



Archived at the Flinders Academic Commons:

<http://dspace.flinders.edu.au/dspace/>

This is the authors' version of an article published in *Conservation Genetics*. The final publication is available at Springer via

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10592-013-0529-0>

doi:[10.1007/s10592-013-0529-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10592-013-0529-0)

Please cite this article as:

Schofield JA, Gardner MG, Fenner AL, Bull CM (2014)
Promiscuous mating in the endangered Australian lizard
Tiliqua adelaidensis: a potential windfall for its
conservation. *Conservation Genetics* 15, 177-185

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013. All
rights reserved. **Please note** that any alterations made
during the publishing process may not appear in this
version.

Promiscuous mating in the endangered Australian lizard *Tiliqua adelaidensis*: a potential windfall for its conservation.

Julie A. Schofield¹, Michael G. Gardner^{1,2} Aaron L. Fenner¹, and C. Michael Bull¹

¹School of Biological Sciences, Flinders University, GPO Box 2100, Adelaide, SA 5001, Australia.

²Evolutionary Biology Unit, South Australian Museum, North Terrace Adelaide 5000 South Australia.

Corresponding author: Julie.Schofield@flinders.edu.au

Abstract

Studies have revealed an unsuspected complexity in social systems within a few lizard species, including group living, long-term monogamy and individual recognition of partners or offspring. Comparisons among these species and their relatives could provide valuable insights, allowing us to investigate traits that are shared across social systems and identify general principles relating to the evolution of sociality. The endangered pygmy bluetongue lizard, *Tiliqua adelaidensis*, is a member species in the *Egernia* group, but is thought to show a more solitary social structure than other members in this group. Within this study we used microsatellite markers to determine the mating system of *T. adelaidensis*. Unlike many other species in the *Egernia* group, we found a predominately promiscuous mating system in *T. adelaidensis*. We detected multiple paternity in 75% of litters. Of the 70 males identified as having fathered juveniles, only five were identified as mating with the same female in more than one year and only three were identified as the father of juveniles with the same female in

consecutive years. The genetic evidence suggested that partners were chosen randomly with respect to the level of relatedness among neighbouring lizards. However, mated lizards were geographically closer to each other than expected by random chance. Multiple paternities rely on the opportunity for males to encounter multiple females during the period when they are receptive to mating, and this may depend on population densities. Drivers for the polygamous mating system may be the single occupancy burrow and the central place territorial defence of those burrows in *T. adelaidensis*. We propose a fourth mating system for the *Egernia* group: polygyny within stable non-social colonies.

Key Words

Multiple paternity, polygamy, lizard sociality

Introduction:

Species within many taxonomic groups display a range of social behaviours from those that live in highly social groups, often providing some level of parental care to their young, to species where individuals are normally isolated, contacting only for reproduction, and providing little or no parental care. The mating system of a species is defined by the number and frequency of mating partners, and is often linked to the form of social organization. The mating system can also influence mating success, gene flow within and between populations, and the ability to recolonize newly available habitat and avoid inbreeding (Greenwood 1980). Many species have evolved social mechanisms and mating systems in large, continuous habitats, but now occupy isolated fragments of habitat, with consequential impacts on their dispersal and mating systems (Stow et al. 2001, Levy et al. 2010). Knowledge of the mating system and how it has changed with restricted dispersal is an important component in the sustained management of these species.

How have different mating systems and levels of sociality evolved among related species? Studies of variation among the members of a single clade can provide insights into the relevant selective factors (Oliver and Sachser 2011). Over two decades of field studies have revealed that one Australian lizard clade, the *Egernia* group of skinks, includes species with a variety of social systems (Bull 2000, Gardner et al. 2002, O'Connor and Shine 2003, Stow and Sunnucks 2004; Chapple 2003). The *Egernia* group is a monophyletic lineage that includes six primarily Australian genera *Egernia*, *Liopholis*, *Bellatorias*, *Lissolepis*, *Tiliqua*, and *Cyclodomorphus*, and one Melanesian genus *Corucia* (Gardner et al. 2008).

A large proportion of species in the *Egernia* group live in mixed sex social aggregations, often comprising related individuals, with shared refuges or home sites (Chapple 2003). Monogamy appears to be the most common mating strategy in the social, sedentary species, such as those that live in social groups on isolated rocky outcrops (e.g. *Egernia stokesii*

(Gardner et al 2002), *E. saxatilis* (O'Connor and Shine 2003), *E. cunninghami* (Stow et al 2004), and *Liopholis whitii* (Chapple and Keogh 2005), those that have large multi generational groups co-occurring in extended burrow systems (e.g. *Liopholis kintorei* (McAlpin et al.2011)), or those that have limited movement (e.g. *Tiliqua rugosa* (Bull 2000)). Uller and Olsson (2008) predicted that females of species with low population densities during the reproductive season and of species with strong pair-bonding, should have fewer encounters with alternative mating partners during the female receptive phase, and thus have lower levels of multiple paternity. In several well studied social species in the *Egernia* group, monogamous mate fidelity is high among years, and multiple paternity is low within years (Chapple 2003, Uller and Olsson 2008).

The genus *Tiliqua*, embedded within the *Egernia* clade, does not appear to share the high levels of social grouping of its sister taxa. Field work on *T. rugosa* has shown monogamous pairings during breeding seasons that can persist for over 20 yrs (Bull 2000), but no evidence of more extended kin group associations (Bull and Baghurst 1998). The more mobile *T. scincoides* appears to be primarily asocial, with males occupying individual territories and mating polygamously with overlapping females (Cogger 2000, Koenig et al. 2001).

The pygmy bluetongue lizard (*Tiliqua adelaidensis*) is a cryptic species found in native grasslands in the geographical region referred to as the mid north of the state of South Australia. Individual lizards live up to 9 yrs (Milne 1999) and spend the majority of their time alone, refuging in abandoned spider burrows, or basking, and at the burrow entrance from where they ambush passing invertebrate prey (Hutchinson et al. 1994, Milne et al. 2003). Each burrow is occupied by one individual and in both males and females their range of normal activity extends no more than 5cm from their burrow entrance (Fenner and Bull 2011). Mating occurs in the spring months in October and November (Milne 1999, Milne et al. 2003, Fenner and Bull 2009). Adult males move away from their burrows, seeking

females to mate with during this period (Schofield et al 2012). Video recorded matings have been brief encounters between a burrow resident and another lizard moving up to the burrow, apparently in search of a mate (Milne et al. 2003, Fenner and Bull 2009, Ebrahimi pers.comm.). Females produce one litter of up to four live young per year and can breed in consecutive years (Milne et al. 2002). Some neonates begin dispersing from the natal burrow within a week after birth and by 5 weeks most of the juveniles have left the natal burrow, leading to early separation of the mother and her offspring (Milne et al. 2002). Alternatively, some females move to a new burrow soon after the birth, leaving the juvenile to inhabit the natal burrow (Milne et al. 2002). Apart from the brief contacts during mating, and the short shared occupancy of natal burrows, there are no records of social aggregations in this species. Smith et al. (2009) reported restricted gene flow even between closely adjacent populations, and moderate levels of genetic differentiation among sites with F_{ST} varying from 0.021 – 0.091. They found no evidence of population genetic bottlenecks and little evidence of inbreeding due to consanguineous mating. Individual populations had observed heterozygosities ranging from 0.75 to 0.82 (Smith et al 2009).

However, the secretive lifestyle of this species makes it difficult to observe whether there are any social associations among neighbouring lizards, or whether the mating system is polygamous as may be predicted if this is a more asocial species. We used genetic analysis to identify the parents of juvenile pygmy bluetongue lizards in populations from two locations, and to determine the mating system used by this species. We had two aims. The first was to provide an additional comparative case within the *Egernia* clade to allow new insights into the evolution of sociality within that group. The second was to provide vital information for modeling population genetics and demography, and determining conservation strategies, within isolated populations of this endangered species.

113

114 **Methods**

115 **Field sampling**

116 Lizards were sampled from two localities in native grassland, 11kms apart, and both within
117 20 km east of Burra, South Australia (33° 42'S; 138° 56'E). In the spring and summer of
118 2005/2006 we searched 11 – 12 ha at each locality and captured 160 lizards from locality 1
119 and 63 lizards from locality 2. In a second sampling period which included the two spring
120 and summer seasons of 2008/2009 and 2009/2010, we captured 353 individual lizards within
121 three 1.2 ha enclosures. One enclosure site was at locality 1 and two enclosure sites, 1 km
122 apart, were at locality 2. Each enclosure site had four 110 m long trap lines set in a square
123 (and thus enclosing an area of 1.2 ha) (Fig1). Each trap line had a 15 cm high black-plastic
124 drift fence and 16 bucket traps (20 litre, 38 cm deep, 28.5 cm diameter), placed immediately
125 under the drift fence, and spaced at 7 m intervals along its length (Figure 1). We attempted to
126 capture most of the resident lizards in each site first by setting the pitfall traplines and
127 trapping for 43,000 trap days over the entire sampling period (Schofield et al. 2012). We also
128 searched the inside of each enclosure each month for any occupied burrows that we could
129 detect, and attempted to lure individuals to the surface with mealworms following the method
130 of Milne et al. (1999). We sampled blood from those resident lizards that we were able to
131 capture.

132 Each captured lizard, was individually marked by toe clip and its sex, mass, snout-to-vent
133 length (SVL), and GPS location were recorded. Lizards were classified into neonates up to 6
134 months old (SVL <50mm), sub adults up to 18 months old (SVL51-80mm) or adults (SVL>
135 80mm), following Milne (1999). Among adults, sex was determined by the larger head size
136 and shorter body of males (Hutchinson et al 1994). Between late Jan and early March,

females produce a live litter of up to four offspring which remain in the maternal burrow with their mother for periods varying from a few days to several weeks (Milne et al. 2002). We recorded each case where neonates were found in the same burrow as an adult female, and, where possible, we also sampled blood or toe clips from these individuals. Sub-adults within enclosures could have moved there before the enclosure walls were erected, and their parents may not necessarily have been within the sampling area.

DNA extraction and PCR amplification

A blood sample from a clipped toe was stored on FTA paper (Whatman, Maidstone), and DNA was extracted following the procedure for nucleated erythrocytes (Smith and Burgoyne 2004). Individual genotypes for 561 lizards were determined at 15 previously described polymorphic microsatellite loci: Est12 (Gardner, et al. 1999), TrL9, TrL12, TrL14, TrL15, TrL16, TrL19, TrL21, TrL27, TrL28, TrL29, TrL32, TrL34, TrL35 and TrL37 (Gardner et al. 2008). Multiplex PCR conditions followed Gardner et al. (2008) with amplicons genotyped on an ABI 3730 capillary electrophoresis DNA analyser (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA). A fluorescently labelled size standard (GS500 (-250) LIZ) was run with the samples and alleles were scored using GeneMapper software version 3.7 (Applied Biosystems) with manual checking.

Hardy-Weinberg disequilibrium and linkage

We tested whether any individual locus had null alleles or deviated from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE), and whether there was any linkage disequilibrium (LD) between pairs of loci, using GENEPOP 4.0.10 (Raymond and Rousset 1995, Rousset 2008). We obtained a

larger sample for these tests by combining our data from this study with genotypes for 34 additional lizards reported by Smith et al. (2009) from a separate but nearby locality (locality 6 of Smith et al. (2009) 1 km from locality 1, and 6km from locality 2). We ran the HWE and LD tests separately on adults from each locality to determine if there were consistent patterns. P-values were adjusted for multiple testing by the sequential Bonferroni method (Holm 1979) when appropriate.

Parentage analysis

For each juvenile, whether it was captured in the first or second sampling period, we searched for potential parents from among all of the adults sampled from the same location over both sampling periods. We used adult genotypes at the 15 microsatellite loci in the program CERVUS 3.03 to assign parents to genotyped juveniles. The following simulation parameters were used: 100,000 cycles, 70% of the candidate parents sampled, 88% of loci typed and a genotyping error rate of 1%. We accepted that we had sampled the true parents when the confidence level exceeded 95%. Adults that were assigned as parents but that mismatched their presumed offspring at > 2 loci were disregarded as inferred parents. Juveniles were assumed to be siblings from the same litter if they were allocated the same mother and were born in the same year. The simulations were also performed using an input parameter of 50% of candidate parents sampled but as there was no difference we only present the results for 70%.

To assess the levels of monogamy and polygamy among adult lizards, we used CERVUS 3.03 and COLONY 2.0 to determine sib-groups and to predict the number of unsampled parents. We assumed a polygamous mating system with no inbreeding as the populations were in HWE. The marker type, allelic dropout rate and other error rates that were used can be found in Online Resource 1. The probability that a parent was in the sample was tested at

50% and 70%. The results were the same for both, therefore probabilities were set at 70%. A probability of 70% was chosen because the cryptic nature of the lizards made it unlikely we had sampled of all the adults. Paternal and maternal relationships derived from the CERVUS results were entered as Known Paternal and Known Maternal data sets. We then used COLONY to simultaneously infer sibship and parentage using a full-pedigree likelihood method (Jones and Wang 2009). Not all potential parents were sampled during our studies and our estimates may not be an accurate reflection of all of the matings that had taken place. However as we had good discrimination with our loci (Smith et al 2009) any potential bias would be minimal. The mean heterozygosities of litters fathered by single or multiple fathers were compared using a paired sample t-test. Allelic richness could not be estimated with confidence due to the small sample size.

Where we identified both parents and knew their actual locations when sampled, we investigated whether individual parents showed any evidence for a preference for less related individuals as mating partners. To do this we compared the relatedness of the partners to their relatedness to other geographically close alternative partners. The only sample set that was large enough for this analysis was in enclosure site 2 (locality 2) in the second sampling period. Relatedness (r) was estimated, using the program Coancestry 1.0 (Wang 2011), with a moment estimator which assumes no inbreeding (Wang 2002). We compared relatedness of the two parents with the relatedness of opposite sex individuals located closest to them. For each parent we considered either its relatedness to the nearest, or its mean relatedness to the four nearest, non-partner individuals of the opposite sex. We then compared the relatedness of partners and non-partners by paired t-test, separately for each sex.

Results

Hardy-Weinberg and linkage disequilibrium

208 Genotype frequencies deviated significantly from HWE at five of the 15 loci, but in each case
209 the deviations were only detected at single localities, one (TrL32) at locality 1, three (TrL12,
210 TrL15 and TrL37) at locality 2, and one (TrL32) at locality 6. No locus showed significant
211 deviation from HWE at more than one of the three localities (locality 1, sample size N=142;
212 locality 2, N=220; locality 6, N =34). Similarly, only two pairs of loci were significantly
213 linked in locality 1 (TrL 15/ TrL 16 and TrL 15/ TrL 21), three were linked in locality 2 (TrL
214 16/ TrL 19, TrL 19/ TrL 37, and Est12/ TrL 21) and none were linked in locality 6. Null
215 alleles were detected at five loci, but again no locus showed null alleles consistently over all
216 localities: locality1 (TrL16) locality 2 (TrL15, 21, 28 and Est12) and locality 6 (TrL 16). All
217 15 loci were used in subsequent analyses as patterns of disequilibrium and null alleles were
218 not consistent across localities and deviations may have been due to population level
219 processes (e.g. birth and death rates; different founding individuals).

220 **Parentage analysis**

221 We derived genotypes from 561 of 576 captured lizards (360 adults and 201 juveniles) (Table
222 1). Among the adults there were 189 males (52.5%) and 171 females (47.5%). Among the
223 201 juveniles (130 neonates, 71 sub adults), 140 (69 neonates, 71 sub adults) were captured
224 alone either in burrows or in pitfall traps, and 13, all neonates, were found as the only
225 juvenile in a burrow with an adult female. Juveniles found in groups of two to four
226 individuals were all from burrows and were all neonates. There were 11 groups of two, six
227 groups of three, and two groups of four individual juveniles together, with or without an
228 accompanying adult female (Table 2). A total of 39 neonate juveniles were found in burrows
229 with an adult female (Table 2). No juveniles were found in a burrow with an adult male
230 lizard.

Using CERVUS, 113 (56.2%) of the juveniles could be assigned to one (80 juveniles) or both (33 juveniles) parents. Parentage was assigned to 51% of the neonates, and to 64% of the subadults. Despite an intensive survey regime at each site, only 35% (location 1) and 69% (location 2) of the parents of captured juveniles were sampled. Where only one parent was identified, it was the mother in 47 cases and the father in 33 cases.

Relatedness of lizards in the same burrow

We were able to obtain a sample for DNA analysis from 17 of the 23 females located with neonates in the same burrows. In 15 cases (88.2%) CERVUS inferred the co-located female as the mother of all of the accompanying neonates. We deduced these were mothers with their litters, and found a mean relatedness of 0.468 (range 0.221- 0.677) between these females and their neonates.

In the two other cases, females were not assigned as the parent of a neonate located in the same burrow, and relatedness values were low ($r = -0.17$ and $r = -0.06$). Both neonates were sampled during the period of birth and neonate dispersal (26 Jan and 24 Feb). The first was a single neonate and female. The second was a female with two neonates, one related and one unrelated.

No sub adults were found sharing a burrow, either with juvenile or with adult lizards. In 18 of the 19 groups of two or more neonates located together (Table 2), CERVUS assigned group members to the same mother, and relatedness values among the group members suggested they were siblings or half siblings (mean $r = 0.412$; range = 0.121 - 0.785). The other group of two neonates found in the same burrow with an adult female, has been discussed above. In that group the two neonates appeared to be unrelated to each other ($r = -0.0004$).

Paternal contribution

CERVUS identified from among the 201 sampled juveniles 56 sets of 2 – 4 siblings born in the same year with the same mother (described as a family in this paper). For some of those groups the mother was not identified from among the adults that were sampled. In 37 of those sets the siblings were sampled occupying separate burrows. In 24 of these 56 families, both the mother of all of the sibs, and the father of at least one sib could be identified from among the adults sampled. In 18 (75%) of those 24 litters, COLONY suggested that an additional male fathered one or more of the other juveniles (Table 3). For 17 litters there were at least two fathers, while one litter of four sibs had at least three fathers. For the remaining 32 maternal families we used COLONY to deduce the possible male parent contributions to the litters and inferred that at least 22 (69%) of those families had multiple fathers. There was no significant difference between the mean heterozygosities of litters with single paternity (7.4) and litters with multiple paternity (6.6) (Table 4)

We identified 43 female individuals that produced litters, and deduced that 18 of those (41.9%) had produced more than one litter over the duration of this study, 11 of them in consecutive years. During the second sampling period of two years, sub adult juveniles sampled in the first year (2008) were assumed to have come from matings in 2007, thus we had data for matings in four different consecutive years, even though sampling took place in three. Most females that produced multiple litters had two litters over consecutive years, while two females were detected to have produced litters in 3 and 4 consecutive years respectively.

CERVUS identified 70 (37%) of the 189 adult males sampled in the study as fathers of sampled juveniles. Seven (10%) of those males fathered juveniles with two different females in the same season. This may under-represent the rate of polygyny since both males and litters in the sampled populations would have been incompletely sampled. Five males were identified as fathering juveniles with the same female in multiple years in the second

sampling period, with three of those cases (60%) being in consecutive years. Those five males were also among the seven polygynous males, mating with more than one female in at least one season.

Relatedness among mating partners

Within individuals sampled at enclosure site 2, CERVUS identified 20 juveniles for which both the mother and the father could be identified. The 20 juveniles came from 17 maternal litters, and were fathered by 17 males. Three of the males fathered juveniles from two of the females, one female had offspring fathered by two of the males, and another female had offspring fathered by three of the males. Each male-female parent combination was only responsible for one juvenile, so that none of the juveniles from the 20 sampled had an identical mother and father.

The mean relatedness between the male and female parents for each of the 20 juveniles ($r = 0.063$; Table 5) did not differ significantly from the mean relatedness of all male-female combinations among the sampled adults in site 2 (Mann Whitney $U = 34560.5$, $z = -1.64$, sig 0.101). There was no evidence that lizards were choosing mating partners that were less related than random. Furthermore for both males and females, relatedness to their mating partner was not significantly different from relatedness to the nearest other individual of the opposite sex, or from the average relatedness of the four nearest other individuals of the opposite sex (Table 6). That is, there was no evidence that partners were chosen non-randomly from among neighbouring lizards with respect to relatedness.

Further evidence that relatives were not discriminated against as mating partners, came from three offspring resulting from matings between partners with relatedness values of 0.500, 0.365 and 0.297 (Table 5). In each case other less related individuals were available as partners from among neighbouring lizards (Table 5). Genotypes and lizard locations were

derived from samples collected when the lizard was first captured, and this may have been before or after the October/ November period when mating occurs. The mean distance between burrows occupied by males and females that had produced young was 27.24m (N = 20; SE = 6.04; range = 3 – 107m) (Table 5). The mean distance between all possible male and female pairs within enclosure site 2 was 64.7m (N = 4028; SE = 0.51; range = 1 – 160). Mated males and females were found closer to each other than if males and females within the enclosure had mated at random with respect to geographic distance (Mann Whitney U = 13226.50 , $z = -5.189$, $P < 0.001$).

DISCUSSION.

Compared with other lizards in the *Egernia* group our genetic results suggest a high level of multiple mating within the sampled localities of pygmy bluetongue lizards. Within a season it was common for females to be mated by two or more males, and males could mate with more than one female in this period. Mating appeared to be indiscriminate with regard to degree of genetic relatedness, and male and female mating partners could be located in burrows over 100 m apart. The distribution of the number of matings per male could not be estimated because some litters, and thus some matings, were unsampled. Even in the sampled litters, a male that had mated with the female may not have contributed to the progeny.

Chapple and Keogh (2005) proposed three distinct mating systems for the *Egernia* group (i) a combination of polygyny and within season monogamy (ii) long-term genetically monogamous pairings during the breeding season and (iii) long term genetic monogamy within temporally stable social aggregations. Unlike other members of the group, pygmy bluetongue lizards appear to be promiscuous and to display a polygamous mating system.

326

327 Several previous observations support our interpretation of the genetic analysis. Video
328 recordings of female occupied burrows (Milne et al. 2003, Fenner and Bull 2009), suggest
329 that males move across the population to seek out females in their burrows, and that
330 individual females are visited by multiple males (Ebrahimi unpubl. data 2013).

331

332 In our study, males were recorded as far as 100 m away from the females they mated with.
333 Records of mating have all been in the spring (October) (Milne et al. 2003, Fenner and Bull
334 2009). This is the time when other observations have suggested that males of this normally
335 sedentary lizard are actively moving around (and exposed to predation). It is the time of year
336 when a male lizard was found inside a brown snake stomach in 1992 when the species was
337 re-discovered (Armstrong and Reid 1992), and also the time of year when Schofield et al.
338 (2012) reported maximum capture rates of adult lizards (86% males) in pit-fall traps.

339 Combining those observations with the genetic data from the current study suggests that,
340 during a short mating period in spring, males move around the population seeking females in
341 burrows, and can mate with multiple partners. And at the same time, females in their burrows
342 accept matings from several different males. During this period the males will be exposed to
343 enhanced predation risk (Fenner and Bull 2009), and this increased predation may explain the
344 absence of some of the fathers of the juveniles from the genetic sample in this study. It would
345 also explain the disappearance of more males than females from lizard populations over a
346 spring-summer period (Fellows 2008).

347 One explanation for why females accept multiple matings may be the high risk of inbreeding.
348 Previous genetic analyses (Smith et al 2009) have shown clustering of related individuals

within populations, indicative of low dispersal rates. Furthermore, Fenner and Bull (2010) failed to find evidence that individual pygmy bluetongue lizards discriminated among scent cues from related and non-related individuals. Thus there is a high chance of a related male and female coming together and of the partners not being inhibited by that relatedness in their mating behaviour. Results from the current study confirm that some juveniles were produced from matings between highly related males and females. In these circumstances, females that mate with more than one male increase the chance that some of their offspring will be more outbred.

One aim of our study was to contribute to understanding how mating systems evolved within the *Egernia* group of Australian lizards. The promiscuous and indiscriminate mating system of pygmy bluetongue lizards differs substantially from related species which have stable, long-term monogamous partnerships (Bull 2000; Gardner et al. 2002), which show a highly developed olfactory discrimination among related and non-related individuals (Bull et al. 2001) and which tend to choose single, unrelated mating partners (Bull and Cooper 1999; Gardner et al. 2002).

One ecological factor that might drive this difference is that pygmy bluetongue lizards do not dig their own refuge burrows, but instead rely on burrows dug by spiders. These are usually too small for persistent sharing of burrows by more than one lizard, and the short supply of burrows of optimal depth (Fellows et al. 2009) has led to a system of single occupancy burrows and central place territorial defence (Fenner and Bull 2011). Specifically there is no opportunity for the social aggregations commonly reported in other *Egernia* group species, and for the development of within group interactions that might favour less polygamous mating systems.

372 There are at least two conservation implications of our results for this endangered lizard.
373 First, the indiscriminate partner choice and close spatial proximity of relatives in existing
374 populations, suggest that individual lizards will not actively avoid mating with highly related
375 partners. This means there may be a greater risk of inbreeding as populations decline, and as
376 the genotypic range of potential partners is reduced. Continued monitoring of genetic
377 diversity in populations, particularly those with low population density, will be important.
378 Our result contrasts with the earlier studies on another *Egernia* group member, *E.*
379 *cunninghamii*. Stow and Sunnucks (2004) reported a reduction in mating between relatives in
380 highly fragmented areas where potential partners were limited. Second, and conversely, that a
381 promiscuous mating system may prove advantageous during any translocations or
382 reintroductions. This is because it could ensure the rapid mixing of genotypes among founder
383 individuals at unoccupied sites, or the rapid integration of new genetic material into existing
384 populations.

385

386 The success of translocations could be measured by a high reproductive output with the
387 maintenance of genetic diversity over time (Griffith et. al 1989, Gregory et al 2012). In
388 polygynous mating systems females are the limiting factor. The introduction of more females
389 than males could reduce the male search time for a mate and thus reduce predation risk to
390 males especially in species that mate indiscriminately. However when considering
391 reproductive potential in monogamous or pair bonding species equal numbers of each sex
392 would result in maximal reproduction (Sigg et al. 2005). To ensure breeding compatibility in
393 these species the translocation of previously mated individuals would be ideal. In species
394 with kin recognition and mating avoidance or long term genetic monogamy within temporally
395 stable social aggregation a selection of less related individuals would benefit reproduction
396 and genetic diversity in translocations (Gregory et. al 2012). The success of captive breeding

and translocation efforts for any species may hinge upon understanding both the baseline genetic diversity of source and translocated populations and the mating systems they display (Haig 1998; Sigg et al. 2005; Grueber and Jamieson 2008 Gregory et. al 2012).

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by funds from the Australian Research Council, the Holsworth Wildlife Research Endowment, and the Nature Foundation of South Australia. Thanks to the landholders Richard Sawyers and Chris and Maria Reed, for access to their property and to Travis Hague, Janet Davill and Bill and Pam O'Malley for helping with field work, and to Alison Fitch for lab advice. The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the Flinders University Animal Welfare Committee in compliance with the Australian Code of Practice for the Use of Animals for Scientific Research, permit number E260.

References

- Armstrong, G and Reid, J. (1992). The rediscovery of the Adelaide pygmy bluetongue lizard *Tiliqua adelaidensis*; (Peters 1863) Herpetofauna 22: 3-6
- Bull, C. M. (2000). Monogamy in Lizards. Behavioural processes 51: 7-20.
- Bull, C. M. and Baghurst, B. C. (1998). Home range overlap between mothers and their offspring in the sleepy lizard, *Tiliqua rugosa*. Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 42, 357-362.
- Bull, C. M. and S. J. B. Cooper (1999). Relatedness and avoidance of inbreeding in the lizard, *Tiliqua rugosa*. Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 46: 367-372.

421 Bull, C. M., C. L. Griffin, M. Bonnett, M. G. Gardner and S. J. B. Cooper (2001).
 422 Discrimination between related and unrelated individuals in the Australian lizard *Egernia*
 423 *striolata*. Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 50: 173-179.

424 Bull, C. M., C. L. Griffin, E.J. Lanham ,G.R. Johnston (2000) Recognition of pheromones
 425 from group members in a gregarious lizard *Egernia striolata*, Journal of Herpetology 34, 92-
 426 99

427 Chapple, D. G. (2003). Ecology, life history, and behaviour in the australian scincid genus
 428 *Egernia*, with comments on the evolution of complex sociality in lizards. Herpetological
 429 Monographs 17: 145-180.

430 Chapple, D. G. and J. S. Keogh (2005). Complex mating system and dispersal patterns in a
 431 social lizard, *Egernia whitii*. Molecular Ecology 14: 1215-1227.

432 Cogger, H. G. (2000). Reptiles & amphibians of Australia, Reed New Holland.

433 Fellows, H. L. (2008). Temporal and spatial dynamics of the endangered pygmy bluetongue
 434 lizard, *Tiliqua adelaidensis*: implications for translocation attempts_ Honours, Flinders
 435 University.

436 Fenner, A. L. and C. M. Bull (2009). *Tiliqua adelaidensis* (Pygmy Bluetongue lizard) Mating
 437 Behaviour. Herpetological Reveiw 40: 91-92.

438 Fenner, A. L. and C. M. Bull (2010). Response of the endangered pygmy bluetone lizard to
 439 conspecific scats. Journal of Ethology 29: 69-77.

440 Fenner, A. L. and C. M. Bull (2011). Central-place territorial defence in a burrow-dwelling
 441 skink:aggressive responses to conspecific models in pygmy bluetongue lizards. Journal of
 442 Zoology 283:45-51

443 Gardner, M.G., Cooper, S.J.B., Bull, C.M., and Grant, W.N. (1999). Isolation of
 444 microsatellite loci from a social lizard, *Egernia stokesii*, using a modified enrichment
 445 procedure. Journal of Heredity 90, 301-304.

446 Gardner, M. G., C. M. Bull and S. J. B. Cooper (2002). High levels of genetic monogamy in
 447 the group-living Australian lizard *Egernia stokesii*. *Molecular Ecology* 11: 1787-1794.

448 Gardner, M. G., C. M. Bull, S. J. B. Cooper and G. A. Duffield (2001). Genetic evidence for
 449 a family structure in stable social aggregations of the Australian lizard *Egernia stokesii*.
 450 *Molecular Ecology* 10: 175-183.

451 Gardner, M. G., A. F. Hugall, S. C. Donnellan, M. N. Hutchinson and R. Foster (2008).
 452 Molecular systematics of social skinks: phylogeny and taxonomy of the *Egernia* group
 453 (Reptilia: Scincidae). *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 154: 781-794.

454 Gardner, M. G., J. J. Sanchez, R. Y. Dudaniec, L. Rheinberger, A. L. Smith and K. M. Saint
 455 (2008). *Tiliqua rugosa* microsatellites: isolation via enrichment and characterisation of loci for
 456 multiplex PCR in *T. rugosa* and the endangered *T. adelaidensis*. *Conservation Genetics* 9:
 457 233-237.

458 Greenwood, P. J. (1980). Mating systems, philopatry and dispersal in birds and mammals.
 459 *Animal Behaviour* 28: 1140-1162.

460 Gregory, A. J., R. S.A. Kaler, T.J. Prebyl, B.K. Sandercock and S.M. Wisely (2012).
 461 Influence of translocation strategy and mating system on the genetic structure of a newly
 462 established population of island Ptarmigan. *Conservation Genetics* 13: 465-474.

463 Griffith, B., Scott, J.M., Carpenter, J.W., Reed, C., (1989). Translocation as a species
 464 conservation tool – status and strategy. *Science* 245: 477–480.

465 Grueber, C.E. & Jamieson, I.G. (2008). Quantifying and managing the loss of genetic
 466 variation through the use of pedigrees in a non-captive endangered species. *Conservation*
 467 *Genetics* 9: 645–651.

468 Haig, S.M. (1998). Molecular contributions to conservation. *Molecular techniques in ecology*
 469 79: 413-425.

470 Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. Scandinavian
471 Journal of Statistics 6 (2): 65–70.

472 Hutchinson, M. N., T. Milne and T. Croft (1994). Redescription and ecological notes on the
473 Pygmy Bluetongue, *Tiliqua adelaidensis* (Squamata: Scincida). Transactions of the royal
474 society of South Australia_188: 217-226.

475 Jones, O. R. and J. L. Wang (2009). COLONY: a program for parentage and sibship
476 inference from multilocus genotype data. Molecular Ecology Resources 10: 551-555.

477 Koenig, J., R. Shine and G. Shea (2001). The ecology of an Australian reptile icon: how do
478 blue-tongued lizards (*Tiliqua scincoides*) survive in suburbia? Wildlife Research 28: 215-
479 227.

480 Levy, E., W. J. Kennington, J. L. Tomkins and N. R. Lebas (2010). Land clearing reduces
481 geneflow in the granite outcrop-dwelling lizard, *Ctenophorus ornatus*. Molecular Ecology 19:
482 4192-4203.

483 Main A.R. and C. M. Bull (1996). Mother-offspring recognition in two Australian lizards,
484 *Tiliqua rugosa* and *Egernia stokesii*. Animal Behaviour 52, 193-200.

485 Milne, T. (1999). Conservation and ecology of the endangered pygmy bluetongue lizard
486 *Tiliqua adelaidensis*. PhD., Flinders University.

487 Milne, T., C. M. Bull and M. N. Hutchinson (2002). Characteristics of litters and juvenile
488 dispersal in the endangered Australian skink *Tiliqua adelaidensis*. Journal of Herpetology 36:
489 110-112.

490 Milne, T., C. M. Bull and M. N. Hutchinson (2003). Use of burrows by the endangered
491 pygmy blue-tongue lizard, *Tiliqua adelaidensis* (Scincidae). Wildlife Research 30: 523-528.

492 O'Connor, D. and R. Shine (2003). Lizards in 'nuclear families': a novel reptilian social
493 system in *Egernia saxatilis* (Scincidae). Molecular Ecology 12: 743-752.

494 Oliver, A. and N. Sachser (2011). Diversity of social and mating systems in caviars: a review.
 495 Journal of Mammalogy 92: 39-53.

496 Schofield, J. A., A. L. Fenner, K. Pelgrim and C. M. Bull (2012). Male-biased movement in
 497 pygmy bluetongue lizards: implications for conservation. Wildlife Research. 39: 677-684

498 Sigg, D.P., A. W. Goldizen and A. R. Pople (2005). The importance of mating systems in
 499 translocation programs: reproductive success of released male bridled nailtailed wallabies.
 500 Biological Conservation. 123: 289-300

501 Smith, A. L., M. G. Gardner, A. L. Fenner and C. M. Bull (2009). Restricted gene flow in the
 502 endangered pygmy bluetongue lizard (*Tiliqua adelaidensis*) in a fragmented agricultural
 503 landscape. Wildlife Research 36: 466-478.

504 Smith, L. M. and L. A. Burgoyne (2004). Collecting, archiving and processing DNA from
 505 Wildlife Samples using FTA(R) databasing paper. BMC Ecology 4: 4.

506 Stamps, J. A., Ed. (1977). Social behaviour and spacing patterns in lizards. Biology of the
 507 Reptilia. New York U.S.A., Academic Press.

508 Stow, A. J. and P. Sunnucks (2004). High mate and site fidelity in Cunningham's Skinks
 509 (*Egernia cunninghami*) in natural and fragmented habitat. Molecular Ecology 13: 419-430.


510 Stow, A. J., P. Sunnucks, D. A. Briscoe and M. G. Gardner (2001). The impact of habitat
 511 fragmentation on dispersal of Cunningham's skink (*Egernia cunninghami*): evidence from
 512 allelic and genotypic analysis of microsatellites. Molecular Ecology 10: 867-878.

513 Uller, T. and M. Olsson (2008). Multiple paternity in reptiles: patterns and processes.
 514 Molecular Ecology 17: 2566-2580.

515 Wang, J. L. (2002). An estimator for pairwise relatedness using molecular markers. Genetics
 516 160: 1203 - 1215.

517 Wang, J. L. (2011). Coancestry: a program for simulating, estimating and analysing
 518 relatedness and inbreeding coefficients. Molecular Ecology Resources 11: 141-145.

519
520



521

522 Figure 1. Sampling grid used at the 3 study sites, where black circles represent pitfall traps
523 and the lines denote plastic drift fence.

524

525

526 Table 1. Capture summary of the individuals from which successful genotypes were derived
527 over the two sampling periods

Sampling period	Juveniles	Males	Females	Total
1 (2005 - 2006)	27	83	91	201
2 (2008 – 2010)	174	106	80	360

528

529 Table 2. The number of groups containing juvenile lizards, and the total numbers of juvenile
530 lizards in each group size category that were detected with or without a female present in the
531 same burrow.

Number of juveniles per group	1	2	3	4
Number of groups with female present	13	5	4	1
Number of groups with no female present	140	6	2	1
Total number of groups	153	11	6	2
Total juvenile lizards	153	22	18	8

532

533

534 Table 3. Number of litters with multiple fathers as identified by CERVUS and inferred
535 multiple father litters by COLONY in brackets

	Full sibs groups	Range of litter size	half sib groups	Range of litter size	Total number of families
Sampled families	6	2-3	18	2-4	24
Inferred families	10	2	22	2-4	32

536

537 Table.4 Levels of heterozygosity found in litters with multiple and single paternities

	Number of individuals	Number of litters	Observed Heterozygosity
Single paternity	11	5	7.38
Multiple paternity	9	4	6.57

538

539

540 Table 5. Comparison of distance to partner and relatedness between the mated pairs and the 4
541 nearest individuals of the opposite sex.

Female partner	Male partner	Relatedness	Relatedness of female to nearest male non	Average relatedness of female 4 nearest	Relatedness of male to nearest female	Average relatedness of male to 4 nearest	Distance between mated pairs
----------------	--------------	-------------	---	---	---------------------------------------	--	------------------------------

			partner	males		females	
2325	2707	-0.0451	-0.160	-0.006	-0.115	-0.133	13.345
2351	2403	-0.0748	-0.036	-0.051	0.002	0.140	5.099
2352	2713	0.3614	0.059	0.116	-0.106	-0.086	30.806
2400	2706	0.1707	0.288	0.069	-0.087	0.053	64.899
2401	2431	-0.1018	-0.092	0.016	0.026	0.052	11.705
2410	2616	-0.1817	-0.026	-0.042	0.059	-0.078	10.630
2413	2355	0.2933	-0.085	-0.006	0.288	0.086	11.705
2413	2335	-0.0081	-0.085	0.178	-0.028	-0.044	107.331
2413	2632	0.4858	-0.074	-0.005	0.451	0.069	21.213
2453	2709	-0.1315	0.573	0.175	-0.077	-0.086	19.2094
2453	2707	-0.1128	0.573	0.175	-0.007	-0.118	22.3607
2500	2761	0.2117	-0.106	-0.038	-0.132	0.027	82.0549
2524	2626	0.171	-0.178	-0.005	0.064	0.040	8.5440
2533	2340	-0.127	0.025	-0.042	0.140	0.106	22.361
2540	2761	0.1311	0.093	0.005	0.037	0.104	17.117
2559	2431	-0.111	-0.205	-0.118	0.026	0.007	10.198
2619	2639	0.0259	-0.047	-0.072	0.138	0.018	31.6228
2651	2330	0.1096	0.003	0.057	-0.034	0.053	31.064
2683	2627	0.1291	-0.103	-0.075	-0.062	0.060	3
2744	2694	0.0597	-0.141	-0.065	0.197	0.259	20.615
Mean		0.06258	0.014	0.013	0.039	0.027	27.244

Table 6. Paired t-test comparing the relatedness among breeding individuals and the 4 nearest of the opposite sex.

Relatedness of mate pairs to:	df	t	sig (2-tailed)
Mated male and average of 4 nearest females	19	0.95	0.353
Mated female and average of 4 nearest males	19	1.17	0.257
Mated male and nearest females	19	0.522	0.608
Nearest males	19	0.746	0.465