresolved conflict and gender load mediated by mito-nuclear incompatibilities (Bonduriansky & Chenoweth, 2009; Mills, Koskela, & Mappes, 2012; Petersen et al., 2013).

Alternatively, the parental care (and related) models for the evolution of endothermy argued that females benefited from an increased metabolic rate and BMR (Lovegrove, 2017; Wone, Sears, Labocha, Donovan, & Hayes, 2009). Accordingly, our results suggest that selection for male fitness can also benefit females via its physiological performance. However, in our natural selection experiment in the field we had conflicting results. While there was an indication of disruptive selection on female BMR in terms of their probability to reproduce (Table 5), BMR had also opposing effects on a female's litter size between male dominance selection lines (Fig. 3b; Table 5 and S6). Females from the subordinate male line tended to have larger litters if they also have higher BMR level. Conversely in the dominant male line, characterized by elevated BMR in females, selection tended to favour females with a lower BMR (Fig. 3b). These results suggest that selection for male fitness has rather negative outcomes on female reproductive performance.

In general, males with a high BMR level were more likely to express dominant behaviour (Table 2). But, elevated BMR in phenotypically, but not genetically, dominant males entails high physiological costs of behavioural dominance in males not genetically suited for dominance (Fig. 1d). The proposed models explaining intraspecific variation in BMR distinguish between compensatory and predisposition functions of BMR in relation to other life history traits (Pettersen, Marshall, & White, 2018; Ricklefs & Wikelski, 2002; Šíchová, Koskela, Mappes, Lantová, & Boratyński, 2014). The results for male behavioural dominance status (Table 2), and the variation in association between BMR and testosterone levels (Table 3), suggests that the two models may perform on different, phenotypic and genetic, levels (Fig. 2). At the phenotypic level, we found that a high BMR, and high maintenance

costs, may limit the expression of testosterone in phenotypically dominant males (Fig. 2a), thus supporting the “compensation” (or “allocation”) hypothesis. However, at the genetic level, in the line selected for high dominance status in males, an elevated level of BMR may reflect a genetic predisposition to express testosterone (Fig. 2b), thus supporting the “increased intake” hypothesis. However, the results from our field experiment support the energetic “compensation” hypothesis, where high BMR is selected against, as it may limit energy required for other important life functions (Fig. 3a). In males from the dominant selection line, selection in the wild promoted low maintenance costs, as those males with lower BMR obtained the highest number of mates and offspring (Table 4, Fig. 3a).

Is there evidence for intralocus sexual conflict mediated by maintenance metabolism? In a previous experiment it has been shown that negative frequency-dependent selection on bank vole male dominance maintains variation in sexually antagonistic alleles (Mokkonen et al., 2011). Here we showed that the selection on maintenance metabolism in the wild can also constrain the fitness of both sexes. While artificial selection for male dominance resulted in increased male dominance, greater male reproductive success and higher female BMR, the field selection experiment pointed to selective disadvantages of high BMR in both sexes in the dominant line. However, while high BMR was selected against in males and female from the dominant line, at the same time females from the subordinate line tended (not statistically significant trend) to be selected for higher BMR (Fig. 3). As those are the most reproductively successful individuals, this result suggests an opportunity for sexual antagonism over maintenance metabolism in bank voles. Thus, along with the findings of energetic costs of selection for dominance, our results suggest conflict between males and

females in energy metabolism. It is possible that energetic capacity, rather than maintenance costs *per se*, more closely determines fitness, with BMR only being correlated to it. Thus, future work in this and other systems should investigate complete animal energetic budgets to assess the extent mito-nuclear conflicts shape fitness in the field.

Acknowledgements. We thank the staff of the Experimental Animal Unit and Konnevesi Research Station, University of Jyväskylä, R. Närä and H. Pietiläinen for logistical support and C. Cayol for statistical advices. The study was financially supported by the Academy of Finland (115961, 119200, 218107 and 132190) and the Centre of Excellence in Evolutionary Research, University of Jyväskylä. ZB is funded by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (RH/BPD/84822/2012). We have no competing interests.

Data accessibility. Data deposited in the Dryad Digital Repository:

<http://doi:10.5061/dryad.vt4m939>, (Boratyński, Koskela, Mappes, Mills, & Mokkonen, 2018)

Authors' contributions. EK, TM, MM and SCM designed the research. MM led the collection of data with help from all co-authors. ZB carried out the energetic lab work and the statistical analyses, and drafted the manuscript together with MM and other co-authors.

References

- Angilletta Jr., M. J., & Sears, M. W. (2003). Is parental care the key to understanding endothermy in birds and mammals? *The American Naturalist*, *162*(6), 821–825. doi.org/10.1086/380921
- Artacho, P., & Nespolo, R. F. (2009). Natural selection reduces energy metabolism in the garden snail, *Helix aspersa* (*Cornu aspersum*). *Evolution*, *63*(4), 1044–1050. doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00603.x
- Artacho, P., Saravia, J., Ferrandière, B. D., Perret, S., & Le Galliard, J.-F. (2015). Quantification of correlational selection on thermal physiology, thermoregulatory behavior, and energy metabolism in lizards. *Ecology and Evolution*, *5*(17), 3600–3609. doi:10.1002/ece3.1548
- Bacigalupe, L. D., Moore, A. J., Nespolo, R. F., Rezende, E. L., & Bozinovic, F. (2017). Quantitative genetic modeling of the parental care hypothesis for the evolution of endothermy. *Frontiers in Physiology*, *8*(DEC), 1–8. doi:10.3389/fphys.2017.01005
- Bonduriansky, R., & Chenoweth, S. F. (2009). Intralocus sexual conflict. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *24*(5), 280–288. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2008.12.005
- Bonduriansky, R., Maklakov, A., Zajitschek, F., & Brooks, R. (2008). Sexual selection, sexual conflict and the evolution of ageing and life span. *Functional Ecology*, *22*(3), 443–453. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2008.01417.x
- Boratyński, J. S., Jefimow, M., & Wojciechowski, M. S. (2016). Phenotypic flexibility of energetics in acclimated Siberian hamsters has a narrower scope in winter than in summer. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B*, *186*(3), 387–402. doi:10.1007/s00360-016-0959-3
- Boratyński, Z., Alves, P., Berto, S., Koskela, E., Mappes, T., & Melo-Ferreira, J. (2011). Introgression of mitochondrial DNA among *Myodes* voles: consequences for energetics? *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, *11*(1), 355. doi:10.1186/1471-2148-11-355
- Boratyński, Z., Ketola, T., Koskela, E., & Mappes, T. (2016). The sex specific genetic variation of energetics in bank voles, consequences of introgression. *Evolutionary Biology*, *43*(1), 37–47. doi:10.1007/s11692-015-9347-2
- Boratyński, Z., Koskela, E., Mappes, T., Mills, S. C., & Mokkonen, M. (2018). Data from: Maintenance costs of male dominance and sexually antagonistic selection in the wild. Dryad Digital Repository. <http://doi:10.5061/dryad.vt4m939>
- Boratyński, Z., Koskela, E., Mappes, T., & Oksanen, T. A. A. (2010). Sex-specific selection on energy metabolism - selection coefficients for winter survival. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, *23*(9), 1969–1978. doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2010.02059.x

Boratyński, Z., Koskela, E., Mappes, T., & Schroderus, E. (2013). Quantitative genetics and fitness effects of basal metabolism. *Evolutionary Ecology*, 27(2), 301–314. doi:10.1007/s10682-012-9590-2

Boratyński, Z., & Koteja, P. (2009). The association between body mass, metabolic rates and survival of bank voles. *Functional Ecology*, 23(2), 330–339. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2008.01505.x

Boratyński, Z., & Koteja, P. (2010). Sexual and natural selection on body mass and metabolic rates in free-living bank voles. *Functional Ecology*, 24(6), 1252–1261. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2010.01764.x

Bryant, D. M., & Newton, A. V. (1994). Metabolic costs of dominance in dippers, *Cinclus cinclus*. *Animal Behaviour*, 48(2), 447–455. doi:10.1006/anbe.1994.1258

Buchanan, K. L., Evans, M. R., Goldsmith, A. R., Bryant, D. M., & Rowe, L. V. (2001). Testosterone influences basal metabolic rate in male house sparrows: a new cost of dominance signalling? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 268(1474), 1337–1344. doi:10.1098/rspb.2001.1669

Careau, V., Bergeron, P., Garant, D., Réale, D., Speakman, J. R., & Humphries, M. M. (2013). The energetic and survival costs of growth in free-ranging chipmunks. *Oecologia*, 171(1), 11–23. doi:10.1007/s00442-012-2385-x

Fairbairn, D. J., & Reeve, J. P. (2001). Natural selection. Measuring selection in natural populations. In C. W. Fox, D. A. Roff, & D. J. Fairbairn (Eds.), *Evolutionary ecology: concepts and case studies*. (pp. 29–43). NY: Oxford University Press.

Farmer, C. G. (2000). Parental care: the key to understanding endothermy and other convergent features in birds and mammals. *The American Naturalist*, 155(3), 326–334. doi:10.1086/303323

Gadgil, M., & Bossert, W. (1970). Life historical consequences of natural selection. *The American Naturalist*, 104(935), 1–24.

Hayward, A., & Gillooly, J. F. (2011). The cost of sex: quantifying energetic investment in gamete production by males and females. *PLoS ONE*, 6(1), e16557. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0016557

Hill, G. E. (2018). Mitonuclear mate choice: a missing component of sexual selection theory? *BioEssays*, 1700191, 1700191. doi:10.1002/bies.201700191

Hill, G. E., & Johnson, J. D. (2013). The mitonuclear compatibility hypothesis of sexual selection. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 280(1768), 20131314. doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.1314

Kalinowski, S. T., Taper, M. L., & Marshall, T. C. (2007). Revising how the computer program

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

CERVUS accommodates genotyping error increases success in paternity assignment. *Molecular Ecology*, 16(5), 1099–1106. doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2007.03089.x

Keil, P., Schweiger, O., Kühn, I., Kunin, W. E., Kuussaari, M., Settele, J., ... Storch, D. (2012). Patterns of beta diversity in Europe: the role of climate, land cover and distance across scales. *Journal of Biogeography*, 39(8), 1473–1486. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2699.2012.02701.x

Konarzewski, M., & Książek, A. (2012). Determinants of intra-specific variation in basal metabolic rate. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B*, 183(1), 27–41. doi:10.1007/s00360-012-0698-z

Koskela, E., Mappes, T., Niskanen, T., & Rutkowska, J. (2009). Maternal investment in relation to sex ratio and offspring number in a small mammal - a case for Trivers and Willard theory? *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 78(5), 1007–1014. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2009.01574.x

Koteja, P. (2004). The evolution of concepts on the evolution of endothermy in birds and mammals. *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology*, 77(6), 1043–1050. doi.org/10.1086/423741

Labocha, M. K., Sadowska, E. T., Baliga, K., Semer, A. K., & Koteja, P. (2004). Individual variation and repeatability of basal metabolism in the bank vole, *Clethrionomys glareolus*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 271, 367–372. doi:10.1098/rspb.2003.2612

Lande, R., & Arnold, S. J. (1983). The measurement of selection on correlated characters. *Evolution*, 37(6), 1210–1226. www.jstor.org/stable/2408842

Lovegrove, B. G. (2017). A phenology of the evolution of endothermy in birds and mammals. *Biological Reviews*, 1220, 1213–1240. doi:10.1111/brv.12280

Mills, S. C., Grapputo, A., Jokinen, I., Koskela, E., Mappes, T., Oksanen, T. A., & Poikonen, T. (2009). Testosterone-mediated effects on fitness-related phenotypic traits and fitness. *The American Naturalist*, 173(4), 475–487. doi.org/10.1086/597222

Mills, S. C., Grapputo, A., Koskela, E., & Mappes, T. (2007). Quantitative measure of sexual selection with respect to the operational sex ratio: a comparison of selection indices. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 274(1606), 143–50. doi:10.1098/rspb.2006.3639

Mills, S. C., Koskela, E., & Mappes, T. (2012). Intralocus sexual conflict for fitness: sexually antagonistic alleles for testosterone. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 279(1735), 1889–95. doi:10.1098/rspb.2011.2340

Mokkonen, M., Kokko, H., Koskela, E., Lehtonen, J., Mappes, T., Martiskainen, H., & Mills, S. C. (2011). Negative frequency-dependent selection of sexually antagonistic alleles in

Myodes glareolus. *Science*, 334(972), 972–974. doi:10.1126/science.1208708

Mokkonen, M., Koskela, E., Mappes, T., & Mills, S. C. (2012). Sexual antagonism for testosterone maintains multiple mating behaviour. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 81(1), 277–283. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01903.x

Mokkonen, M., Koskela, E., Mappes, T., & Mills, S. C. (2016). Evolutionary conflict between maternal and paternal interests: integration with evolutionary endocrinology. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, 56(2), 146–158. doi:10.1093/icb/icw053

Møller, A. P. (2009). Basal metabolic rate and risk-taking behaviour in birds. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 22(12), 2420–9. doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2009.01850.x

Moore, I. T., & Hopkins, W. A. (2009). Interactions and trade-offs among physiological determinants of performance and reproductive success. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, 49(4), 441–451. doi:10.1093/icb/icp081

Nilsson, J.-A. (2002). Metabolic consequences of hard work. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 269(1501), 1735–1739. doi:10.1098/rspb.2002.2071

Nilsson, J. F., & Nilsson, J.-Å. (2016). Fluctuating selection on basal metabolic rate. *Ecology and Evolution*, 6(4), 1197–1202. doi:10.1002/ece3.1954

Pavitt, A. T., Walling, C. A., Mcneilly, A. S., Pemberton, J. M., & Kruuk, L. E. B. (2014). Variation in early-life testosterone within a wild population of red deer. *Functional Ecology*, 28(5), 1224–1234. doi:10.1111/1365-2435.12260

Pavitt, A. T., Walling, C. A., Pemberton, J. M., & Kruuk, L. E. B. (2014). Heritability and cross-sex genetic correlations of early-life circulating testosterone levels in a wild mammal. *Biology Letters*, 10(11), 1–4. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2014.0685

Petersen, J. L., Mickelson, J. R., Rendahl, A. K., Valberg, S. J., Andersson, L. S., Axelsson, J., ... McCue, M. E. (2013). Genome-wide analysis reveals selection for important traits in domestic horse breeds. *PLoS Genetics*, 9(1), e1003211. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1003211

Peterson, M. P., Rosvall, K. A., Taylor, C. A., Lopez, J. A., Choi, J.-H., Ziegenfus, C., ... Ketterson, E. D. (2014). Potential for sexual conflict assessed via testosterone-mediated transcriptional changes in liver and muscle of a songbird. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 217(4), 507–517. doi:10.1242/jeb.089813

Pettersen, A. K., Marshall, D. J., & White, C. R. (2018). Understanding variation in metabolic rate. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, 221(1), jeb166876. doi:10.1242/jeb.166876

Pettersen, A. K., White, C. R., & Marshall, D. J. (2016). Metabolic rate covaries with fitness and the pace of the life history in the field. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 283(1831). doi:10.1098/rspb.2016.0323

- Polymeropoulos, E. T., Oelkrug, R., White, C. R., & Jastroch, M. (2017). Phylogenetic analysis of the allometry of metabolic rate and mitochondrial basal proton leak. *Journal of Thermal Biology*, 68, 83–88. doi:10.1016/j.jtherbio.2017.01.013
- Qvarnström, A., & Forsgren, E. (1998). Should females prefer dominant males? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 13(12), 498–501. doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(98)01513-4
- Rand, D. M., Clark, A. G., & Kann, L. M. (2001). Sexually antagonistic cytonuclear fitness interactions in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics*, 159(1), 173–87.
- Ricklefs, R. E., & Wikelski, M. (2002). The physiology/life-history nexus. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 17(10), 462–468. doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(02)02578-8
- Rolff, J. (2002). Bateman's principle and immunity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 269(1493), 867–872. doi:10.1098/rspb.2002.1959
- Rønning, B., Broggi, J., Bech, C., Moe, B., Ringsby, T. H., Pärn, H., ... Jensen, H. (2016). Is basal metabolic rate associated with recruit production and survival in free-living house sparrows? *Functional Ecology*, 30(7), 1140–1148. doi:10.1111/1365-2435.12597
- Røskoft, E., Järvi, T., Bakken, M., Bech, C., & Reinertsen, R. (1986). The relationship between social status and resting metabolic rate in great tits (*Parus major*) and pied flycatchers (*Ficedula hypoleuca*). *Animal Behaviour*, 34(3), 838–842. doi:10.1016/S0003-3472(86)80069-0
- Sadowska, E. T., Stawski, C., Rudolf, A., Dheyongera, G., Chrzęścik, K. M., Baliga-Klimczyk, K., & Koteja, P. (2015). Evolution of basal metabolic rate in bank voles from a multidirectional selection experiment. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 282(1806), 20150025–20150025. doi:10.1098/rspb.2015.0025
- Schluter, D. (1988). Estimating the form of natural selection on a quantitative trait, 42(5), 849–861.
- Schroderus, E., Jokinen, I., Koivula, M., Koskela, E., Mappes, T., Mills, S. C., ... Poikonen, T. (2010). Intra- and intersexual trade-offs between testosterone and immune system: Implications for sexual and sexually antagonistic selection. *The American Naturalist*, 176(4), E90-7. doi:10.1086/656264
- Šíchová, K., Koskela, E., Mappes, T., Lantová, P., & Boratyński, Z. (2014). On personality, energy metabolism and mtDNA introgression in bank voles. *Animal Behaviour*, 92, 229–237. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2014.04.011
- Tieleman, B. I., Williams, J. B., & Bloomer, P. (2003). Adaptation of metabolism and evaporative water loss along an aridity gradient. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 270(1511), 207–214. doi:10.1098/rspb.2002.2205
- Tschirren, B., Ziegler, A.-K., Canale, C. I., Okuliarová, M., Zeman, M., & Giraudeau, M. (2016).

High yolk testosterone transfer is associated with an increased female metabolic rate. *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology*, 89(5), 448–452. doi:10.1086/687571

Van Doorn, G. S., & Fe, S. (2009). Intralocus sexual conflict. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1168, 52–71. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04573.x

Vehrencamp, S. L., Bradbury, J. W., & Gibson, R. M. (1989). The energetic cost of display in male sage grouse. *Animal Behaviour*, 38(5), 885–896. doi:10.1016/S0003-3472(89)80120-4

Watson, P. J., Arnqvist, G., & Stallmann, R. R. (1998). Sexual conflict and the energetic costs of mating and mate choice in water striders. *The American Naturalist*, 151(1), 46–58. doi:10.1086/286101

White, C. R., & Kearney, M. R. (2013). Determinants of inter-specific variation in basal metabolic rate. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B: Biochemical, Systemic, and Environmental Physiology*, 183, 1–26. doi:10.1007/s00360-012-0676-5

Wone, B., Sears, M. W., Labocha, M. K., Donovan, E. R., & Hayes, J. P. (2009). Genetic variances and covariances of aerobic metabolic rates in laboratory mice. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, 276, 3695–3704. doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.0980

Tables

Table 1. GLMM models to quantify effects of selection procedure (line: dominant vs. subordinate) and sex on residual BMR values (accounted for variation in age and body mass; see Table S2 for similar results for absolute BMR values). Line by sex interaction was not significant ($z = -1.34$, $p = 0.18$).

| | est. (s.e.) | z | p |
|---------------------------------|--------------|-------|-------|
| BMR | | | |
| Line | -0.04 (0.02) | -2.44 | 0.015 |
| Sex | 0.05 (0.02) | 2.47 | 0.013 |
| BMR _{Males} | | | |
| Line | -0.02 (0.03) | -0.83 | 0.40 |
| BMR _{Females} | | | |
| Line | -0.07 (0.03) | -2.51 | 0.012 |
| BMR _{Dominant line} | | | |
| Sex | 0.07 (0.03) | 2.61 | 0.009 |
| BMR _{Subordinate line} | | | |
| Sex | 0.03 (0.03) | 0.95 | 0.34 |

Variance (SD) for random factors: mother ID = $2e-09$ ($5e-05$), BMR chamber = 0.002 (0.046), for males: mother ID = $2e-09$ ($5e-05$), BMR chamber = 0.003 (0.052), and for females: mother ID = $2e-09$ ($5e-05$), BMR chamber = 0.001 (0.030), for dominant line: mother ID = $2e-09$ ($5e-05$), BMR chamber = 0.002 (0.045), and for subordinate line: mother ID = $3e-09$ ($6e-05$), BMR chamber = 0.002 (0.042).

Table 2. GLMM models for males only to quantify effects of residual BMR (accounted for variation in age and body mass), selection procedure (line: dominant vs. subordinate) and (log transformed) testosterone level (Testo) on behavioural dominance status (dominant vs. subordinate; see Table S3 for similar results for absolute BMR values).

| | est. (s.e.) | z | p |
|-------|--------------|-------|---------|
| Line | -3.94 (0.87) | -4.52 | <0.0001 |
| rBMR | 9.13 (3.62) | 2.53 | 0.012 |
| Testo | -0.43 (0.50) | -0.85 | 0.39 |

Variance (SD) for random factors: mother ID = $2e-06$ ($1Ee-03$), BMR chamber = $5e-07$ ($7e-04$).

Table 3. GLMM model for males to quantify effects of selection procedure (line, dominant/subordinate), behavioural dominance status (dominant/subordinate) and testosterone level (Testo) on residual BMR (accounted for variation in age and body mass; Fig. 2).

| | est. (s.e.) | z | p |
|-------------------------|--------------|-------|--------|
| Line | 0.28 (0.11) | 2.60 | 0.009 |
| Dominance | 0.35 (0.10) | 3.36 | 0.0008 |
| Testo | 0.16 (0.06) | 2.68 | 0.007 |
| Dom ^x Testo | -0.15 (0.06) | -2.63 | 0.009 |
| Line ^x Testo | -0.14 (0.06) | -2.27 | 0.023 |

Variance (SD) for random factors: mother ID = 2e-09 (5e-05), BMR chamber = 0.003 (0.050).

Table 4. GLMM models for males to quantify effects of artificial selection procedure (line: dominant vs. subordinate), frequency of individuals from selection lines (frequency: low vs. high) and (log transformed) body mass (BM), age (on the onset of field experiment) and BMR on males fitness components: number of sired litters and offspring.

| | est. (s.e.) | z | p |
|---|--------------|-------|-------|
| Number of sired litters | | | |
| Line | -0.14 (0.34) | -0.40 | 0.69 |
| Frequency | 1.15 (0.88) | 1.30 | 0.19 |
| sBMR | -0.75 (0.33) | -2.29 | 0.022 |
| sBM | -1.34 (0.79) | -1.70 | 0.090 |
| sBMR ² | -0.54 (0.26) | -2.10 | 0.036 |
| Freq ^x sBM | 1.89 (0.80) | 2.37 | 0.018 |
| Number of sired litters _{Dominant line} | | | |
| sBMR | -0.76 (0.26) | -2.94 | 0.003 |
| Number of sired litters _{Subordinate line} | | | |
| sBMR | 0.11 (0.45) | 0.26 | 0.80 |
| Number sired offspring | | | |
| Line | 0.61 (0.30) | 2.00 | 0.046 |
| Frequency | 0.93 (0.67) | 1.38 | 0.17 |
| sBMR | -0.53 (0.22) | -2.45 | 0.014 |
| sBM | -1.54 (0.61) | -2.55 | 0.011 |
| Line ^x sBMR | 0.92 (0.43) | 2.13 | 0.033 |
| Freq ^x sBM | 1.44 (0.61) | 2.36 | 0.018 |
| Number of sired offspring _{Dominant line} | | | |
| Frequency | 1.18 (0.75) | 1.56 | 0.12 |
| sBMR | -0.65 (0.23) | -2.86 | 0.004 |
| sBM | -2.04 (0.74) | -2.74 | 0.006 |
| Freq ^x sBM | 1.98 (0.74) | 2.69 | 0.007 |
| Number of sired offspring _{Subordinate line} | | | |
| sBMR | 0.65 (0.44) | 1.48 | 0.14 |

Variance (SD) for random factors for number of sired litters: mother ID = 4e-09 (6e-05), enclosure = 3e-08 (2e-04), replicate = 0.05 (0.22), in dominant line: mother ID = 0.10 (0.32), enclosure = 2e-09 (5e-05), replicate = 3e-08 (2e-04), in subordinate line: mother ID = 6e-07 (8e-04), enclosure = 1.41 (1.19), replicate = 1.03 (1.02), for number sired offspring: mother

ID = 2e-09 (5e-05), enclosure = 0.03 (0.17), replicate = 0.12 (0.35), for dominant line: mother ID = 2e-09 (5e-05), enclosure = 0.07 (0.26), replicate = 0.30 (0.55), and for subordinate line: mother ID = 3e-09 (5e-05), enclosure = 3.99 (2.00), replicate = 3.51 (1.87).

Table 5. GLMM models for females to quantify effects of artificial selection procedure (line: dominant vs. subordinate), frequency of individuals from selection lines (frequency: low vs. high) and (log transformed) body mass (BM), age (on the onset of field experiment) and BMR on fitness components: probability of female reproduction and litter size.

| | est. (s.e.) | z | p |
|---|--------------|-------|-------|
| Probability of reproduction | | | |
| Line | -0.15 (0.82) | -0.19 | 0.85 |
| Frequency | 0.74 (0.81) | 0.91 | 0.36 |
| sBMR | 0.14 (0.44) | 0.32 | 0.75 |
| sBM | 0.96 (0.51) | 1.89 | 0.059 |
| sBMR ² | 1.00 (0.40) | 2.49 | 0.013 |
| Probability of reproduction _{Dominant line} | | | |
| sBMR | 0.04 (0.39) | 0.10 | 0.92 |
| Probability of reproduction _{Subordinate line} | | | |
| sBMR | -0.43 (0.64) | -0.67 | 0.50 |
| Litter size | | | |
| Line | 0.01 (0.17) | 0.08 | 0.93 |
| Frequency | 0.09 (0.21) | 0.42 | 0.68 |
| sBMR | -0.19 (0.12) | -1.58 | 0.11 |
| sBM | 0.16 (0.08) | 1.85 | 0.064 |
| Line ^x sBMR | 0.40 (0.16) | 2.43 | 0.015 |
| Litter size _{Dominant line} | | | |
| sBMR | -0.15 (0.11) | -1.30 | 0.19 |
| Litter size _{Subordinate line} | | | |
| sBMR | 0.17 (0.11) | 1.53 | 0.13 |

Variance (SD) for random factors for probability of reproduction: mother ID = 0.95 (0.97), enclosure = 2e-06 (1e-03), replicate = 3e-09 (5e-05), in dominant line: mother ID = 8e-01

(9e-01), enclosure = 1e-06 (1e-03), replicate = 8e-01 (9e-01), in subordinate line: mother ID = 1.91 (1.38), enclosure = 0.83 (0.91), replicate = 4e-08 (2e-04), for litter size: mother ID = 4e-08 (2e-04), enclosure = 5e-08 (2e-04), replicate = 5e-08 (2e-04), in dominant line: mother ID = 7e-07 (8e-04), enclosure = 2e-08 (1e-04), replicate = 9e-09 (9e-05), subordinate line: mother ID = 1e-07 (4e-04), enclosure = 2e-08 (1e-04), replicate = 7e-08 (3e-04).

Figure legend

Figure 1. Differences in residual basal metabolic rate (rBMR) in bank voles: (a) between males and females, (b) between selection lines, (c) between males (black closed circles, solid lines) and females (red open circles, dashed lines) within and between selection lines, and (d) between males of either dominant (red open circles, dashed lines) or subordinate (black closed circles, solid lines) behaviours within their respective selection lines. Residual BMR values were calculated from mixed models accounting for variation in body mass, age, as covariates, and mother and respirometric chamber IDs, as random factors.

Figure 2. The relation between residual basal metabolic rate (rBMR) of male bank voles and testosterone level (log transformed) between (a) behaviourally dominant (red closed circles, solid line) and subordinate (black open circles, dashed line) groups and (b) between dominant (red close circles, solid line) and subordinate (black open circles, dashed line) selection lines. Residual BMR values were calculated from mixed models (accounting for variation in body mass, age, covariates, and mother and respirometric chamber IDs, random factors) after excluding significant interactions between testosterone level and dominance, and line and testosterone (Table 3).

Figure 3. Relative fitness components (individual fitness / population mean fitness; from wild conditions experiment) and its 95% confidence intervals (shadings) for (a) males from the dominant selection line [number of litters sired (red closed circles and shading, solid line), number of sired offspring (black open circles and grey shading, dashed line)] and (b) litter size of females from the dominant selection line (red closed circles and shading, solid line) and from the subordinate line (black open circles and grey shading, dashed line) as explained by variation in basal metabolic rate (BMR). Predicted values for fitness components are derived from generalized mixed models (Table 4 and 5).



