

Elsevier Editorial System(tm) for Animal
Behaviour
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: ANBEH-D-15-01063R1

Title: Post-copulatory sexual selection when a female mates once

Article Type: UK Commentary

Corresponding Author: Dr. Liam Robert Dougherty, Ph.D

Corresponding Author's Institution: University of Western Australia

First Author: Liam Robert Dougherty, Ph.D

Order of Authors: Liam Robert Dougherty, Ph.D; Leigh W Simmons, Ph.D;
David M Shuker, Ph.D

1 **Post-copulatory sexual selection and multiple mating**

2

3 Post-copulatory sexual selection (PCSS) arises via traits that are expressed during and after
4 mating that increase the likelihood of an individual gaining fertilisations, relative to other
5 members of the same sex (Birkhead & Pizzari, 2002; Pitnick & Hosken, 2010). It can be seen
6 as the combination of selection pressures arising from sperm competition and cryptic
7 female choice. Sperm competition is defined as the competition between the sperm of
8 different males to fertilise the ova of a given female (Parker, 1970; Simmons, 2001). Cryptic
9 female choice is the biasing of paternity by females towards some males over others
10 (Eberhard, 1996; Thornhill, 1983).

11

12 In order for inter- or intra-sexual competition to continue after mating there must be a risk
13 that a female will mate more than once before any eggs are fertilised. Therefore, PCSS is
14 commonly said to be a consequence of multiple mating by females (e.g. Birkhead & Pizzari,
15 2002; Pitnick & Hosken, 2010). While this is true, a distinction needs to be made here
16 between multiple mating at the population level and at the individual level. It is the average
17 risk that a female will remate (or the average number of matings she may be expected to
18 have) that leads to PCSS, and this is dependent on the population-level female mating rate
19 (Parker, 1970; Simmons, 2001). At the individual level, some females may remate more than
20 others and at different intervals, so that there will be variation in the mated status of
21 females in the population, and in the number of male ejaculates present in the reproductive
22 tract of a given female at a given time. We note that sperm competition can and does also
23 occur in externally-fertilising species in which competition does not occur inside the female

24 reproductive tract (e.g. Ball & Parker, 1996; Fitzpatrick, Simmons, & Evans, 2012; Smith,
25 Warren, Rouchet, & Reichard, 2014). For the purposes of this discussion we focus on
26 internally fertilizing species. We also note that the focus on multiple matings here is for
27 convenience; again what really matters for PCSS is the number of inseminations the average
28 female receives. This distinction is important as in many species not all matings result in
29 successful insemination (e.g. García-González, 2004; Greenway & Shuker, 2015; Greenway,
30 Dougherty, & Shuker, 2015).

31

32 In this commentary, we address the definition of post-copulatory sexual selection as we
33 believe that there is the potential for misinterpretation of PCSS theory with respect to the
34 relationship between PCSS and multiple mating. We use this contribution to outline
35 explicitly the relationship between PCSS and multiple mating in females as we see it. We
36 show how there can be PCSS acting on males or females in either the presence or absence
37 of simultaneously competing ejaculates. We also consider different ways of measuring PCSS
38 acting on male traits, and discuss how PCSS can be measured using either a single-mating or
39 multiple-mating experimental design. Finally we consider how PCSS could be said to occur in
40 a strictly monandrous species.

41

42 **PCSS does not require that ejaculates compete simultaneously**

43

44 PCSS can be separated into its intrasexual (sperm competition) and intersexual (cryptic
45 female choice) components. For both of these processes, selection may arise with or

46 without the simultaneous overlap of ejaculates from different males in the female
47 reproductive tract. We consider each separately below.

48

49 Sperm competition is a selective pressure that arises when there is the risk that a female
50 will remate (or has already mated previously) with another male prior to the fertilisation of
51 her eggs (Parker, 1970; Simmons, 2001). Though multiple mating by females may frequently
52 lead to the overlap of ejaculates from multiple males in the female reproductive tract
53 (narrow-sense sperm competition), the previous definition highlights the fact that sperm
54 competition may be more rightly considered in a broader sense as the selective pressure
55 acting on a male to reduce the number of fertilisations he loses to other males (Simmons,
56 2001, 2014). This leads to selection on males in different ways. Most directly, when sperm
57 from a rival male is already present in the female, there will be selection on current male
58 traits that increase paternity share, such as sperm number or quality (e.g. Kelly & Jennions,
59 2011; Snook, 2005), when sperm compete. However, the risk of sperm competition also
60 selects for male traits that remove the need for direct competition (Simmons, 2001). These
61 can be separated into defensive traits that prevent future inseminations (such as mating
62 plugs: Baer, Morgan, & Schmid-Hempel, 2001; Uhl, Nessler, & Schneider, 2010), or offensive
63 traits that reduce the likelihood that a previous males' sperm will be successful (such as
64 sperm removal organs: Córdoba-Aguilar, Uhía, & Rivera, 2003; Waage, 1979). In some cases
65 these traits may be so effective as to make any female a male mates with subsequently
66 monogamous (Hosken, Stockley, & Tregenza, 2009; Simmons, 2014). Sperm competition can
67 thus be said to drive the evolution of male traits (via PCSS) even when overlapping
68 ejaculates occur very rarely: if there is variation between males in their ability to effectively

69 impose monandry on females, then those that fail to do so will be at a selective
70 disadvantage. We will return to this point below.

71

72 Cryptic female choice also does not require the strict condition that a female chooses
73 between two simultaneous ejaculates, only that certain male phenotypes are better able to
74 overcome female anatomical and physiological barriers to fertilisation (e.g. Arnqvist, 2014;
75 García-González & Simmons, 2007; Rönn, Katvala, & Arnqvist, 2007). Eberhard (1996) lists
76 more than twenty ways in which females may select the sperm of some males over others,
77 many of which do not require the presence of ejaculates from multiple males inside the
78 female. This is most obvious for those species in which females can actively control whether
79 or not to allow sperm to enter and/or remain in her reproductive tract during or after
80 copulation (Eberhard, 1996; Pizzari & Birkhead, 2000; Tallamy, Powell, & McClafferty, 2002).
81 For example, in Orthoptera, females may exert strong choice by removing the male
82 spermatophore almost immediately following mating, potentially preventing any sperm
83 from entering the reproductive tract (Sakaluk & Eggert, 1996; Simmons, 1987), or by
84 preventing any sperm that does enter the reproductive tract from entering the sperm
85 storage organs (Hall, Bussiere, Demont, Ward, & Brooks, 2010; Tuni, Beveridge, & Simmons,
86 2013). These are all forms of sequential cryptic female choice, which will lead to PCSS on
87 male traits in the same way that simultaneous choice will. An analogy can be made to pre-
88 copulatory mate choice: in the same way that the decision to mate or not is a form of choice
89 (Dougherty & Shuker, 2015; Edward, 2015; Kokko & Mappes, 2005), so too is the decision to
90 allow insemination and sperm storage during or after mating. PCSS will only favour the
91 selective use (or even total rejection) of a male's sperm if females typically have the

92 opportunity to mate with several males, and thus cryptic female choice is expected to occur
93 only when females have the potential to remate.

94

95 In summary, both forms of PCSS arise due to actual or potential multiple mating by females.

96 This does not mean, however, that selection only occurs when there is simultaneous overlap

97 of competing ejaculates. It also doesn't mean that selection only occurs in females that

98 mate more than once. Even in a highly polyandrous species the number of times an

99 individual mates is variable, and some females may be monandrous by chance, perhaps

100 because they die early or do not encounter multiple males (Kokko & Mappes, 2013;

101 Rhainds, 2010). The important point is that post-copulatory selection will act on males,

102 regardless of whether a given female with which he mates remains monandrous or not.

103

104 **Measuring PCSS**

105

106 A consideration of the origin of PCSS is important when we want to measure the strength of

107 selection acting on individuals or on specific phenotypic traits. Most often we are concerned

108 with male post-copulatory reproductive success and PCSS on male phenotypes (PCSS acting

109 on female traits has received less attention: Ah-King, Barron, & Herberstein, 2014; Arnqvist,

110 2014; Eberhard, 1996). How should we go about measuring PCSS? Specifically, should we

111 use a single or multiple-mating experimental design? The answer to this depends both on

112 the specific question we are asking and the type of selection we are interested in.

113

114 Many studies attempt to quantify the strength of PCSS acting on male traits by correlating
115 these traits with a measure of reproductive success. A frequently used method in these
116 studies is a multiple-mating (or competitive fertilisation) experimental design, in which two
117 or more males are mated to the same female. In this context male post-copulatory
118 reproductive success is determined by his paternity share, which can be assessed using
119 genetic or phenotypic markers or sterile male techniques (Simmons, 2001). Thus for species
120 in which females frequently mate multiply, a measurement of paternity share can be used
121 to assess how PCSS is acting on males or male traits.

122

123 However, there are other measures of male post-copulatory success that can be used in
124 non-competitive mating situations. For example, as mentioned above males of many species
125 may sometimes fail to fertilise a female (García-González, 2004; Greenway & Shuker, 2015;
126 Greenway et al., 2015), and so PCSS may arise from the differential insemination or
127 fertilisation success of males (e.g. Dougherty, Rahman, Burdfield-Steel, Greenway, & Shuker,
128 2015; Holwell, Winnick, Tregenza, & Herberstein, 2010; Tadler, 1999). A single-mating
129 design can thus be sufficient to detect PCSS, as there will be selection on any male trait that
130 is correlated with either of these measures of non-competitive fertilization success.

131

132 Additionally, single-mating designs can be used to investigate proximate post-copulatory
133 processes that affect competitive fertilization success, such as factors influencing how many
134 sperm reach the female sperm-storage organ following a mating (e.g. Holwell et al., 2010;
135 Tadler, 1999). Such proximate outcomes may be influenced by purely male effects (such as
136 the size of the ejaculate), female effects (such as the number of sperm transported to
137 storage), or the interaction between males and females (such as the ability of male genitalic

138 structures to stimulate the female during mating). A single-mating experimental design thus
139 allows us to assess post-copulatory processes in the absence of the ejaculate of a previous
140 male (whether or not this is ecologically realistic), as long as the absence of a rival male or
141 ejaculate does not alter the selective process. These processes can equally be investigated
142 using a multiple-mating design in conjunction with a method of identifying sperm from
143 different males (e.g. Hall et al., 2010; Lüpold, Manier, Ala-Honkola, Belote, & Pitnick, 2010;
144 Tuni et al., 2013). Proximate outcomes can then be used to infer how PCSS may act if they
145 can be convincingly shown to influence male paternity, though only studies recording actual
146 fitness outcomes can show this conclusively.

147

148 **PCSS in strictly monandrous species**

149

150 The fact that PCSS is driven by multiple mating suggests that it cannot occur in a species in
151 which females always mate once. This is true for species that are monandrous due to life
152 history or biological constraints (e.g. in mayflies that have such a short adult lifespan that
153 the opportunity for multiple mating is very low). However, in other species monandry may
154 be imposed on females by males (Hosken et al., 2009; Simmons, 2001; Wedell, 2005). For
155 example, males may physically block the female reproductive tract using mating plugs (e.g.
156 Baer et al., 2001; Uhl et al., 2010), manipulate female physiology to reduce female
157 receptivity (e.g. Avila, Sirot, LaFlamme, Rubinstein, & Wolfner, 2011; Chapman, 2001; Craig,
158 1967), or deposit chemicals which make females unattractive to rival males (e.g. Andersson
159 et al., 2000). In some cases such manipulations are able to make females permanently
160 unreceptive following mating (e.g. Craig, 1967; Riemann & Thorson, 1969). In such species,

161 there may be PCSS acting on males if some males are more effective than others at
162 imposing monandry. There will be strong selection against any males that fail to impose
163 monandry on a female due to loss of fitness via sperm competition, and so in this way PCSS
164 will also maintain these traits in the population. The result is a population in which almost
165 all females are monandrous, except for a small minority that mate with males of low
166 effectiveness.

167

168 Additionally, male-induced monandry may be in conflict with the fitness optima of females
169 (Hosken et al., 2009), and may thus lead to selection on females to resist male imposition. In
170 turn, this may drive selection on males to evolve more effective suppressing mechanisms,
171 resulting in a familiar 'arms race' for control of mating (Arnqvist & Rowe, 2005). Again, in
172 such a population the maintenance of monandry (if males 'win' the arms race), or the
173 reversion to polyandry (if females win), will be driven by PCSS.

174

175 Finally, if males are so effective as to make all females monandrous, and there is no
176 variation in the ability of males to impose monandry, then PCSS cannot act any further. In a
177 population such as this, monandry can be seen as an evolved response to strong PCSS in the
178 past (even if extant females do not remate), and so PCSS is currently absent (Simmons,
179 2014). Nonetheless, such a situation is expected to be unstable, because selection on male
180 adaptations that impose monandry will be relaxed when females are monandrous. If these
181 adaptations are costly, selection would then favour the loss of the male adaptations and a
182 return to low levels of polyandry, once again imposing selection on those male traits. Thus,
183 episodes of PCSS may maintain monandry in otherwise strictly monandrous species, and so
184 may never be truly absent. One way to measure the strength of PCSS acting on males in

185 such a monandrous population would be to experimentally increase the mating rate of
186 females, and then observe the fitness cost to males that this generates. In most cases a
187 suitable manipulation (one that induces a female to become fully receptive without other
188 side-effects) may be difficult to develop, though we suggest it may be possible in some
189 cases (e.g. experimental removal of anti-aphrodisiac pheromones following mating).
190 Nevertheless, doing this should show strong PCSS on those male traits that act to impose
191 monandry (such as mating plugs), but no PCSS on male traits that increase fertilisation
192 success relative to other males (such as sperm removal organs). In such a monandrous
193 species, any selection acting on a male trait that increases female fecundity is best
194 considered a form of natural selection, as there is no post-copulatory competition between
195 males (Shuker, 2014).

196

197 **Conclusion**

198

199 In this contribution, we have outlined the relationship between female multiple mating and
200 post-copulatory sexual selection. We emphasise that PCSS arises due to the average risk
201 that a female in a population will remate, and that selection may occur in the absence of
202 simultaneously competing ejaculates. Depending on the questions being asked and the
203 processes being considered, PCSS can be measured using either single or multiple mating
204 experiments. Finally, PCSS may lead to the evolution and maintenance of male-imposed
205 monandry, and in such cases can be said to be acting to *prevent* females from mating more
206 than once.

207

208 **References**

209

210 Ah-King, M., Barron, A. B., & Herberstein, M. E. (2014). Genital evolution: why are females
211 still understudied? *Plos Biology*, *12*(5), e1001851.

212 Andersson, J., Borg-Karlson, A.-K., & Wiklund, C. (2000). Sexual cooperation and conflict in
213 butterflies: a male–transferred anti–aphrodisiac reduces harassment of recently mated
214 females. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*,
215 *267*(1450), 1271–1275.

216 Arnqvist, G. (2014). Cryptic female choice. In D. M. Shuker & L. W. Simmons (Eds.), *The*
217 *evolution of insect mating systems* (pp. 204– 220). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University
218 Press.

219 Arnqvist, G., & Rowe, L. (2005). *Sexual conflict*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

220 Avila, F. W., Sirot, L. K., LaFlamme, B. A., Rubinstein, C. D., & Wolfner, M. F. (2011). Insect
221 seminal fluid proteins: identification and function. *Annual Review of Entomology*, *56*,
222 21–40.

223 Baer, B., Morgan, E. D., & Schmid-Hempel, P. (2001). A nonspecific fatty acid within the
224 bumblebee mating plug prevents females from remating. *Proceedings of the National*
225 *Academy of Sciences*, *98*(7), 3926–3928.

226 Ball, M., & Parker, G. (1996). Sperm competition games: External fertilization and
227 “adaptive” infertility. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, *180*(2), 141–150.

228 Birkhead, T. R., & Pizzari, T. (2002). Postcopulatory sexual selection. *Nature Reviews*
229 *Genetics*, *3*(4), 262–273.

230 Chapman, T. (2001). Seminal fluid-mediated fitness traits in *Drosophila*. *Heredity*, *87*(5),
231 511–521.

232 Córdoba-Aguilar, A., Uhía, E., & Rivera, A. C. (2003). Sperm competition in Odonata
233 (Insecta): the evolution of female sperm storage and rivals' sperm displacement.
234 *Journal of Zoology*, 261(04), 381–398.

235 Craig, G. B. (1967). Mosquitoes: female monogamy induced by male accessory gland
236 substance. *Science*, 156(3781), 1499–1501.

237 Dougherty, L. R., Rahman, I. A., Burdfield-Steel, E. ., Greenway, E. V., & Shuker, D. M. (2015).
238 Experimental reduction of intromittent organ length reduces male reproductive
239 success in a bug. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 282, 20150724.

240 Dougherty, L. R., & Shuker, D. M. (2015). The effect of experimental design on the
241 measurement of mate choice: a meta-analysis. *Behavioral Ecology*, 26, 311–319.

242 Eberhard, W. (1996). *Female control: sexual selection by cryptic female choice*. Princeton,
243 N.J.: Princeton University Press.

244 Edward, D. A. (2015). The description of mate choice. *Behavioral Ecology*, 26(2), 301–310.

245 Fitzpatrick, J. L., Simmons, L. W., & Evans, J. P. (2012). Complex patterns of multivariate
246 selection on the ejaculate of a broadcast spawning marine invertebrate. *Evolution*,
247 66(8), 2451–2460.

248 García-González, F. (2004). Infertile matings and sperm competition: the effect of
249 “nonsperm representation” on intraspecific variation in sperm precedence patterns.
250 *The American Naturalist*, 164(4), 457–472.

251 García-González, F., & Simmons, L. W. (2007). Shorter sperm confer higher competitive
252 fertilization success. *Evolution*, 61(4), 816–824.

253 Greenway, E. G., Dougherty, L. R., & Shuker, D. M. (2015). Mating failure. *Current Biology*,
254 25(13), R534–R536.

255 Greenway, E. G., & Shuker, D. M. (2015). The repeatability of mating failure in a polyandrous
256 bug. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, *28*, 1578–1582.

257 Hall, M. D., Bussiere, L. F., Demont, M., Ward, P. I., & Brooks, R. C. (2010). Competitive PCR
258 reveals the complexity of postcopulatory sexual selection in *Teleogryllus commodus*.
259 *Molecular Ecology*, *19*(3), 610–619.

260 Holwell, G. I., Winnick, C., Tregenza, T., & Herberstein, M. E. (2010). Genital shape correlates
261 with sperm transfer success in the praying mantis *Ciulfina klassi* (Insecta: Mantodea).
262 *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, *64*(4), 617–625.

263 Hosken, D., Stockley, P., Tregenza, T., & Wedell, N. (2009). Monogamy and the battle of the
264 sexes. *Annual Review of Entomology*, *54*, 361–378.

265 Kelly, C. D., & Jennions, M. D. (2011). Sexual selection and sperm quantity: meta-analyses of
266 strategic ejaculation. *Biological Reviews*, *86*(4), 863–884.

267 Kokko, H., & Mappes, J. (2005). Sexual selection when fertilization is not guaranteed.
268 *Evolution*, *59*(9), 1876–1885.

269 Kokko, H., & Mappes, J. (2013). Multiple mating by females is a natural outcome of a null
270 model of mate encounters. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*, *146*(1), 26–37.

271 Lüpold, S., Manier, M. K., Ala-Honkola, O., Belote, J. M., & Pitnick, S. (2010). Male *Drosophila*
272 *melanogaster* adjust ejaculate size based on female mating status, fecundity, and age.
273 *Behavioral Ecology*, *22*, 184–191.

274 Parker, G. A. (1970). Sperm competition and its evolutionary consequences in the insects.
275 *Biological Reviews*, *45*(4), 525–567.

276 Pitnick, S., & Hosken, D. J. (2010). Postcopulatory sexual selection. In D. Westneat & C. Fox
277 (Eds.), *Evolutionary Behavioral Ecology* (pp. 379–399). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University
278 Press.

279 Pizzari, T., & Birkhead, T. (2000). Female feral fowl eject sperm of subdominant males.
280 *Nature*, 405(6788), 787–789.

281 Rhainds, M. (2010). Female mating failures in insects. *Entomologia Experimentalis et*
282 *Applicata*, 136(3), 211–226.

283 Riemann, J. G., & Thorson, B. J. (1969). Effect of male accessory material on oviposition and
284 mating by female house flies. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, 62(4),
285 828–834.

286 Rönn, J., Katvala, M., & Arnqvist, G. (2007). Coevolution between harmful male genitalia and
287 female resistance in seed beetles. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
288 104(26), 10921–10925.

289 Sakaluk, S. K., & Eggert, A.-K. (1996). Female control of sperm transfer and intraspecific
290 variation in sperm precedence: antecedents to the evolution of a courtship food gift.
291 *Evolution*, 50, 694–703.

292 Shuker, D. M. (2014). Sexual selection theory. In D. M. Shuker & L. W. Simmons (Eds.), *The*
293 *evolution of insect mating systems* (pp. 20–41). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

294 Simmons, L. (1987). Sperm competition as a mechanism of female choice in the field cricket,
295 *Gryllus bimaculatus*. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 21(3), 197–202.

296 Simmons, L. W. (2001). *Sperm competition and its evolutionary consequences in the insects*.
297 Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

298 Simmons, L. W. (2014). Sperm competition. In D. M. Shuker & L. W. Simmons (Eds.), *The*
299 *evolution of insect mating systems* (pp. 181–203). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

300 Smith, C., Warren, M., Rouchet, R., & Reichard, M. (2014). The function of multiple
301 ejaculations in bitterling. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 27(9), 1819–1829.

302 Snook, R. R. (2005). Sperm in competition: not playing by the numbers. *Trends in Ecology &*
303 *Evolution*, 20(1), 46–53.

304 Tadler, A. (1999). Selection of a conspicuous male genitalic trait in the seedbug *Lygaeus*
305 *simulans*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 266(1430), 1773–
306 1777.

307 Tallamy, D. W., Powell, B. E., & McClafferty, J. A. (2002). Male traits under cryptic female
308 choice in the spotted cucumber beetle (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae). *Behavioral*
309 *Ecology*, 13(4), 511–518.

310 Thornhill, R. (1983). Cryptic female choice and its implications in the scorpionfly
311 *Harpobittacus nigriceps*. *American Naturalist*, 122, 765–788.

312 Tuni, C., Beveridge, M., & Simmons, L. (2013). Female crickets assess relatedness during
313 mate guarding and bias storage of sperm towards unrelated males. *Journal of*
314 *Evolutionary Biology*, 26(6), 1261–1268.

315 Uhl, G., Nessler, S. H., & Schneider, J. M. (2010). Securing paternity in spiders? A review on
316 occurrence and effects of mating plugs and male genital mutilation. *Genetica*, 138(1),
317 75–104.

318 Waage, J. K. (1979). Dual function of the damselfly penis: sperm removal and transfer.
319 *Science*, 203(4383), 916–918.

320 Wedell, N. (2005). Female receptivity in butterflies and moths. *Journal of Experimental*
321 *Biology*, 208(18), 3433–3440.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank David Hosken for helpful discussion, and the Natural Environment Research Council (UK) and the Australian Research Council for funding.