

# Pure

Scotland's Rural College

## Limits to sustained energy intake. XXII. Reproductive performance of two selected mouse lines with different thermal conductance

Al Jothery, AH; Krol, E; Hawkins, J; Chetoui, A; Saint-Lambert, A; Gamo, Y; Shaw, SC; Valencak, T; Bunger, L; Hill, WG; Vaanholt, LM; Hambly, C; Speakman, JR

*Published in:*

Journal of Experimental Biology

*DOI:*

[10.1242/jeb.103705](https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.103705)

Print publication: 01/01/2014

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Al Jothery, AH., Krol, E., Hawkins, J., Chetoui, A., Saint-Lambert, A., Gamo, Y., ... Speakman, JR. (2014). Limits to sustained energy intake. XXII. Reproductive performance of two selected mouse lines with different thermal conductance. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 217, 3718 - 3732. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.103705>

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## Limits to sustained energy intake. XXII. Reproductive performance of two selected mouse lines with different thermal conductance

Aqeel H. Al Jothery<sup>1,2,†</sup>, Elżbieta Król<sup>1,†</sup>, James Hawkins<sup>1</sup>, Aurore Chetoui<sup>1</sup>, Alexander Saint-Lambert<sup>1</sup>, Yuko Gamo<sup>1</sup>, Suzanne C. Shaw<sup>1</sup>, Teresa Valencak<sup>1,3,4</sup>, Lutz Bünger<sup>5</sup>, William G. Hill<sup>6</sup>, Lobke M. Vaanholt<sup>1</sup>, Catherine Hambly<sup>1</sup> and John R. Speakman<sup>1,3,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen AB24 2TZ, UK, <sup>2</sup>Department of Physiology, College of Medicine, University of Karbala, Karbala, Iraq, <sup>3</sup>Institute of Genetics and Developmental Biology, State Key Laboratory of Molecular Developmental Biology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Bei Chen Xi Lu, Chaoyang, Beijing, People's Republic of China, <sup>4</sup>Research Institute of Wildlife Ecology, University of Veterinary Medicine, A-1160 Vienna, Austria, <sup>5</sup>Animal and Veterinary Science Group, Scotland's Rural College (SRUC), Edinburgh EH9 3JG, UK, <sup>6</sup>Institute of Evolutionary Biology, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JT, UK

\* Author for correspondence ([j.speakman@abdn.ac.uk](mailto:j.speakman@abdn.ac.uk))

† Authors with equal contribution

Running title: Reproductive performance and thermal conductance

**1 ABSTRACT**

2 Maximal sustained energy intake (SusEI) appears limited, but the factors imposing the limit  
3 are disputed. We studied reproductive performance in two lines of mice selected for high and  
4 low food intake (MH and ML, respectively), and known to have large differences in thermal  
5 conductance (29% higher in the MH line at 21 °C). When these mice raised their natural  
6 litters, their metabolisable energy intake significantly increased over the first 13 days of  
7 lactation and then reached a plateau. At peak lactation, MH mice assimilated on average 45.3 %  
8 more energy than ML mice ( $222.9 \pm 7.1$  and  $153.4 \pm 12.5$  kJ day<sup>-1</sup>,  $N=49$  and  $24$ , respectively).  
9 Moreover, MH mice exported on average 62.3 kJ day<sup>-1</sup> more energy as milk than ML mice  
10 ( $118.9 \pm 5.3$  and  $56.6 \pm 5.4$  kJ day<sup>-1</sup>,  $N$ =subset of  $32$  and  $21$ , respectively). The elevated milk  
11 production of MH mice enabled them to wean litters ( $65.2 \pm 2.1$  g) that were on average 50.2%  
12 heavier than litters produced by ML mothers ( $43.4 \pm 3.0$  g), and pups that were on average  
13 27.2% heavier ( $9.9 \pm 0.2$  and  $7.8 \pm 0.2$  g, respectively). Lactating mice in both lines had  
14 significantly longer and heavier guts compared to non-reproductive mice. However,  
15 inconsistent with the central limit hypothesis, the ML mice had significantly longer and  
16 heavier intestines than MH mice. An experiment where the mice raised litters of the opposing  
17 line demonstrated that lactation performance was not limited by offspring growth capacity.  
18 Our findings are consistent with the idea that the SusEI at peak lactation is constrained by the  
19 capacity of the mothers to dissipate body heat.

20  
21 **KEY WORDS: Artificial selection, Cross-fostering, Daily energy expenditure, Heat**  
22 **dissipation limit, Milk production, Lactation**

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Factors limiting maximal rates of sustained energy intake (SusEI) and sustained energy  
3 expenditure (SusMR) have been of interest for at least 30 years, since the suggestion that both  
4 are constrained at some multiple of basal metabolism (Drent and Daan, 1980; Kirkwood,  
5 1983). Four different ideas have emerged to explain why intake and expenditure might be  
6 limited (reviewed in Speakman and Król, 2005a; Piersma and van Gils, 2010; Speakman and  
7 Król, 2011). The central limitation hypothesis (Weiner, 1989; Weiner, 1992; Peterson et al.,  
8 1990; Sadowska et al. 2013) suggests that limits are imposed by the uptake capacity of the  
9 alimentary tract. The peripheral limitation hypothesis (Hammond et al., 1996) posits the limit  
10 resides in the capacities of the tissues where the energy is expended. The heat dissipation  
11 limit (HDL) theory (Speakman and Król, 2010) suggests that intake is constrained by the  
12 capacity to dissipate the heat generated as a by-product of food utilisation and milk  
13 production. Finally, a trade-off idea suggests that working beyond a certain limit generates  
14 negative physiological consequences that impact survival (Drent and Daan, 1980; Daan et al.,  
15 1996; Piersma, 2011; Piersma and van der Velde, 2012). The HDL theory could be  
16 considered a special case of this latter idea, since the implication is that processing food and  
17 elevating metabolic rate beyond the heat dissipation capacity, leads to hyperthermia, with  
18 direct or indirect negative consequences for survival.

19 Among the most popular models for exploring the question of where the limit resides  
20 is lactation (Hammond and Diamond, 1992; Speakman and McQueenie, 1996). During  
21 lactation food intake increases enormously (Johnson et al., 2001a) and conspicuously reaches  
22 a plateau in late lactation that is resistant to attempts to breach it by imposing additional  
23 workloads on the female, by manipulating litter size or pup demands (Hammond and  
24 Diamond, 1992; Johnson et al., 2001a; Laurien-Kehnen and Trillmich, 2003; Duah et al.,  
25 2013), making females simultaneously pregnant (Johnson et al., 2001c), or forcing them to  
26 run to obtain their food (Perrigo, 1987; Zhao et al., 2013a). Yet, when lactating animals are  
27 placed into the cold, they are able to eat significantly more than at room temperature  
28 (Hammond et al., 1994; Hammond and Kristan, 2000; Johnson and Speakman, 2001;  
29 Rogowitz, 1998; Zhang and Wang, 2007), and conversely when kept in hot conditions their  
30 maximal intake declines (Król and Speakman, 2003a; Wu et al., 2009; Yang et al., 2013).  
31 This effect could be explained either by the HDL theory, the summed peripheral demands  
32 idea, or temperature dependent variations in pup energy demands. In MF1 mice, observations  
33 of milk production and pup growth at the different temperatures (enhanced in the cold and  
34 reduced in the heat: Johnson and Speakman, 2001; Król and Speakman, 2003b) strongly

1 supported only the HDL idea. Yet in other studies cold exposure did not have impacts on pup  
2 growth (Zhang and Wang, 2007; Zhao and Cao, 2009; Zhao et al., 2010; Zhao et al., 2013b;  
3 Yang et al., 2013) supporting the other two ideas.

4 Attempts to separate between the ideas that the intake is limited by the heat  
5 dissipation capacity of the mother, the peripheral capacities of the mammary glands, or the  
6 demand of the pups, have produced a confusion of results. Shaving MF1 mice to increase  
7 their heat dissipation capacity showed that the females ate more food, produced more milk  
8 and weaned larger pups (Krdl et al., 2007) – consistent only with the HDL idea. However,  
9 shaving Swiss mice resulted in significantly elevated food intake, but the inferred milk  
10 production and pup growth changes, while in the predicted direction, were not statistically  
11 significant (Zhao and Cao, 2009; Zhao et al., 2010). In a later study, the pup growth capacity  
12 interpretation was rejected, by raising small litters in the cold, and showing they could grow  
13 faster than larger litters (Zhao et al., 2013b) thereby implicating the milk production capacity,  
14 as the factor limiting sustained intake in Swiss mice. Conversely, shaving lactating field voles  
15 increased offspring growth, but milk production was again in the expected direction but not  
16 significantly different (Simons et al., 2011).

17 A novel approach was used to address the issue in brown hares, by keeping mother  
18 and pups at different temperatures (Valencak et al., 2010). The results suggested that in the  
19 early phase of lactation pup demand might drive intake, but that later in lactation it was less  
20 clear what factors imposed the limit (Valencak et al., 2009). This approach was later  
21 expanded to mice (Valencak et al., 2013). However, again the results were not clear cut,  
22 because while the mothers with access to the cold elevated their intake and milk production  
23 (consistent with the HDL theory), their pups did not grow more, potentially pointing to  
24 increased pup demand driving the intake and milk production effects.

25 Overall, the current data are extremely confusing and suggest different species and  
26 strains operate under different constraints. Moreover, multiple constraints may apply in the  
27 same individuals under different conditions, for example, at different ambient temperatures  
28 (Yang et al., 2013) or at different litter sizes (Wu et al., 2009). More experimental data across  
29 a range of different animal models are needed to enhance our understanding of the factors  
30 that are of potential importance in limiting SusEI. In the current paper, we proposed a direct  
31 test of the HDL theory using two related mouse lines (MH and ML). The lines had been  
32 divergently selected on their maintenance requirements (Hastings et al., 1997; B ünger et al.,  
33 1998). We have previously shown that a correlated trait for such selection has been thermal  
34 conductance, whereby MH mice have higher thermal conductance than the ML mice by 23 to

1 55% depending on the ambient temperature (29% at 21 °C) (Selman et al., 2001b). We  
2 predicted *a priori* from the HDL theory that if heat dissipation constrains both food intake at  
3 peak lactation and peak lactation performance, the MH line with greater capacity to dissipate  
4 heat, would have greater peak lactation energy intake, greater milk production and elevated  
5 pup growth. Moreover, these traits would be conserved if the mothers were given pups of the  
6 opposing line to raise, reflecting heat dissipation capacity of the mother, rather than growth  
7 capacity of the offspring.

8

## 9 RESULTS

### 10 Experiment with natural litters

#### 11 *Maternal body mass*

12 Body mass during baseline was  $25.7 \pm 0.4$  g ( $N=33$ ) in MH and  $25.2 \pm 0.5$  g ( $N=16$ ) in ML mice  
13 (ANOVA, line,  $F_{1,47}=0.5$ ,  $P=0.5$ ). Female body mass increased significantly over the last 10  
14 days of pregnancy. Although there was no significant line effect on pregnant body mass, the  
15 interaction between day and line was highly significant (ANOVA, line,  $F_{1,51}=2.4$ ,  $P=0.13$ ;  
16 day,  $F_{9,459}=555.5$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; interaction line  $\times$  day,  $F_{9,459}=25.5$ ,  $P<0.001$ ). Maternal body  
17 mass of MH mice increased significantly more than that of the ML mice in the last few days  
18 of pregnancy (Fig.1A). Maternal body mass did not differ between lines across days of  
19 lactation, but the interaction between line and day was significant (ANOVA, line,  $F_{1,71}=2.6$ ,  
20  $P=0.11$ ; day,  $F_{12,852}=2.7$ ,  $P=0.002$ ; interaction line  $\times$  day,  $F_{12,852}=2.6$ ,  $P=0.002$ ; Table 1).  
21 Body mass of ML mice remained unchanged throughout lactation but body mass of MH mice  
22 exhibited a significant drop over the last 3 days (15 to 18). The average reduction in body  
23 mass was  $0.8 \pm 0.3$  g (Fig. 1A).

24

#### 25 *MEI and ADE*

26 On day 12-14 of lactation, MH mice produced on average  $2.3 \pm 0.1$  g ( $N=32$ ) dry mass of  
27 faeces daily compared to  $1.6 \pm 0.1$  g ( $N=21$ ) dry mass in ML mice. Faecal production was  
28 highly correlated with food intake ( $r=0.78$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) and this relationship did not differ  
29 significantly between the lines (line,  $F_{1,50}=1.8$ ,  $P=0.18$ ; food intake,  $F_{1,50}=20.2$ ,  $P<0.001$ , Fig.  
30 1B). Despite this, there was a significant difference in the ADE between lines (MH mice  
31  $83.1 \pm 0.3\%$ , ML mice  $80.7 \pm 0.9\%$ :  $t_{51}=2.7$ ,  $P=0.01$ ). We applied these estimates of ADE from  
32 the feeding trial to convert estimated food intake into MEI during baseline and throughout  
33 reproduction (see Methods for more details).

MEI during baseline was  $51.1 \pm 1.8 \text{ kJ day}^{-1}$  ( $N=33$ ) and  $37.1 \pm 2.4 \text{ kJ day}^{-1}$  ( $N=16$ ) in the MH and ML mice, respectively (ANOVA, line,  $F_{1,47}=35.7$ ,  $P<0.001$ , Fig. 1C). During pregnancy, MEI increased significantly over the last 5 days of pregnancy, when line and day of pregnancy both had significant effects (ANOVA, line,  $F_{1,51}=28.9$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; day,  $F_{4,204}=3.2$ ,  $P=0.015$ ; interaction line  $\times$  day,  $F_{4,204}=1.1$ ,  $P=0.36$ ). During lactation, MH mice had higher MEI than ML mice, and MEI also varied significantly with day of lactation (ANOVA, line,  $F_{1,71}=26.7$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; day,  $F_{12,852}=36.7$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; interaction line  $\times$  day,  $F_{12,852}=2.6$ ,  $P=0.003$ ). A significant line  $\times$  day interaction indicated that MH and ML mice responded differently over time during lactation. In both lines, MEI increased over the first 13 days and reached a plateau at day 13. MEI of ML mice remained at this plateau until day 18. However, MH mice remained at this asymptotic level for only 3 days before MEI dropped significantly: coincident with the period over which the same mice were losing mass (see above). The average fall in MEI over days 15-18 of lactation was 58.3 kJ. This reduction in MEI was correlated with the reduction of body mass over the same period ( $r=0.55$ ,  $P<0.001$ , Fig. 1D). Mice that reduced their intake more over the last 3 days of lactation also lost more weight over the same interval.

At peak lactation (days 13-15), MH mice had a higher MEI of  $222.9 \pm 7.1 \text{ kJ day}^{-1}$  ( $N=49$ ) compared to  $153.4 \pm 12.5 \text{ kJ day}^{-1}$  ( $N=24$ ) in ML mice. Asymptotic MEI (days 13-15) was positively correlated with body mass at peak lactation ( $r=0.58$ ,  $P<0.001$ ), litter size ( $r=0.68$ ,  $P<0.001$ ), and litter mass ( $r=0.73$ ,  $P<0.001$ , Fig. 2). Using GLM with mean body mass at peak lactation, litter size, and pup mass at weaning (day 18) as covariates indicated that effect of line on MEI remained significant when these additional factors were added to the model.

#### *Daily energy expenditure (DEE)*

DEE of MH and ML mice (Table 3) averaged  $90.7 \pm 2.3 \text{ kJ day}^{-1}$  ( $N=32$ ) and  $71.5 \pm 1.9 \text{ kJ day}^{-1}$  ( $N=21$ ), respectively ( $t_{51}=5.9$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; Table 1). DEE was highly correlated with MEI ( $r=0.78$ ,  $P<0.001$ ). The relationship between DEE and MEI was independent of the line (GLM, line,  $F_{1,50}=0.3$ ,  $P=0.57$ ; MEI,  $F_{1,50}=27.4$ ,  $P<0.001$ , Fig. 3).

#### *MEO and reproductive performance*

Over days 12-14 of lactation, MH mice had significantly higher MEI than the ML mice. The average MEI in the subset of MH mice for which DEE had been measured was  $209.6 \pm 6.3 \text{ kJ day}^{-1}$  ( $N=32$ ) compared to the average of  $128.1 \pm 6.3 \text{ kJ day}^{-1}$  ( $N=21$ ) in the ML mice (line

1 effect,  $t_{51}=8.7$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; Table 1). MH mice also had significantly higher MEO compared to  
 2 the ML mice ( $t_{51}=7.92$ ,  $P<0.001$ ), averaging  $118.9\pm 5.3$  and  $56.6\pm 5.4$  kJ day<sup>-1</sup> in the MH and  
 3 ML mice, respectively (Table 1). MEO was highly correlated with body mass at peak  
 4 lactation ( $r=0.48$ ,  $P<0.001$ ), litter size ( $r=0.59$ ,  $P<0.001$ ), litter mass ( $r=0.79$ ,  $P<0.001$ ), and  
 5 pup mass ( $r=0.59$ ,  $P<0.001$ , Fig. 4). Using GLM with mean body mass at peak lactation,  
 6 litter size, litter mass, and pup mass at weaning as covariates indicated that effect of line on  
 7 MEO remained significant when these additional factors were added to the model.

8 Litter size did not differ significantly between lines at birth and at weaning (at birth,  
 9  $t_{71}=1.5$ ,  $P=0.136$ ; at weaning,  $t_{71}=1.9$ ,  $P=0.067$ ). At birth, the average litter size was  $7.0\pm 0.3$   
 10 ( $N=49$ ) and  $6.1\pm 0.6$  ( $N=24$ ) in the MH and ML mice, respectively. At weaning, the litter size  
 11 of MH mice ( $6.7\pm 0.3$ ,  $N=49$ ) was also not significantly different compared to  $5.7\pm 0.6$  ( $N=24$ )  
 12 in ML mice (Table 1). Litter mass in both MH and ML mice increased significantly  
 13 throughout lactation (ANOVA, line,  $F_{1,71}=32.2$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; day,  $F_{12,852}=962.7$ ,  $P<0.001$ ;  
 14 interaction line  $\times$  day,  $F_{12,852}=28.5$ ,  $P<0.001$ , Fig. 5A). At weaning, the litter mass of MH  
 15 mice ( $65.2\pm 2.1$  g,  $N=49$ ) was significantly ( $P<0.001$ ) heavier than the litter mass of ML mice  
 16 ( $43.4\pm 3.0$  g,  $N=24$ ; Table 1). Because litter sizes were not significantly different between the  
 17 lines, pup mass in both lines also increased significantly throughout lactation (ANOVA, line,  
 18  $F_{1,71}=78.2$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; day,  $F_{12,851}=1818.1$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; interaction line  $\times$  day,  $F_{12,851}=19.1$ ,  
 19  $P<0.001$ , Fig. 5B) with the pups from the MH line being significantly ( $P<0.001$ ) heavier than  
 20 those of the ML line. The pup mass at weaning for the MH mice was  $9.9\pm 0.2$  g compared to  
 21  $7.8\pm 0.2$  g in ML mice (Table 1). The growth rate was higher over the first days of lactation  
 22 compared later. The average litter growth rate on day 7 was  $4.3\pm 0.2$  g and  $2.7\pm 0.2$  g  
 23 compared to  $1.1\pm 0.1$  g and  $0.7\pm 0.2$  g on day 18 in MH and ML mice, respectively, Fig. 5C).  
 24 Pup mass at weaning was negatively correlated with litter size ( $r=0.28$ ,  $P=0.01$ ), but  
 25 including litter size into the model did not change the significant difference in pup mass  
 26 between lines (GLM, line,  $F_{1,70}=104.7$ ,  $P<0.001$ , litter size,  $F_{1,58}=36.4$ ,  $P<0.001$ , Fig. 6B).

27

### 28 *Organ morphology*

29 The average wet masses of several internal organs in lactating and non-reproductive mice are  
 30 presented in Table 4. Using GLM with reproductive status and line as fixed factors showed  
 31 that mean maternal body mass of lactating mice on the day of dissection was significantly  
 32 different compared to the non-reproductive mice, and the interaction line  $\times$  reproductive  
 33 status was also significant (GLM, line,  $F_{1,53}=0.5$ ,  $P=0.83$ ; reproductive status,  $F_{1,53}=6.2$ ,  
 34  $P=0.01$ ; interaction line  $\times$  reproductive status,  $F_{1,53}=4.6$ ,  $P=0.03$ ). Differences between the



1 lines may then only be a reflection of the overall size differences. Analyses of the data for  
 2 organ morphology in lactating and non-reproductive lactating mice with body mass as  
 3 covariate are therefore also presented in Table 4.

4 Reproductive status and line had significant effects on the length of small intestine,  
 5 caecum, and whole gut. Lactating mice had significantly longer intestines than non-  
 6 reproductive individuals and the ML line had longer intestines than the MH line. Lactating  
 7 mice had significantly heavier full and empty guts than non-reproductive individuals and the  
 8 ML line had heavier full and empty guts than the MH line. In addition to a significant line  
 9 effect, among the lactating mice there was a significant positive relationship between the MEI  
 10 on day 18 and the mass of the full gut (GLM,  $F_{1,33}=25.5$ ,  $P<0.001$ ), mass of the empty gut  
 11 (GLM,  $F_{1,33}=25.5$ ,  $P<0.001$ , Fig. 7A) and length of the small intestine (GLM,  $F_{1,33}=25.5$ ,  
 12  $P<0.001$ , Fig. 7B). For the mass of the empty gut, the effect of the interaction between body  
 13 mass with line was significant, but the interactions with line were not significant for the full  
 14 gut and the length of the small intestine. There were no significant relationships between MEI  
 15 on day 18 and the lengths of the large intestine and caecum ( $P>0.05$  in both cases). There  
 16 were no significant differences in mean wet mass of BAT or mammary glands between lines.  
 17 Mean wet masses of mammary glands were positively but weakly correlated with MEI  
 18 ( $r=0.36$ ,  $P=0.03$ ), DEE ( $r=0.34$ ,  $P=0.037$ ) and MEO ( $r=0.32$ ,  $P=0.05$ ). The relationship  
 19 between mass of the mammary gland and MEI, DEE, and MEO was not different between  
 20 the two lines (Fig. 8).

21

## 22 **Experiment with cross-fostered litters**

### 23 *Maternal body mass*

24 Mean body mass changed significantly across the days of pregnancy and differed between the  
 25 two lines (ANOVA, line,  $F_{1,14}=25.3$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; day,  $F_{13,182}=429.4$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; interaction line  $\times$   
 26 day,  $F_{13,182}=36.5$ ,  $P<0.001$ ). During lactation, the body mass of H-L mice (MH mothers with  
 27 cross-fostered ML pups) was higher than that of L-H mice (ML mothers with cross-fostered  
 28 MH pups) (ANOVA, line,  $F_{1,19}=10.6$ ,  $P=0.004$ ; day,  $F_{11,209}=12.8$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; interaction line  $\times$   
 29 day,  $F_{11,209}=6.6$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; H-L ( $N=10$ ) and L-H ( $N=11$ ); Table 2). The day  $\times$  line interaction  
 30 was significant, indicating that the body mass changed differently during lactation in the two  
 31 lines. Similar to the MH mice raising MH pups, the body mass of H-L mice fell over the last  
 32 3 days of lactation by on average  $2.9 \pm 0.6$  g (Fig. 9A).

33

### 34 *MEI and ADE*

1 Faecal production of lactating mice monitored over days 13-15 was significantly correlated  
 2 with food intake ( $r=0.49$ ,  $P=0.05$ ). There was no significant line effect when food intake was  
 3 included as a covariate (GLM, line,  $F_{1,12}=0.7$ ,  $P=0.42$ ; food intake,  $F_{1,12}=0.1$ ,  $P=0.7$ , Fig. 9B).  
 4 On days 13-15 of lactation, there was no significant difference ( $t_{13}=0.9$ ,  $P=0.41$ ) in the  
 5 average ADE between the lines which averaged  $86.8 \pm 1.5\%$  ( $N=6$ ) and  $85.4 \pm 0.9\%$  ( $N=9$ ) in  
 6 H-L and L-H mothers, respectively. Using these estimates of ADE we converted food intake  
 7 estimates throughout reproduction into MEI. MEI increased significantly over the last 5 days  
 8 of pregnancy and was different between the lines (ANOVA, line,  $F_{1,14}=46.9$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; day,  
 9  $F_{4,56}=4.1$ ,  $P=0.006$ ; interaction line  $\times$  day,  $F_{4,56}=4.1$ ,  $P=0.006$ , Fig. 9C).

10 During lactation, H-L mice had a significantly higher MEI than L-H mice, and MEI  
 11 also varied significantly with the day of lactation (ANOVA, line,  $F_{1,19}=27.2$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; day,  
 12  $F_{11,209}=18.4$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; interaction line  $\times$  day,  $F_{11,209}=3.2$ ,  $P=0.001$ ). The pattern observed in  
 13 the L-H mice was very similar to that observed for ML mice in the experiment with natural  
 14 litters. MEI increased over the first 13 days of lactation and reached a plateau over days 13-  
 15 18. In contrast, the MEI of the H-L mice mirrored that of the MH mice raising natural litters.  
 16 MEI increased to a plateau which only lasted from day 13 to 15 and thereafter there was a  
 17 decline (Fig. 9C). The average drop over days 15-18 of lactation was 107.4 kJ. This reduction  
 18 in MEI was correlated with the reduction of body mass over the same period ( $r=0.79$ ,  
 19  $P=0.007$ , Fig. 9D). Between days 13 to 15 of lactation, H-L mothers ( $N=10$ ) assimilated on  
 20 average  $242.5 \pm 8.8$  kJ day<sup>-1</sup> compared to  $165.3 \pm 9.8$  kJ day<sup>-1</sup> in L-H mice ( $N=11$ ). Using GLM  
 21 with mean body mass at peak lactation, litter size, and litter mass at weaning as covariates,  
 22 indicated that effect of line on MEI remained significant when these other factors were added  
 23 to the model. Asymptotic MEI (days 13-15) was positively correlated with body mass at peak  
 24 lactation ( $r=0.85$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) and litter mass at weaning ( $r=0.68$ ,  $P=0.001$ ), but it was not  
 25 significantly correlated with litter size ( $r=0.32$ ,  $P=0.15$ ) (Fig. 10).

### 26 *DEE*

27 DEE of H-L and L-H mice averaged  $98.5 \pm 8.3$  kJ day<sup>-1</sup> ( $N=6$ ) and  $84.5 \pm 8.4$  kJ day<sup>-1</sup> ( $N=8$ ),  
 28 respectively ( $t_{12}=1.2$ ,  $P=0.27$ : Table 2, 3).

### 29 *MEO and reproductive performance*

30 Over days 13-15 of lactation, H-L mice had significantly higher MEI than L-H mice (line  
 31 effect,  $t_{12}=5.9$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; Table 2). This led to them having significantly higher MEO  
 32 compared to L-H mice ( $t_{12}=4.1$ ,  $P=0.001$ ). MEO was significantly higher in H-L than L-H  
 33  
 34

1 mice (Table 2). Using GLM with mean body mass at peak lactation, litter size, litter mass,  
 2 and pup mass at weaning as covariates, indicated that effect of line on MEO remained  
 3 significant when these factors were added to the model. MEO was not significantly correlated  
 4 with litter size ( $r=0.21$ ,  $P=0.47$ ) or pup mass ( $r=0.32$ ,  $P=0.27$ ) (Fig. 11). There was, however,  
 5 a positive correlation between MEO and body mass at peak lactation (days 13-15) ( $r=0.85$ ,  
 6  $P<0.001$ ) and litter mass ( $r=0.64$ ,  $P=0.01$ ) (Fig. 11).

7 Litter size did not differ significantly between lines when the litters were swapped  
 8 ( $t_{19}=0.4$ ,  $P=0.7$ ). The average litter size after swapping was  $7.2\pm 0.5$  and  $7.5\pm 0.8$  in H-L and  
 9 L-H mice, respectively. No pups were lost. Litter masses of both H-L and L-H mothers  
 10 increased significantly throughout lactation (ANOVA, line,  $F_{1,19}=10.5$ ,  $P=0.003$ ; day,  
 11  $F_{11,208}=211.8$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; interaction line  $\times$  day,  $F_{11,209}=3.7$ ,  $P<0.001$ ). Although litter mass  
 12 did not differ significantly between lines from day 7-11 of lactation, ML pups supported by  
 13 MH mothers were significantly heavier than MH pups supported by ML mothers from day 12  
 14 until weaning (pairwise comparison, day 12,  $P=0.036$ ; day 13,  $P=0.015$  and days 14-18,  
 15  $P<0.01$ ). At weaning, the average litter mass of ML pups supported by MH mothers was  
 16 greater than that for MH pups supported by ML mothers (Fig. 12A, Table 2). At weaning,  
 17 pup mass of MH pups supported by ML mice was significantly greater than that of the MH  
 18 pups raised by ML mice (Table 2). Growth rate of litters in both lines varied significantly  
 19 throughout lactation but marginally failed to reach significance between lines (ANOVA, line,  
 20  $F_{1,19}=3.1$ ,  $P=0.08$ ; day,  $F_{10,189}=3.3$ ,  $P<0.001$ ; interaction line  $\times$  day,  $F_{10,189}=0.6$ ,  $P=0.8$ , Fig.  
 21 12C). Greater litter mass at weaning was highly correlated with litter size ( $r=0.86$ ,  $P<0.001$ )  
 22 and litter mass at weaning of H-L mothers was significantly greater than L-H mothers when  
 23 litter size was added to the model (GLM, line,  $F_{1,18}=20.2$ ,  $P<0.001$ , litter size,  $F_{1,18}=114.9$ ,  
 24  $P<0.001$ , Fig. 13A). Pup mass at weaning was negatively correlated to litter size ( $r=0.74$ ,  
 25  $P<0.001$ ) and the average mass of ML pups supported by MH mice was significantly heavier  
 26 than MH pups supported by ML mice, when litter size was added to the model (GLM, line,  
 27  $F_{1,18}=13.3$ ,  $P=0.002$ , litter size,  $F_{1,18}=35.6$ ,  $P<0.001$ , Fig. 13B).

28

### 29 **Comparison of cross-fostered and natural litters**

30 We pooled the data collected with respect to the natural and cross fostered litters and  
 31 examined the effects of group (mother-offspring source: H-H, H-L, L-L and L-H) on the peak  
 32 metabolisable energy intake, milk energy output and litter mass at day 18, with litter size as a  
 33 covariate. For MEI, there was a significant effect of litter size ( $F_{1,89}=68.2$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) and a  
 34 significant group effect ( $F_{3,89}=20.1$ ,  $P<0.001$ ). For MEO, there was a significant effect of

1 litter size ( $F_{1,61}=21.8$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) and a significant group effect ( $F_{3,61}=20.8$ ,  $P<0.001$ ). For the  
2 litter mass at weaning, there was a significant effect of litter size ( $F_{1,82}=335.8$ ,  $P<0.001$ ) and a  
3 significant group effect ( $F_{3,82}=35.3$ ,  $P<0.001$ ). For all three variables, *post hoc* Tukey test  
4 comparisons revealed that the high mothers differed from the low mothers ( $P<0.05$ ) but there  
5 was no difference between the high mothers raising high or low pups ( $P>0.05$ ), and no  
6 difference between the low mothers raising either high or low pups ( $P>0.05$ ).

7

## 8 **DISCUSSION**

9 The goal for this study was to test the HDL theory by comparing the reproductive  
10 performance of two lines of mice previously shown to have high and low thermal  
11 conductance. The HDL theory suggests that at peak lactation mammals are constrained by  
12 their capacity to dissipate body heat, and hence predicts that the MH mice, with greater  
13 thermal conductance, should have greater peak energy intake, permitting them to invest more  
14 energy in milk production and hence produce heavier litters and pups.

15 During lactation, mice in both lines increased MEI significantly over the first 13 days  
16 and then reached a plateau (asymptotic food intake). These findings are consistent with  
17 previous research on food intake during lactation in different animal models. Lactating MF1  
18 mice reach a plateau around day 11 of lactation (Johnson et al., 2001a; Krđ et al., 2003;  
19 Vaanholt et al., 2013; Gamo et al., 2013; Duah et al., 2013), lactating common voles on day  
20 14 (*Microtus arvalis*) (Simons et al., 2011), lactating Brandt's voles (*Lasiopodomys brandtii*)  
21 on day 8 (Wu et al., 2009), lactating European hares (*Lepus europaeus*) during weeks 3-4  
22 (Valencak and Ruf, 2009) and lactating Mongolian gerbils (*Meriones unguiculatus*) on day 9  
23 (Yang et al., 2013). Consistent with the prediction of the HDL theory, the peak metabolisable  
24 energy intake in lactation (days 13-15) was significantly higher in the MH line compared  
25 with the ML line. This was in turn translated into a greater milk production, which led to a  
26 greater growth of the litters in the MH line mice and ultimately led to them weaning heavier  
27 pups. The litter mass of MH mice at weaning was 50.2% heavier compared the average litter  
28 mass weaned by ML mice. Similarly, the mass of individual pups raised by MH mice was  
29 27.2% greater than those raised by the ML mice. The MH females exported on average 62.3  
30 kJ day<sup>-1</sup> more energy as milk than ML females. Since the increase in MEO in MH mice was  
31 fuelled by extra MEI (81.5 kJ day<sup>-1</sup>), the efficiency for converting the MEI to MEO was  
32 76.4%. This is consistent with previous efficiency estimates (Romero et al., 1976; Baldwin et  
33 al., 1980; Freetly et al., 2006; Krđ et al., 2007). Our findings are corroborated by a previous  
34 study that was conducted on laboratory mice which had been selected for high and low heat

1 loss (Nielsen et al., 1997a; Nielsen et al., 1997b). It was demonstrated by using a weigh-  
2 suckle-weigh method that high heat loss mice synthesized on average 20.6% more milk than  
3 low heat loss mice. As a consequence, they weaned litters on average 10.1 g heavier  
4 (McDonald and Nielsen, 2006).

5 The asymptotic MEI in the ML line remained stable over days 13 to 18, consistent  
6 with studies in other mouse strains and other small rodents and lagomorphs (Johnson et al.,  
7 2001a; Krđ and Speakman, 2003a; Krđ and Speakman, 2003b; Krđ et al., 2003; Krđ et al.,  
8 2007; Wu et al., 2009; Simons et al., 2011; Zhao and Cao, 2009; Valencak and Ruf, 2009;  
9 Zhao et al., 2010; Vaanholt et al., 2013; Gamo et al., 2013; Yang et al., 2013; Duah et al.,  
10 2013). In contrast, the pattern observed in the MH mice was different. There was a significant  
11 drop in MEI across days 15-18 amounting to a total deficit of 58.3 kJ. At the same time, the  
12 MH females lost 0.8 g of body mass. This reduction in body mass could be just reduced gut  
13 fill reflecting the lower food intake. However, if this loss of weight represented withdrawal of  
14 fat reserves, it would represent approximately 31 kJ of energy ( $39 \text{ kJ g}^{-1} \times 0.8 \text{ g}$ ) (Johnson et  
15 al., 2001c; Speakman, 2008) that could supplement the reduced intake. Since fat is the most  
16 energy dense tissue, this is the maximal level of energy that could be supplied by the lost  
17 body mass. Hence, making these limiting assumptions, the lactating MH mice had between  
18 58.3 and 27.3 kJ ( $14.6$  to  $6.7 \text{ kJ day}^{-1}$ ) lower energy intake over the last few days of lactation  
19 than they would have had if they had sustained their energy intake at the peak level. Since the  
20 milk energy output at peak lactation was  $118.9 \pm 5.3 \text{ kJ day}^{-1}$ , the reduction in daily milk  
21 production would have been at least 5.6% and up to 12.5%, assuming that all the deficit was  
22 paid for by reduced milk production. Over this period, the growth of the MH litters declined  
23 steeply (Fig. 5C), yet they still retained greater growth than the ML litters, consistent with the  
24 fact the ML litters were receiving on average only  $56.6 \text{ kJ day}^{-1}$  of milk. Exactly why the MH  
25 mice used a strategy of fuelling late lactation by a reduction in energy intake possibly  
26 supplemented by a withdrawal of reserves is unclear. Since it occurred in both experiments  
27 with natural litters and cross-fostered litters, it was a strategy adopted by the mothers,  
28 independent of the pups they were suckling.

29 Examination of the internal organs of lactating mice revealed a significant increase in  
30 the size and mass of several organs compared to non-reproductive mice. These changes  
31 included the whole gut length, small intestine length, caecum length, empty and full gut  
32 masses. However, no significant differences were found in the mass of BAT and length of the  
33 large intestine between lactating and non-reproductive mice. Our findings were similar to the  
34 patterns that were found in previous work in a diversity of rodent species. This previous work

1 has shown substantial increases in lactation of the alimentary tract and associated organs such  
2 as liver and pancreas (Kennedy et al., 1958; Jolicoeur et al., 1980; Wu et al., 2009; Speakman  
3 and McQueenie, 1996). The increase in the sizes of the components of the alimentary tract  
4 during lactation are consistent with the central limit theory that intake is constrained by the  
5 uptake capacity of the alimentary tract (Kirkwood, 1983; Perrigo, 1987; Hammond and  
6 Diamond, 1992; Hammond and Diamond, 1994; Koteja, 1996; Künkele, 2000; Johnson et al.,  
7 2001a; Johnson et al., 2001b; Laurien-Kehnen and Trillmich, 2003; Speakman, 2008).  
8 However, it seems highly unlikely that such changes underpin the difference in intake  
9 between the MH and ML lines at peak lactation, because the differences between lines were  
10 in the opposite direction. The ML mice had longer whole guts, mostly attributed to their  
11 significantly longer small intestines. Moreover, ML mice had significantly greater wet  
12 masses of empty and full guts. These data are consistent with previous work on these lines  
13 (Selman et al., 2001a) where the ML mice had significantly greater dry mass of the stomach  
14 and large intestine. However, whole gut length was not measured in that study. Surprisingly,  
15 at the end of lactation (day 18), there was a significant positive relationship between the MEI  
16 and the masses of both the full and empty gut, and the length of the small intestine, within  
17 each of the lines, which completely contrasted the difference between the lines. Consequently,  
18 while it seems unlikely that a central limit imposed by gut capacity was responsible for the  
19 line difference, it remains feasible that the individual differences within lines could be  
20 attributed to such an effect.

21 Sadowska et al. (2013) studied the reproductive performance of mice that had been selected  
22 for high and low basal metabolic rate (BMR) and found that those with high BMR had  
23 greater reproductive performance. They attributed this difference to differences in the  
24 assimilation capacity of the alimentary tract, and hence concluded their data were consistent  
25 with the central limitation hypothesis. The mice we studied also differ in their resting  
26 metabolic rate in the thermoneutral zone (RMRt: which is similar to BMR Speakman et al.  
27 2004) with non-reproductive MH mice having higher RMRt than the ML mice (Selman et al.  
28 2001a). However, we have shown previously that these differences in RMRt between the M  
29 lines are not linked to morphological differences in the alimentary tract (Selman et al. 2001a).  
30 Moreover, given the strain differences discussed above, this seems an unlikely explanation  
31 for the data presented here. However, the positive correlation between RMRt and thermal  
32 conductance observed in the M strain mice (Selman et al. 2001b) suggests a potential  
33 alternative explanation for the observations on mice selected for high and low BMR  
34 (Sadowska et al. 2013). It is potentially the case that the mice with higher BMR also had

1 higher thermal conductance, and were hence able to dissipate more heat, and this was the  
2 primary factor regulating the level of their reproductive performance, with the observed  
3 changes in the alimentary tract in that study a secondary response. Unfortunately, thermal  
4 conductance differences between the strains were not measured in this previous study  
5 (Sadowska et al. 2013). The thermal conductance of these mice was measured by Gębczyński  
6 (2005) at generation 19, and no significant differences were noted. The relevance of these  
7 measurements to the mice studied by Sadowska et al. (2013) is however uncertain because  
8 they are separated by 8 years (and 13 generations) of continued selection, hence there has  
9 been ample time for a difference in thermal conductance as a correlated trait to develop  
10 between these two studies. Note that although a similar time elapsed between the  
11 characterisation of thermal conductance of the lines studied here and the present study of  
12 their reproductive performance a reduction in the difference in thermal conductance between  
13 the lines over this interval seems unlikely. For the trait under selection (food intake), at  
14 generation 8-9, the difference was 20.5%, at generation 14-15 it was 28.7%, and at  
15 generations 21-23 the difference was 45.2% (Hastings et al. 1997). At generation 38 when  
16 selection stopped it was 58.7% (Bunger et. al 1998). After repeated rounds of inbreeding, at  
17 generation 47 we characterised the thermal conductance. We did not measure the food intake  
18 of the lines in this generation, but did so in generation 50 when the difference averaged  
19 45.5%. In the current study (generations 68-83), the difference in baseline food intake  
20 between the lines persisted at the similar level of 37.7%. Hence, there has been only a slight  
21 reduction in the difference, between generation 50 and 83. At generation 47, we performed a  
22 pilot study to explore the lactation performance of the two lines, and found that at peak  
23 lactation the intake of the high line was 55% greater than that of the low line. This compares  
24 with 31% at generation 68, 64% at generation 75, 56% at generation 80 and 47% at  
25 generation 83. Clearly, these values vary a lot from generation to generation, but the overall  
26 average for the data presented here (generations 68 to 83) is 49.5%, a slight reduction on the  
27 value of 55% at generation 47, consistent with the slight reduction in the difference between  
28 the baseline food intakes over the same period. These data clearly indicate that the metabolic  
29 phenotype of the MH and ML mice has remained virtually unchanged over the last 35-40  
30 generations since the period of inbreeding designed to fix the genetics, hence we are  
31 confident the difference in thermal conductance probably also persisted through this period.

32

33 Although DEE and MEO were uncorrelated with features of the alimentary tract,  
34 these traits and MEI were positively correlated with the mass of the mammary glands.

1 Despite this weak correlation there was no significant difference in the mass of the mammary  
2 glands between the two lines. Similar results were found in lactating MF1 mice that were  
3 exposed to warm and hot conditions at peak lactation, which also had a highly significant  
4 difference in their MEO but not in the masses of their mammary glands (Krd et al., 2003).  
5 Indeed, it has been recently shown in MF1 mice that mice rearing experimentally  
6 manipulated small litters actually had heavier mammary glands compared to mice rearing  
7 experimentally manipulated large litters. This was partially attributable to the differences in  
8 the fat contents of mammary glands between the two groups, with the heaviest mammary  
9 glands in those raising the smallest litters containing more fat (Duah et al., 2013). These data  
10 further emphasise that mass of the mammary gland is a poor index of lactation performance  
11 in mice. Greater attention should be paid in future to the use of more informative techniques  
12 such as measuring the activity and the number of secretory cells (e.g. the bromodeoxyuridine-  
13 labelling index; Capuco et al., 2002; or the explants method; Wilde et al., 1999).

14 An alternative explanation to the HDL theory for the results observed in the  
15 experiment with natural litters is that female milk production was driven by pup demand  
16 (Speakman and Krd 2005a; Zhao et al., 2013b). By this idea, the greater food intake and  
17 milk production of the high line was because the MH line pups demanded greater milk from  
18 their mothers. To test whether the system was regulated by the performance of the mother or  
19 the demands of the pups, we cross-fostered litters in the second experiment. In this  
20 experiment the performance of the MH mothers raising ML pups matched exactly their  
21 performance when raising MH pups, and the same was also true of ML mothers raising MH  
22 pups, compared to their performance when raising ML pups. Although the comparison  
23 between the mothers raising natural litters and mothers raising cross-fostered litters is not  
24 ideal because those raising natural litters received a different level of disturbance, this  
25 comparison also shows that the difference between the lines resides in the mothers and not in  
26 the offspring. These data very clearly show that the overall energy flux of the mother-pup  
27 system is controlled by factors that affect the performance of the female, rather than the  
28 growth capacity of the pups. This is consistent with the data generated elsewhere (Zhao et al.,  
29 2013b).

### 31 **Conclusions**

32 In the experiment with natural litters, we showed that the mice selected for high and low food  
33 intake were limited in their maximum energy intake and reached a plateau at day 13 of  
34 lactation. Reproductive performance in the MH mice was significantly higher than that of the



1 ML mice. MH mice ate more food and produced more milk and weaned heavier pups. Our  
2 morphological findings suggest that mice at peak lactation were unlikely to be constrained  
3 centrally by the capacity of alimentary tract (central limit hypothesis). Furthermore, it was  
4 demonstrated that the reproductive performance was driven by factors affecting the mothers  
5 rather than growth capacity of the pups. Our results support the hypothesis that capacity to  
6 dissipate heat is the physiological mechanism shaping the maximum energy intake and the  
7 reproductive performance in mice selected for high and low food intake, due to the correlated  
8 effects of selection on thermal conductance

9

## 10 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 11 **Source of mouse lines**

12 We used mice from the maintenance (M) lines (Hastings et al., 1997; Bünger et al., 1998),  
13 which originated from a common background generated by a three strain cross, between two  
14 inbred strains (JU and CBA) and one outbred CFLP strain (Sharp et al., 1984). The mice  
15 were divergently selected over 38 generations for high and low food intake (MH and ML,  
16 respectively) at the University of Edinburgh, UK. Because food intake is related to body mass,  
17 the selection was based on food intake corrected for average body mass. Three independent  
18 replicate lines were selected in each direction. At generation 20, inter-crossing was made in  
19 each three replicates, and only one resultant line in each direction was maintained till  
20 generation 38, after which the selective breeding was terminated. At the beginning of  
21 generation 43, partially inbred lines were produced by sib-sib mating for 4 generations to  
22 facilitate mapping work. Mice were subsequently random bred within each line, avoiding sib-  
23 sib mating. The current studies were performed over a period of five years spanning the  
24 approximate generations 68 to 83. The MH and ML lines were shown to have different  
25 thermal conductance (Selman et al., 2001b).

26

### 27 **Breeding protocol**

28 Virgin female mice aged 9-12 weeks were individually housed in shoebox cages (48 cm x 15  
29 cm x 13 cm) under a 12 h L: 12 h D photoperiod at  $21 \pm 2$  °C and a relative humidity of  $59 \pm 5\%$ .  
30 All cages were provided with sawdust, paper bedding and a cardboard tube. Animals had *ad*  
31 *libitum* access to water and food (details below). After 12 days of baseline females were  
32 mated with non-sibling males for 11-15 days. Pregnant mice were monitored daily to  
33 establish the day of parturition (day 0), and the timing for pregnancy was back calculated

1 from the day of birth as day -1 (last day of pregnancy) to day -18 (beginning of pregnancy).  
2 Adult females and their pups were subjected to various measurements (details below) until  
3 day 18 of lactation.

#### 4 5 **Experiment with natural litters**

6 Data were collected during four years (2007-2010), resulting in a total sample size of 49  
7 lactating MH and 24 lactating ML mice. In 2007, mice were fed CRM diet (Pelleted Rat and  
8 Mouse Breeder and Grower Diet, Special Diets Services, BP Nutrition, Witham, UK) and in  
9 the other years, they were fed D12450B diet (Research Diets, New Brunswick, NJ, USA).  
10 Because not all lactating females were monitored for body mass and food intake during their  
11 baseline period and/or during pregnancy, the pre-lactation sample sizes are smaller than those  
12 during lactation, and varied depending on the parameter. Specifically, the body mass and  
13 food intake measurements during the baseline period were performed on 33 MH and 16 ML  
14 mice, and during pregnancy on 40 MH and 13 ML mice, respectively. Mice were allowed to  
15 raise their natural litters to weaning. Ten age matched females from each line were not mated  
16 to provide non-reproductive controls. On day 18 of lactation, all lactating ( $N=73$ ) and non-  
17 reproductive ( $N=20$ ) mice were sacrificed and a subsample dissected to evaluate organ  
18 morphology (details below).

#### 19 20 **Experiment with cross-fostered litters**

21 Data on reproductive performance of MH mothers ( $N=10$ ) rearing cross-fostered ML pups  
22 (H-L) and ML mothers ( $N=11$ ) rearing cross-fostered MH pups (L-H) were collected in 2011.  
23 Mice had *ad libitum* access to water and food (D12450B, Research Diet, New Brunswick, NJ,  
24 USA). Mothers and their naturally born pups were left undisturbed for a period 1-2 days after  
25 birth. Cross-fostering of pups was performed on days 2-4 of lactation (the exact day of swap  
26 varied between mothers due to the asynchronous nature of the births).

27 To allow mothers and their cross-fostered pups to settle down together, they were left  
28 undisturbed for another two days, before monitoring of body mass and energy balance  
29 resumed. Because not all females were monitored during pregnancy, the pre-lactation sample  
30 sizes are smaller than those during lactation. Specifically, the body mass and food intake  
31 measurements during pregnancy were performed on 8 individuals from each line, with no  
32 data collected during the baseline.

#### 33 34 **Body mass, food intake and reproductive performance**

1 Female body mass and food intake were measured ( $\pm 0.01$  g) daily between 12:00 and 14:30 h.  
 2 No food intake measurements were taken when females were housed with males. Litter size  
 3 and mass ( $\pm 0.01$  g) were recorded daily on days 5-18 of lactation, and the average pup mass  
 4 was calculated as the litter mass divided by litter size. The growth rate of litter ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) was  
 5 calculated as the difference in litter mass between two consecutive days of lactation.

### 7 **Metabolisable energy intake (MEI)**

8 Measurements of MEI were performed either on days 12-14 of lactation (experiment with  
 9 natural litters) or on days 13-15 of lactation (experiment with cross-fostered litters). Females  
 10 and their litters were placed in cages with fresh sawdust, and a weighed portion of D12450B  
 11 food was added to the hopper at the beginning of the 48 h feeding trial. Samples of food were  
 12 taken to determine dry mass content ( $93.8 \pm 0.2\%$ ,  $N=8$ ), and the food remaining in the hopper  
 13 was reweighed at the end of feeding trial. Any uneaten, fragmented food and faeces were  
 14 removed from the cage, dried to a constant mass at  $60^\circ\text{C}$  and weighed. The gross energy  
 15 content of D12450B food ( $17.8 \pm 0.17$  kJ  $\text{g}^{-1}$  dry mass,  $N=3$ ) and faeces (MH mothers,  
 16  $15.4 \pm 0.04$  kJ  $\text{g}^{-1}$  dry mass,  $N=32$ ; ML mothers,  $15.7 \pm 0.1$  kJ  $\text{g}^{-1}$  dry mass,  $N=21$ ; H-L  
 17 mothers,  $15.4 \pm 0.08$  kJ  $\text{g}^{-1}$  dry mass,  $N=6$ ; L-H mothers,  $15.8 \pm 0.1$  kJ  $\text{g}^{-1}$  dry mass,  $N=9$ ) were  
 18 measured by bomb calorimetry (Parr 6200 calorimeter with semi-micro oxygen bomb 1109A,  
 19 Scientific and Medical Products Ltd, Cheadle, UK). Dry food consumption ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) was  
 20 calculated by multiplying the food intake ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) by the food dry mass content (%). Gross  
 21 energy intake (GEI, kJ  $\text{day}^{-1}$ ) was then calculated by multiplying the dry food consumption  
 22 ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) by the food energy content (kJ  $\text{g}^{-1}$  dry mass). Energy lost through faeces (kJ  $\text{day}^{-1}$ )  
 23 was calculated by multiplying dry faecal production ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) by the faecal energy content  
 24 (kJ  $\text{g}^{-1}$  dry mass). MEI (kJ  $\text{day}^{-1}$ ) was calculated as the difference between GEI and energy  
 25 lost through faeces, assuming that the energy loss via urine was 3% of the energy digested  
 26 (Drożdż, 1975). The apparent digestive efficiency (ADE) was calculated as the percentage of  
 27 GEI that was digested.

28 Because CRM and D12450B diets had different apparent digestibility, all energy  
 29 intake data were presented as MEI rather than GEI. Evaluation of MEI during baseline,  
 30 pregnancy and lactation was based on the measured values of GEI, assuming that both ADE  
 31 and the 3% loss of energy via urine remained stable through the whole experiment (Król and  
 32 Speakman, 2003a; Król et al., 2007). For mice fed with CRM diet, MEI was calculated using  
 33 the measured value of dry mass content of food ( $94.4 \pm 0.3\%$ ,  $N=10$ ) and previously published  
 34 values of the diet energy content ( $17.97$  kJ  $\text{g}^{-1}$  dry mass) and the diet-specific ADE (79.8%)

1 (Král et al., 2007). MEI in mice fed with D12450B diet was calculated using the parameters  
2 measured in the current study, including the energy content of D12450B diet ( $17.8 \text{ kJ g}^{-1}$  dry  
3 mass) and the diet-specific ADE (MH mothers, 83.1%; ML mothers, 80.7%; H-L mothers  
4 86.8% and L-H mothers, 85.4%).

### 6 **Daily energy expenditure (DEE)**

7 The doubly labelled water (DLW) technique (Butler et al., 2004) was used to measure DEE  
8 over days 15-17 of lactation (MH,  $N=32$  and ML,  $N=21$  for experiment with natural litters;  
9 H-L,  $N=6$  and L-H,  $N=8$  for experiment with cross-fostered litters). Previous work has  
10 indicated the accuracy of this method to measure DEE in small mammals (Speakman and  
11 Král, 2005b). Measurements were made across two days to minimise the potential day to day  
12 variability in DEE (Speakman et al., 1994; Berteaux et al., 1996). Recycling of isotopes  
13 between the mother and her pups was considered negligible (Scantlebury et al., 2000). On  
14 day 15 of lactation, mice were weighed ( $\pm 0.01 \text{ g}$ ) and injected intraperitoneally with  
15 approximately 0.25 g of water enriched with  $^{18}\text{O}$  (27.8 atom%) and  $^2\text{H}$  (15.9 atom%).  
16 Syringes were weighed before and after injection ( $\pm 0.0001 \text{ g}$ ) to calculate the exact dose of  
17 DLW injected. Blood samples were collected after 1 h to evaluate initial isotope enrichments  
18 (Král and Speakman, 1999; Visser et al., 2000a) and were also taken from unlabelled mice to  
19 evaluate the background isotope enrichments (method D in Speakman and Racey, 1987).  
20 Blood samples were immediately heat sealed into two 50  $\mu\text{l}$  glass capillaries. Two days after  
21 dosing, a final blood sample was collected as close as possible to 48 h after the initial sample  
22 to minimise circadian effects (Speakman and Racey, 1988b). Capillaries containing the blood  
23 samples were then distilled using a vacuum (Nagy, 1983), and the produced water was used  
24 to generate  $\text{CO}_2$  (Speakman et al., 1990) or  $\text{H}_2$  (Speakman and Král, 2005b). The isotope  
25 ratios  $^{18}\text{O}:^{16}\text{O}$  in  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $^2\text{H}:^1\text{H}$  in  $\text{H}_2$  were analysed using gas source isotope ratio mass  
26 spectrometry (ISOCHROM $\mu$ GAS system and IsoPrime IRMS, Micromass, Manchester, UK).  
27 Three high-enrichment standards bracketing the experimental samples were run each day  
28 (Meijer et al., 2000). Initial isotope dilution spaces (mol) were evaluated by the intercept  
29 method (Coward and Prentice, 1985), and converted to grams considering a molecular mass  
30 of body water of 18.020 and expressed as a percentage of the body mass prior to injection.  
31 The intercept method was used instead of a plateau method because the actual body water  
32 pool estimated by desiccation was more accurately predicted by the intercept approach  
33 (Speakman and Král, 2005b). The isotope elimination rate ( $k$ ) was evaluated following  
34 published methods (Lifson et al., 1955). The single-pool model equation 7.19 was used

1 (Speakman, 1997) to determine the rate of CO<sub>2</sub> production, which has been shown to be most  
2 appropriate for this size of animal (Visser and Schekkerman, 1999; Visser et al., 2000b;  
3 Speakman and Król, 2005b). Energy equivalents of the rate of CO<sub>2</sub> production were  
4 evaluated using a conversion factor of 24.026 J ml<sup>-1</sup> CO<sub>2</sub> (Weir, 1949).

### 6 **Milk energy output (MEO)**

7 We subtracted the estimated DEE from MEI to calculate MEO (Król and Speakman, 2003b).

### 9 **Organ morphology**

10 Reproductive females on day 18 of lactation ( $N=22$  MH and  $N=15$  ML) along with non-  
11 reproductive females ( $N=10$  for both MH and ML) were sacrificed by CO<sub>2</sub> overdose. The  
12 brain and liver were collected for other studies not reported here. Brown adipose tissue  
13 (BAT), mammary glands, and the alimentary tract were removed and then weighed ( $\pm 0.0001$   
14 g; Ohaus Analytical plus Balance, Nänikon, Switzerland). The alimentary tract was separated  
15 into small intestine, large intestine and caecum, and the lengths of these components were  
16 measured with a ruler ( $\pm 1$  mm). The total length of the three components was reported as the  
17 whole gut length. The sections were weighed first with the gut content (full) and then empty.

### 19 **Statistical analysis**

20 Data were tested for normality using the Shapiro-Wilks test and natural logarithms were used  
21 to normalize them where required. We determined the changes in body mass and MEI  
22 throughout two stages of the experiment (baseline and pregnancy) using ANOVA, accounting  
23 for repeated measures by including individual as a nested random factor within line. During  
24 lactation, changes in body mass, MEI, litter mass, pup mass, and growth rate of litters were  
25 determined also using ANOVA, accounting for repeated measures by including individual as  
26 a nested random factor within line and litter size as a time varying covariate to correct for  
27 litter losses. When the effect of line or the interaction between line  $\times$  day was significant, a  
28 *post hoc* test (Tukey pairwise comparisons) were used to determine the differences between  
29 lines. Significant differences between days were also determined using a *post hoc*  
30 comparisons test (Tukey pairwise comparisons). General linear modelling (GLM) was  
31 performed to explore the relationships between asymptotic MEI and litter size, body mass,  
32 litter mass, and pup mass with line as a fixed factor and other factors as covariates when  
33 appropriate. Relationships between body mass, asymptotic MEI, litter size, litter mass, and  
34 pup mass were determined using Pearson correlation and the lines were fitted using a linear

1 regression analysis. Arcsine transformations were performed prior to analysis for percentage  
 2 data (ADE), but untransformed data are quoted in the summary statistics. Independent *t*-tests  
 3 were performed to determine the differences in MEO, DEE, ADE, and litter size between  
 4 lines. Differences in organ masses between two lines were tested using GLM with line,  
 5 reproductive status and interaction between line and reproductive status as fixed factors, and  
 6 body mass (minus organ mass) on day 18 of lactation as a covariate. The relationships  
 7 between organ masses and MEI, MEO and DEE were established by using GLM with organ  
 8 mass as the independent variable and line and reproductive status as fixed factors and the  
 9 body mass minus the mass of the respective organ mass as a covariate. A full factor model  
 10 with all 2-way and 3-way interactions was fitted and then non-significant interaction terms  
 11 were removed. Comparisons between the natural and cross-fostered litters for MEI, MEO and  
 12 litter mass on day 18 were made using GLM with the group (mother-offspring: H-H, H-L, L-  
 13 L and L-H) as a fixed factor and litter size on day 18 as a covariate. All data are presented as  
 14 mean  $\pm$  s.e.m. Minitab (Version 16; Minitab Inc., State College, PA, USA) was used to  
 15 perform all statistical analyses.

16  
 17  
 18  
 19

## 20 **List of abbreviations**

21	ADE	apparent digestive efficiency
22	BAT	brown adipose tissue
23	BMR	basal metabolic rate
24	DEE	daily energy expenditure
25	DLW	doubly labelled water
26	HDL	heat dissipation limit
27	H-L	MH mothers with cross-fostered ML pups
28	L-H	ML mothers with cross-fostered MH pups
29	MEI	metabolisable energy intake
30	MEO	milk energy output
31	MH	high maintenance line
32	ML	low maintenance line

1 RMRt resting metabolic rate at thermoneutrality

2 SusMR sustained energy expenditure

3 SusEI sustained energy intake

4

## 5 **Acknowledgments**

6 We are grateful to the animal house staff that looked after the mice. Peter Thomson provided  
7 invaluable technical support for the isotope analysis.

8

## 9 **Author contribution**

10 J.R.S and E.K. designed the experiments; A.H.A.J., E.K., J.H., A.C., A.S.L. and Y.G.  
11 collected the data in the experiment with natural litters; S.C.S. and T.V. collected the data in  
12 the experiment with cross-fostered litters. W.G.H. and L.B. performed the original selection  
13 and provided the mice, C.H. analysed the DLW samples; A.H.A.J., L.V., T.V., E.K. and  
14 J.R.S. analysed the data, A.H.A.J. and J.R.S. wrote the paper and it was further edited by E.K.  
15 and L.V., and commented on and approved by the other authors.

16

## 17 **Competing interests**

18 No competing interests declared.

19

## 20 **Funding**

21 The mice were selected under grants from BBSRC to W.G.H. and L.B. who was additionally  
22 supported by Cotswold International. A.H.A.J. was supported by a scholarship from the Iraqi  
23 government. A.C. and A.S.L. were supported by the Erasmus program and Y.G. was  
24 supported by a scholarship from the international rotary foundation. The work was also partly  
25 funded by research grants from NERC to J.R.S. and C.H. and from BBSRC to J.R.S. and E.K.  
26 J.R.S. was also supported by a 1000 talents professorship during the final phase of the work.

27

## 28 **References**

29 **Baldwin, R. L., Smith, N. E. and Taylor, J. and Sharp, M.** (1980). Manipulating metabolic  
30 parameters to improve growth rate and milk secretion. *J. Anim. Sci.* **51**, 1416-1428.

31 **Berteaux, D., Thomas, D. W., Bergeron, J. M. and Lapierre, H.** (1996). Repeatability of  
32 daily field metabolic rate in female Meadow Voles (*Microtus pennsylvanicus*). *Funct.*  
33 *Ecol.* **10**, 751-759.

- 1 **Butler, P. J., Green, J. A., Boyd, I. L. and Speakman, J. R.** (2004). Measuring metabolic  
2 rate in the field: the pros and cons of the doubly labelled water and heart rate methods.  
3 *Funct. Ecol.* **18**, 168-183.
- 4 **Bünger, L., MacLeod, M. G., Wallace, C. A. and Hill, W. G.** (1998). Direct and correlated  
5 effects of selection for food intake corrected for body weight in the adult mouse.  
6 *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress on Genetics Applied to Livestock Production,*  
7 *Armidale 26*, 97-100. The University of New England, Australia.
- 8 **Capuco, A. V., Li, M., Long, E., Ren, S., Hruska, K. S., Schorr, K. and Furth, P. A.**  
9 (2002). Concurrent pregnancy retards mammary involution: effects on apoptosis and  
10 proliferation of the mammary epithelium after forced weaning of mice. *Biol. Reprod.* **66**,  
11 1471-1476.
- 12 **Coward, W. A. and Prentice, A. M.** (1985). Isotope method for the measurement of carbon  
13 dioxide production rate in man. *Am. J. Clin. Nutr.* **41**, 659-661.
- 14 **Daan, S., Deerenberg, C. and Dijkstra, C.** (1996). Increased daily work precipitates natural  
15 death in the kestrel. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **65**, 539-544.
- 16 **Drent, R. H. and Daan, S.** (1980). The prudent parent: energetic adjustments in avian  
17 breeding. *Ardea* **68**, 225-252.
- 18 **Drożdż, A.** (1975). Metabolic cages for small mammals. In *Methods for Ecological*  
19 *Bioenergetics, International Biological Programme Handbook No. 24* (ed. W. Grodzinski,  
20 R. Z. Klekowski and A. Duncan), pp. 346-351. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications.
- 21 **Duah, O. A., Monney, K. A., Hambly, C., Król, E. and Speakman, J. R.** (2013). Limits to  
22 sustained energy intake. XVII. Lactation performance in MF1 mice is not programmed by  
23 fetal number during pregnancy. *J. Exp. Biol.* **216**, 2339-2348.
- 24 **Freetly, H. C., Nienaber, J. A. and Brown-Brandl, T.** (2006). Partitioning of energy during  
25 lactation of primiparous beef cows. *J. Anim. Sci.* **84**, 2157-2162.
- 26 **Gamo, Y., Bernard, A., Mitchell, S. E., Hambly, C., Al Jothery, A., Vaanholt, L. M.,**  
27 **Król, E. and Speakman, J. R.** (2013). Limits to sustained energy intake. XVI. Body  
28 temperature and physical activity of female mice during pregnancy. *J. Exp. Biol.* **216**,  
29 2328-2338.
- 30 **Gębczyński, A.K.**, (2005). Daily variation of thermoregulatory costs in laboratory mice  
31 selected for high and low basal metabolic rate. *J. Therm. Biol.* **30**, 187-193
- 32 **Hammond, K. A. and Diamond, J.** (1992). An experimental test for a ceiling on sustained  
33 metabolic rate in lactating mice. *Physiol. Zool.* **65**, 952-977.



- 1 **Hammond, K. A. and Diamond, J.** (1994). Limits to dietary nutrient intake and intestinal  
2 nutrient uptake in lactating mice. *Physiol. Zool.* **67**, 282-303.
- 3 **Hammond, K. A. and Kristan, D. M.** (2000). Responses to lactation and cold exposure by  
4 deer mice (*Peromyscus maniculatus*). *Physiol. Biochem. Zool.* **73**, 547-556.
- 5 **Hammond, K. A., Konarzewski, M., Torres, R. M. and Diamond, J.** (1994). Metabolic  
6 ceilings under a combination of peak energy demands. *Physiol. Zool.* **67**, 1479-1506.
- 7 **Hammond, K. A., Lloyd, K. C. K. and Diamond, J.** (1996). Is mammary output capacity  
8 limiting to lactational performance in mice? *J. Exp. Biol.* **199**, 337-349.
- 9 **Hastings, I. M., Moruppa, S. M., Bünger, L. and Hill, W. G.** (1997). Effects of selection  
10 on food intake in the adult mouse. *J. Anim. Breed. Genet.* **114**, 419-434.
- 11 **Johnson, M. S. and Speakman, J. R.** (2001). Limits to sustained energy intake. V. Effect of  
12 cold-exposure during lactation in *Mus musculus*. *J. Exp. Biol.* **204**, 1967-1977.
- 13 **Johnson, M. S., Thomson S. C. and Speakman, J. R.** (2001a). Limits to sustained energy  
14 intake. I. Lactation in the laboratory mouse *Mus musculus*. *J. Exp. Biol.* **204**, 1925-1935.
- 15 **Johnson, M. S., Thomson, S. C. and Speakman, J. R.** (2001b). Limits to sustained energy  
16 intake. II. Inter-relationships between resting metabolic rate, life-history traits and  
17 morphology in *Mus musculus*. *J. Exp. Biol.* **204**, 1937-1946.
- 18 **Johnson, M. S., Thomson, S. C. and Speakman, J. R.** (2001c). Limits to sustained energy  
19 intake. III. Effects of concurrent pregnancy and lactation in *Mus musculus*. *J. Exp. Biol.*  
20 **204**, 1947-1956.
- 21 **Jolicoeur, L., Asselin, J. and Morisset, J.** (1980). Trophic effects of gestation and lactation  
22 on rat pancreas. *Biomed. Res.* **1**, 482-488.
- 23 **Kennedy, G. C., Pearce, W. M. and Parrott, D. M.** (1958). Liver growth in the lactating rat.  
24 *J. Endocrinol.* **17**, 158-160.
- 25 **Kirkwood, J. K.** (1983). A limit to metabolisable energy intake in mammals and birds.  
26 *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.* **75A**, 1-3.
- 27 **Koteja, P.** (1996). Limits to the energy budget in a rodent, *Peromyscus maniculatus*: does gut  
28 capacity set the limit? *Physiol. Zool.* **69**, 994-1020.
- 29 **Král, E. and Speakman, J. R.** (1999). Isotope dilution spaces of mice injected  
30 simultaneously with deuterium, tritium and oxygen-18. *J. Exp. Biol.* **202**, 2839-2849.
- 31 **Král, E. and Speakman, J. R.** (2003a). Limits to sustained energy intake. VI. Energetics of  
32 lactation in laboratory mice at thermoneutrality. *J. Exp. Biol.* **206**, 4255-4266.
- 33 **Král, E. and Speakman, J. R.** (2003b). Limits to sustained energy intake. VII. Milk energy  
34 output in laboratory mice at thermoneutrality. *J. Exp. Biol.* **206**, 4267-4281.

- 1 **Král, E., Johnson, M. S. and Speakman, J. R.** (2003). Limits to sustained energy  
2 intake.VIII. Resting metabolic rate and organ morphology of laboratory mice lactating at  
3 thermoneutrality. *J. Exp. Biol.* **206**, 4283-4291.
- 4 **Král, E., Murphy, M. and Speakman, J. R.** (2007). Limits to sustained energy intake. X.  
5 Effects of fur removal on reproductive performance in laboratory mice. *J. Exp. Biol.* **210**,  
6 4233-4243.
- 7 **Künkele, J.** (2000). Effects of litter size on the energetics of reproduction in a highly  
8 precocial rodent, the guinea pig. *J. Mammal.* **81**, 691-700.
- 9 **Laurien-Kehnen, C. and Trillmich, F.** (2003). Lactation performance of guinea pigs (*Cavia*  
10 *porcellus*) does not respond to experimental manipulation of pup demands. *Behav. Ecol.*  
11 *Sociobiol.* **53**, 145-152.
- 12 **Lifson, N., Gordon, G. B. and McClintock, R.** (1955). Measurements of total carbon  
13 dioxide production by means of  $D_2O^{18}$ . *J. Appl. Physiol.* **7**, 704-710.
- 14 **McDonald, J. M. and Nielsen, M. K.** (2006). Correlated responses in maternal performance  
15 following divergent selection for heat loss in mice. *J. Anim. Sci.* **84**, 300-304.
- 16 **Meijer, H. A. J., Neubert, R. E. M. and Visser, G. H.** (2000). Cross contamination in dual  
17 inlet isotope ratio mass spectrometers. *Int. J. Mass Spectrom.* **198**, 45-61.
- 18 **Nagy, K. A.** (1983). *The Doubly Labeled Water ( $^3HH^{18}O$ ) Method: A Guide to its Use*  
19 (*UCLA Publication no. 12-1417*). Los Angeles, CA: University of California.
- 20 **Nielsen, M. K., Jones, L. D., Freking, B. A. and DeShazer, J. A.** (1997a). Divergent  
21 selection for heat loss in mice: I. Selection applied and direct response through fifteen  
22 generations. *J. Anim. Sci.* **75**, 1461-1468.
- 23 **Nielsen, M. K., Freking, B. A., Jones, L. D., Nelson, S. M., Vorderstrasse, T. L. and**  
24 **Hussey, B. A.** (1997b). Divergent selection for heat loss in mice: II. Correlated responses  
25 in feed intake, body mass, body composition, and number born through fifteen  
26 generations. *J. Anim. Sci.* **75**, 1469-1476.
- 27 **Perrigo, G.** (1987). Breeding and feeding strategies in deer mice and house mice when  
28 females are challenged to work for their food. *Anim. Behav.* **35**, 1298-1316.
- 29 **Peterson, C. C., Nagy, K. A. and Diamond, J.** (1990). Sustained metabolic scope. *Proc.*  
30 *Natl. Acad. Sci.* **87**, 2324-2328.
- 31 **Piersma, T.** (2011). Why marathon migrants get away with high metabolic ceilings: towards  
32 an ecology of physiological restraint. *J. Exp. Biol.* **214**, 295-302.
- 33 **Piersma, T. and van Gils, J. A.** (2010). *The flexible phenotype: a body centred integration*  
34 *of ecology, physiology and behaviour*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- 1 **Piersma, T. and van ver Velde, M.** (2012). Dutch House Martins *Delichon urbicum* gain  
2 blood parasite infections over their lifetime, but do not seem to suffer. *J. Ornithol.* **153**,  
3 907-912.
- 4 **Rogowitz, G. L.** (1998). Limits to milk flow and energy allocation during lactation of the  
5 hispid cotton rat (*Sigmodon hispidus*). *Physiol. Zool.* **71**, 312-320.
- 6 **Romero, J. J., Canas, R., Baldwin, R. L. and Koong, L. J.** (1976). Lactational efficiency  
7 complex of rats: provisional model for interpretation of energy balance data. *J. Dairy Sci.*  
8 **59**, 57-67.
- 9 **Sadowska, J., Gebczynski, A. K. and Konarzewski, M.** (2013). Basal metabolic rate is  
10 positively correlated with parental investment in laboratory mice. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **280**,  
11 20122576.
- 12 **Scantlebury, M., Hynds, W., Booles, D. and Speakman, J. R.** (2000). Isotope recycling in  
13 lactating dogs (*Canis familiaris*). *Am. J. Physiol.* **278**, R669-R676.
- 14 **Selman, C., Lumsden, S., Bünger, L., Hill, W. G. and Speakman, J. R.** (2001a). Resting  
15 metabolic rate and morphology in mice (*Mus musculus*) selected for high and low food  
16 intake. *J. Exp. Biol.* **204**, 777-784.
- 17 **Selman, C., Korhonen, T., Bünger, L., Hill, W. G. and Speakman, J. R.** (2001b).  
18 Thermoregulatory responses of two mouse *Mus musculus* strains selectively bred for high  
19 and low food intake. *J. Comp. Physiol. B* **171**, 661-668.
- 20 **Sharp, G., Hill, W. G. and Robertson, A.** (1984). Effects of selection on growth, body  
21 composition, and food intake in mice. II. Responses in selected traits. *Genet. Res.* **43**, 75-  
22 92.
- 23 **Simons, M. J. P., Reimert, I., van der Vinne, V., Hambly, C., Vaanholt, L. M.,**  
24 **Speakman, J. R. and Gerkema, M. P.** (2011). Ambient temperature shapes reproductive  
25 output during pregnancy and lactation in the common vole (*Microtus arvalis*): a test of the  
26 heat dissipation limit theory. *J. Exp. Biol.* **214**, 38-49.
- 27 **Speakman, J. R.** (1997). *Doubly Labelled Water: Theory and Practice*. London: Chapman  
28 & Hall.
- 29 **Speakman, J. R.** (2008). The physiological costs of reproduction in small mammals. *Phil.*  
30 *Trans. R. Soc. B* **363**, 375-98.
- 31 **Speakman, J.R., Król, E., E. and Johnson, M.S.** (2004) The functional significance of  
32 individual variation in basal metabolic rate. *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology* **77**:  
33 900-915.

- 1 **Speakman, J. R. and Kráľ, E.** (2005a). Limits to sustained energy intake IX: a review of  
2 hypotheses. *J. Comp. Physiol. B* **175**, 375-394.
- 3 **Speakman, J. R. and Kráľ, E.** (2005b). Comparison of different approaches for the  
4 calculation of energy expenditure using doubly labeled water in a small mammal. *Physiol.*  
5 *Biochem. Zool.* **78**, 650-667.
- 6 **Speakman, J. R. and Kráľ, E.** (2010). Maximal heat dissipation capacity and hyperthermia  
7 risk: neglected key factors in the ecology of endotherms. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **79**, 726-746.
- 8 **Speakman, J. R. and Kráľ, E.** (2011). Limits to sustained energy intake. XIII. Recent  
9 progress and future perspectives. *J. Exp. Biol.* **214**, 230-341.
- 10 **Speakman, J. R. and McQueenie, J.** (1996). Limits to sustained metabolic rate: The link  
11 between food intake, basal metabolic rate, and morphology in reproducing mice, *Mus*  
12 *musculus*. *Physiol. Zool.* **69**, 746-769.
- 13 **Speakman, J. R. and Racey, P. A.** (1987). The equilibrium concentration of O-18 in body  
14 water: implications for the accuracy of the doubly-labeled water technique and a potential  
15 new method of measuring RQ in free-living animals. *J. Theor. Biol.* **127**, 79-95.
- 16 **Speakman, J. R. and Racey, P. A.** (1988b). Consequences of non steady-state CO<sub>2</sub>  
17 production for accuracy of the doubly labeled water technique – the importance of  
18 recapture interval. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.* **90A**, 337-340.
- 19 **Speakman, J. R., Nagy, K. A., Masman, D., Mook, W. G., Poppitt, S. D., Strathearn, G.**  
20 **E. and Racey, P. A.** (1990). Interlaboratory comparison of different analytical techniques  
21 for the determination of O-18 abundance. *Anal. Chem.* **62**, 703-708.
- 22 **Speakman, J. R., Racey, P. A., Haim, A., Webb, P. I., Ellison, G. T. H. and Skinner, J. D.**  
23 (1994). Interindividual and intraindividual variation in daily energy expenditure of the  
24 pouched mouse (*Saccostomus campestris*). *Funct. Ecol.* **8**, 336-342.
- 25 **Vaanholt, L. M., Sinclair, R. E. and Speakman, J. R.** (2013). Limits to sustained energy  
26 intake. XIV. Heritability of reproductive performance in mice. *J. Exp. Biol.* **216**, 2308-  
27 2315.
- 28 **Valencak, T. G. and Ruf, T.** (2009). Energy turnover in European hares is centrally limited  
29 during early, but not during peak lactation. *J. Comp. Physiol. B* **179**, 933-943.
- 30 **Valencak, T. G., Tataruch, F. and Ruf, T.** (2009). Peak energy turnover in lactating  
31 European hares: the role of fat reserves. *J. Exp. Biol.* **212**, 231-237.
- 32 **Valencak, T. G., Hackländer, K. and Ruf, T.** (2010). Peak energy turnover in lactating  
33 European hares: a test of the heat dissipation limitation hypothesis. *J. Exp. Biol.* **213**,  
34 2832-2839.

- 1 **Valencak, T. G., Wright, P., Weir, A., Mitchell, S. E., Vaanholt, L. M., Hambly, C., Krđ,**  
2 **E. and Speakman, J. R.** (2013). Limits to sustained energy intake. XXI. Effect of  
3 exposing the mother, but not her pups, to a cold environment during lactation in mice. *J.*  
4 *Exp. Biol.* **216**, 4326-4333.
- 5 **Visser, G. H. and Schekkerman, H.** (1999). Validation of the doubly labeled water method  
6 in growing precocial birds: the importance of assumptions concerning. *Physiol. Biochem.*  
7 *Zool.* **72**, 740-749.
- 8 **Visser, G. H., Dekinga, A., Achterkamp, B. and Piersma, T.** (2000a). Ingested water  
9 equilibrates isotopically with the body water pool of a shorebird with unrivaled water  
10 fluxes. *Am. J. Physiol.* **279**, R1795-R1804.
- 11 **Visser, G. H., Boon, P. E. and Meijer, H. A. J.** (2000b). Validation of the doubly labeled  
12 water method in Japanese Quail *Coturnix c. japonica* chicks: is there an effect of growth  
13 rate? *J. Comp. Physiol. B* **170**, 365-372.
- 14 **Weiner, J.** (1989). Metabolic constraints to mammalian energy budgets. *Acta Theriol.* **34**, 3-  
15 35.
- 16 **Weiner, J.** (1992). Physiological limits to energy budgets sustainable in birds and mammals:  
17 ecological implications. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **7**, 384-388.
- 18 **Weir, J. B. de V.** (1949). New methods for calculating metabolic rate with special reference  
19 to protein metabolism. *J. Physiol.* **109**, 1-9.
- 20 **Wilde, C. J., Knight, C. H. and Racey, P. A.** (1999). Influence of torpor on milk protein  
21 composition and secretion in lactating bats. *J. Exp. Zool.* **284**, 35-41.
- 22 **Wu, S. H., Zhang, L. N., Speakman, J. R. and Wang, D. H.** (2009). Limits to sustained  
23 energy intake. XI. A test of the heat dissipation limitation hypothesis in lactating Brandt's  
24 voles (*Lasiopodomys brandtii*). *J. Exp. Biol.* **212**, 3455-3465.
- 25 **Yang, D. B., Li, L., Wang, L. P., Chi, Q. S., Hambly, C., Wang, D. H. and Speakman, J.**  
26 **R.** (2013). Limits to sustained energy intake. XIX. A test of the heat dissipation limitation  
27 hypothesis in Mongolian gerbils (*Meriones unguiculatus*). *J. Exp. Biol.* **216**, 3358-3368.
- 28 **Zhang, X. Y. and Wang, D. H.** (2007). Thermogenesis, food intake and serum leptin in  
29 cold-exposed lactating Brandt's voles *Lasiopodomys brandtii*. *J. Exp. Biol.* **210**, 512-521.
- 30 **Zhao, Z. J. and Cao, J.** (2009). Effect of fur removal on the thermal conductance and energy  
31 budget in lactating Swiss mice. *J. Exp. Biol.* **212**, 2541-2549.
- 32 **Zhao, Z. J., Chi, Q. S. and Cao, J.** (2010). Milk energy output during peak lactation in  
33 shaved Swiss mice. *Physiol. Behav.* **101**, 59-66.

- 1 **Zhao, Z. J., Král, E., Moille, S., Gamo, Y. and Speakman, J. R.** (2013a). Limits to  
 2 sustained energy intake. XV. Effects of wheel-running on the energy budget during  
 3 lactation. *J. Exp. Biol.* **216**, 2316-2327.
- 4 **Zhao, Z. J., Song, D., Su, Z., Wei, W., Liu, X. and Speakman, J. R.** (2013b). Limits to  
 5 sustained energy intake. XVIII. Energy intake and reproductive output during lactation in  
 6 Swiss mice raising small litters. *J. Exp. Biol.* **216**, 2349-2358.

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 **Figure legends**

18 **Fig. 1. Parameters of energy budget in MH mice (filled circles) and ML mice (open**  
 19 **circles) raising natural litters.** (A) Mean body mass ( $\pm$  s.e.m.) during baseline, pregnancy  
 20 and lactation (for sample size details, see Results). (B) Relationship between faecal  
 21 production and daily food intake in lactating MH ( $N=32$ ) and lactating ML mice ( $N=21$ ). The  
 22 fitted line represents a linear regression ( $y=0.65+0.11x$ ,  $r^2=0.61$ ) for the pooled data ( $N=53$ ).  
 23 (C) Mean metabolisable energy intake ( $\pm$  s.e.m.) during baseline, pregnancy and lactation (for  
 24 sample size details, see Results). (D) Relationship between body mass changes (days 15-18)  
 25 and metabolisable energy intake changes (days 15-18) for lactating MH ( $N=49$ ). The fitted  
 26 line represents a linear regression ( $y=0.03+0.03x$ ,  $r^2=0.30$ ).

27  
28 **Fig. 2. Estimated values of asymptotic metabolisable energy intake (days 13-15 of**  
 29 **lactation) in MH mice ( $N=49$ , filled circles) and ML mice ( $N=24$ , open circles) raising**  
 30 **natural litters.** MEI plotted against (A) body mass at peak lactation (MH:  $y=-41.03+8.25x$ ,  
 31  $r^2=0.20$ ; ML:  $y=-269.32+13.74x$ ,  $r^2=0.61$ ), (B) litter size at weaning (MH:  $y=125.4+14.57x$ ,  
 32  $r^2=0.27$ ; ML:  $y=43.50+19.25x$ ,  $r^2=0.75$ ), (C) litter mass at weaning (MH and ML pooled:  
 33  $y=53.67+2.53x$ ,  $r^2=0.53$ ).

34

1 **Fig. 3. Daily energy expenditure (DEE) and metabolisable energy intake (MEI) in MH**  
 2 **mice ( $N=32$ , filled circles) and ML mice ( $N=21$ , open circles) raising natural litters.** Both  
 3 parameters were measured at peak lactation. The fitted line represents a linear regression  
 4 ( $y=43.39+0.22x$ ,  $r^2=0.61$ ) for the pooled data ( $N=53$ ).

6 **Fig. 4. Milk energy output (MEO) in MH mice ( $N=32$ , filled circles) and ML mice ( $N=21$ ,**  
 7 **open circles) raising natural litters.** MEO plotted against (A) body mass at peak lactation  
 8 (MH:  $y=45.85+5.36x$ ,  $r^2=0.22$ ; ML:  $y=71.48+4.31x$ ,  $r^2=0.20$ ), (B) litter size at weaning (MH:  
 9  $y=57.62+9.21x$ ,  $r^2=0.26$ ; ML:  $y=29.19+5.44x$ ,  $r^2=0.20$ ), (C) litter mass at weaning (MH:  
 10  $y=29.24+1.36x$ ,  $r^2=0.42$ ; ML:  $y=25.58+0.78x$ ,  $r^2=0.22$ ), (D) pup mass at weaning (MH:  
 11  $y=37.10+8.17x$ ,  $r^2=0.06$ ; ML:  $y=81.72-3.10x$ ,  $r^2=0.01$ ).

13 **Fig. 5. Parameters of reproductive performance in MH mice ( $N=49$ , filled circles) and**  
 14 **ML mice ( $N=24$ , open circles) raising natural litters.** Litter mass (A), mean pup mass (B),  
 15 and mean litter growth rate (C) throughout lactation. The data are expressed as mean  $\pm$  s.e.m.

16 **Fig. 6. Litter and pup masses at weaning for MH mice ( $N=49$ , filled circles) and ML**  
 17 **mice ( $N=24$ , open circles) raising natural litters.** Litter mass (A) (MH:  $y=22.47+6.38x$ ,  
 18  $r^2=0.73$ ; ML,  $y=8.22+6.16x$ ,  $r^2=0.92$ ) and pup mass (B) (MH:  $y=12.58-0.4x$ ,  $r^2=0.40$ ; ML,  
 19  $y=9.09-0.2x$ ,  $r^2=0.34$ ) are plotted against litter size at weaning.

21 **Fig. 7. Metabolisable energy intake (MEI) on day 18 of lactation MH mice ( $N=22$ , filled**  
 22 **circles) and ML mice ( $N=14$ , open circles) raising natural litters.** MEI plotted against (A)  
 23 wet masses of empty gut (MH:  $y=18.22+77.01x$ ,  $r^2=0.44$ ; ML:  $y=12.94+48.02x$ ,  $r^2=0.20$ ), (B)  
 24 length of small intestine (MH:  $y=199.36+8.13x$ ,  $r^2=0.38$ ; ML:  $y=255.26+7.77x$ ,  $r^2=0.32$ ).

26 **Fig. 8. Wet masses of mammary gland at the end of lactation in MH mice ( $N=22$ , filled**  
 27 **circles) and ML mice ( $N=15$ , open circles) raising natural litters.** Mean mass of wet  
 28 mammary gland plotted against (A) milk energy output (MH:  $y=2.15+0.07x$ ,  $r^2=0.10$ ; ML:  
 29  $y=2.03+0.02x$ ,  $r^2=0.22$ ), (B) metabolisable energy intake (MH:  $y=2.15+0.01x$ ,  $r^2=0.11$ ; ML:  
 30  $y=1.03+0.01x$ ,  $r^2=0.28$ ), (C) daily energy expenditure (MH:  $y=1.30+0.02x$ ,  $r^2=0.14$ ; ML:  
 31  $y=0.73+0.03x$ ,  $r^2=0.12$ ).

32

1 **Fig. 9. Parameters of energy budget in H-L mice (filled circles) and L-H mice (open**  
 2 **circles) raising cross-fostered pups.** (A) Mean body mass ( $\pm$  s.e.m.) during pregnancy and  
 3 lactation (for sample size details, see Results). (B) Relationship between faecal production  
 4 and daily food intake in lactating H-L ( $N=6$ ) and lactating L-H mice ( $N=9$ ). The fitted line  
 5 represents a linear regression ( $y=0.5+0.09x$ ,  $r^2=0.24$ ) for the pooled data ( $N=15$ ). (C) Mean  
 6 metabolisable energy intake ( $\pm$  s.e.m.) during pregnancy and lactation (for sample size details,  
 7 see Results). (D) Relationship between body mass changes (days 15-18) and metabolisable  
 8 energy intake changes (days 15-18) for lactating H-L ( $N=10$ ). The fitted line represents a  
 9 linear regression ( $y=1.17+0.04x$ ,  $r^2=0.62$ ).

10

11 **Fig. 10. Estimated values of asymptotic metabolisable energy intake (days 13-15 of**  
 12 **lactation) in H-L mice ( $N=10$ , filled circles) and L-H mice ( $N=11$ , open circles) raising**  
 13 **cross-fostered pups.** MEI plotted against (A) body mass at peak lactation (H-L:  $y=-68.24+$   
 14  $8.77x$ ,  $r^2=0.39$ ; L-H:  $y=-47.22+6.90x$ ,  $r^2=0.74$ ), (B) litter size at weaning (H-L:  
 15  $y=178.07+8.94x$ ,  $r^2=0.23$ ; L-H:  $y=103.15+8.3x$ ,  $r^2=0.50$ ), (C) litter mass at weaning (H-L:  
 16  $y=117.03+1.8x$ ,  $r^2=0.48$ ; L-H:  $y=71.85+1.55x$ ,  $r^2=0.63$ ).

17

18 **Fig. 11. Milk energy output (MEO) in H-L mice ( $N=6$ , filled circles) and L-H mice ( $N=8$ ,**  
 19 **open circles) raising cross-fostered pups.** MEO plotted against (A) body mass at peak  
 20 lactation (H-L:  $y=2.92+4.15x$ ,  $r^2=0.18$ ; L-H:  $y=-147.22+7.33x$ ,  $r^2=0.74$ ), (B) litter size at  
 21 weaning (C) litter mass at weaning (H-L:  $y=141.50+0.12x$ ,  $r^2=0.001$ ; L-H,  $y=8.71+0.136x$ ,  
 22  $r^2=0.25$ ), (D) pup mass at weaning (H-L:  $y=-70.78+23.77x$ ,  $r^2=0.68$ ; L-H:  $y=92.87-2.03x$ ,  
 23  $r^2=0.007$ ).

24

25 **Fig. 12. Parameters of reproductive performance in H-L mice ( $N=10$ , filled circles) and**  
 26 **L-H mice ( $N=11$ , open circles) raising cross-fostered pups.** Litter mass (A), mean pup  
 27 mass (B), and mean litter growth rate (C) throughout lactation. The data are expressed as  
 28 mean  $\pm$  s.e.m.

29

30 **Fig. 13. Mean of litter size at weaning in MH mice ( $N=49$ , filled circles) and ML mice**  
 31 **( $N=24$ , open circles) raising natural litters.** Litter size plotted against (A) litter mass at  
 32 weaning (H-L:  $y=24.39+6.23x$ ,  $r^2=0.75$ ; L-H,  $y=17.06+5.79x$ ,  $r^2=0.97$ ), (B) pup mass at  
 33 weaning (H-L:  $y=13.43-0.51x$ ,  $r^2=0.55$ ; L-H:  $y=11.7-0.43x$ ,  $r^2=0.73$ ).

34



1 Table 1. Reproductive performance of lactating mice with high (MH) and low (ML) thermal  
 2 conductance, raising natural litters. Values are means  $\pm$  s.e.m.;  $N=49$  and  $N=24$  for MH and  
 3 ML, respectively (body mass, litter size, litter mass, and pup mass);  $N=32$  and  $N=21$  for MH  
 4 and ML, respectively (MEI, DEE, and MEO).

Trait	MH mice	ML mice
Body mass (g) on day 15	31.9 $\pm$ 0.4	30.9 $\pm$ 0.7
MEI (kJ day <sup>-1</sup> ) over days 12-14	209.6 $\pm$ 6.3	128.1 $\pm$ 6.3
DEE (kJ day <sup>-1</sup> ) over days 15-17	90.7 $\pm$ 2.3	71.5 $\pm$ 1.9
MEO (kJ day <sup>-1</sup> )	118.9 $\pm$ 5.3	56.6 $\pm$ 5.4
Litter size at weaning	6.7 $\pm$ 0.3	5.7 $\pm$ 0.6
Litter mass (g) at weaning	65.2 $\pm$ 2.1	43.4 $\pm$ 3.0
Pup mass (g) at weaning	9.9 $\pm$ 0.2	7.8 $\pm$ 0.2

7  
 8 MEI, metabolisable energy intake; DEE, daily energy expenditure; MEO, milk energy output.  
 9

1 Table 2. Reproductive performance of lactating mice with high (MH) and low (ML), raising  
 2 cross-fostered ML and MH pups. Values are means  $\pm$  s.e.m.;  $N=10$  and  $N=11$  for H-L and L-  
 3 H, respectively (body mass, litter size, litter mass, and pup mass);  $N=6$  and  $N=8$  for H-L and  
 4 L-H, respectively (MEI, DEE, and MEO).

5

Trait	MH mothers with ML pups (H-L)	ML mothers with MH pups (L-H)
Body mass (g) on day 15	35.2 $\pm$ 0.6	30.8 $\pm$ 1.2
MEI (kJ day <sup>-1</sup> ) over days 13-15	248.9 $\pm$ 8.1	160.2 $\pm$ 12
DEE (kJ day <sup>-1</sup> ) over days 15-17	98.5 $\pm$ 8.3	84.5 $\pm$ 8.4
MEO (kJ day <sup>-1</sup> )	150.4 $\pm$ 13.6	75.8 $\pm$ 10.1
Litter size at weaning	7.2 $\pm$ 0.5	7.5 $\pm$ 0.8
Litter mass (g) at weaning	69.3 $\pm$ 3.4	60.3 $\pm$ 5.0
Pup mass (g) at weaning	9.8 $\pm$ 0.3	8.5 $\pm$ 0.4

6

7 MEI, metabolisable energy intake; DEE, daily energy expenditure; MEO, milk energy output.

1 Table 3. Results of doubly labelled water measurements of daily energy expenditure  
 2 performed on lactating mice with high (MH) and low (ML) thermal conductance, raising  
 3 natural or cross- fostered ML and MH pups.

Trait	Experiment with natural litters		Experiment with cross-fostered litters	
	MH mice	ML mice	MH mothers with ML pups (H-L)	ML mothers with MH pups (L-H)
Body mass (g) <sup>a</sup>	31.8±0.5	29.7±0.5	35.4±0.9	30.4±1.6
$k_d$ (h <sup>-1</sup> ) <sup>b</sup>	0.052±0.003	0.054±0.005	0.032±0.001	0.03±0.002
$k_o$ (h <sup>-1</sup> ) <sup>c</sup>	0.073±0.004	0.073±0.006	0.043±0.002	0.040±0.003
$k_o/k_d$	1.410±0.009	1.380±0.019	1.372±0.032	1.38±0.030
$N_d$ (% of body mass) <sup>d</sup>	73.8±0.6	70.2±0.8	80.5±2.1	82.6±2.9
$N_o$ (% of body mass) <sup>d</sup>	69.5±0.6	65.9±0.8	70.1±0.4	71.7±1.2
$N_d/N_o$	1.062±0.006	1.073±0.005	1.153±0.030	1.15±0.032
DEE (kJ day <sup>-1</sup> ) <sup>e</sup>	90.7±2.3	71.5±1.9	98.5±8.3	84.5±8.4

5  
 6 Values are means ± s.e.m.;  $N=32$  for MH lactating mice;  $N=21$  for ML lactating mice  
 7 (experiment with natural litters) and  $N=6$  for H-L lactating mice;  $N=8$  for L-H lactating mice  
 8 (experiment with cross-fostered litters).

9 <sup>a</sup>Body mass before injection; <sup>b</sup>elimination rate of <sup>2</sup>H; <sup>c</sup>elimination rate of <sup>18</sup>O; <sup>d</sup>deuterium ( $N_d$ )  
 10 and oxygen ( $N_o$ ) dilution spaces expressed as % of body mass before injection; <sup>e</sup>daily energy  
 11 expenditure measured over days 15-17 of lactation.

1 Table 4. Wet masses of tissues and organs of lactating MH ( $N=22$ ) and ML ( $N=15$ ) mice and  
 2 non-reproductive MH and ML ( $N=10$  for both lines) mice. Values are presented as mean  $\pm$   
 3 sem. P values indicate statistical significance of effects. Line, reproductive status, interaction  
 4 between line and reproductive status, interaction between line and body mass, interaction  
 5 between reproductive status and body mass, and interaction among three traits were used in a  
 6 GLM model. Body mass at dissecting day minus the organ mass being considered as the  
 7 dependent variable was used as a covariate for organ mass parameters. Body mass at day of  
 8 dissection was used as a covariate for organ length parameters. Non-significant interactions  
 9 were removed from the models.

	Organ wet mass (g)				Organ length (cm)			
	BAT	Mammary gland	Full gut	Empty gut	Small intestine	Large intestine	Caecum	Whole gut
<b>Means</b>								
Lactating MH mice	0.083 $\pm$ 0.002	3.03 $\pm$ 0.2	4.28 $\pm$ 0.2	1.99 $\pm$ 0.1	45.7 $\pm$ 0.5	8.2 $\pm$ 0.3	3.3 $\pm$ 0.16	57.2 $\pm$ 0.6
Lactating ML mice	0.076 $\pm$ 0.004	2.89 $\pm$ 0.2	4.93 $\pm$ 0.3	2.32 $\pm$ 0.1	49.1 $\pm$ 0.7	7.8 $\pm$ 0.4	3.3 $\pm$ 0.21	60.2 $\pm$ 1.0
Non-reproductive MH mice	0.077 $\pm$ 0.003		2.50 $\pm$ 0.1	1.69 $\pm$ 0.1	41.2 $\pm$ 0.6	7.4 $\pm$ 0.3	2.0 $\pm$ 0.15	50.6 $\pm$ 0.5
Non-reproductive ML mice	0.086 $\pm$ 0.005		2.83 $\pm$ 0.2	1.94 $\pm$ 0.1	45.5 $\pm$ 1.0	7.3 $\pm$ 0.3	2.2 $\pm$ 0.13	54.9 $\pm$ 1.3
<b>Statistics</b>								
Line	$P=0.005^a$	ns	$P=0.003^b$	$P<0.001^b$	$P<0.001^b$	ns	ns	$P<0.001^b$
RS	ns		$P<0.001^c$	$P=0.002^c$	$P<0.001^c$	ns	$P<0.001^b$	$P<0.001^c$
BM	$P=0.007$	$P=0.009$	$P=0.005$	$P<0.001$	$P=0.001$	ns	ns	$P<0.001$
Line x RS	$P=0.031$		ns	$P=0.007$	Ns	ns	ns	ns
Line x BM	$P=0.005$	ns	ns	Ns	Ns	ns	ns	ns
RS x BM	ns		ns	Ns	Ns	ns	ns	ns
Line x RS x BM	ns		ns	Ns	Ns	ns	ns	ns

10

11

12 RS, reproductive status; BM, body mass minus respective organ mass; ns, not significant  
 13 ( $P>0.05$ ); <sup>a</sup>MH > ML; <sup>b</sup>ML > MH; <sup>c</sup>Lactating mice > non-reproductive mice.

14





























