1 **Size is not everything: Nuanced effects of female multiple mating and annual litter**

2 **number on testes size in terrestrial mammals**

3

4 Annemarie van der Marel[a,b], Miyako H. Warrington[b,c], Jane M. Waterman[b,d]

5

6 a- Departamento de Ecología, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

7 b- Department of Biological Sciences, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada

8 c- Department of Biological and Medical Sciences, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, UK

9 d- Mammal Research Institute, Department of Zoology and Entomology, University of

10 Pretoria, Pretoria 0002, South Africa

11

12 * Correspondence: J. M. Waterman, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Manitoba,

13 50 Sifton Road, Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2, Canada. E-mail address:

14 jane.waterman@umanitoba.ca

15

16 ORCID:

17 Anne Marie van der Marel, 0000-0003-3942-8314

18 Miyako H Warrington, 0000-0003-2699-1167

19 Jane M Waterman, 0000-0003-0027-9067

20

21 Heading title: Testes size in terrestrial mammals

Abstract

Sperm production represents a costly reproductive investment by males. High reproductive competition within the female reproductive tract may select for higher sperm counts or quality resulting in selection for larger testes size. In species where females mate multiply or have more offspring per litter (litter size), or more litters per year (litter rate), male reproductive competition may select for larger relative testes size (i.e., scaled by body mass). Given that different mating systems vary in the alternative forms of reproductive investment available to males, sperm production levels may vary with social system. Here, we examined the relationship between testes size and mating systems, litter size, and litter rate while considering male lifespan and investment in paternal care in 224 terrestrial mammalian species in 15 orders. Relative testes size was larger in species where females mated with multiple males. Furthermore, in species with multiple-mating females, species with higher litter rates had larger testes compared to species with fewer litters per year. In contrast, in monogamous species, species that had multiple litters per year had smaller relative testes sizes compared to species with fewer litters per year. Neither longevity nor paternal care influenced testes size. Our results elucidate the effect of female reproductive strategies on relative testes size is nuanced and varies between mating systems. Our findings suggest that the interplay between male and female reproductive investment may be different within similar social mating systems.

Keywords: mating system, promiscuity, polyandry, reproductive strategy, testes

1 **Introduction**

2 Sperm competition has received a lot of attention (reviewed in Simmons & Wedell, 2020) since

3 the foundational work of Parker (1970). Sperm production represents a form of reproductive

4 investment by males (Parker, 2020). Larger testes are associated with enhanced fertilization as

5 a result of an increased number of sperm per insemination, and larger accessory glands are

6 associated with ejaculate features that may enhance the performance and quality of sperm

7 (Parker, 2020). In cases of high reproductive competition within the female reproductive tract,

8 such as in species where females mate with multiple males, selection for higher sperm count or

9 quality may exist (Parker, 2020). Thus, relative testes mass (i.e., scaled by body mass) has

10 been used as an indicator of the intensity of sperm competition (Parker et al., 1997; Balshine et

11 al., 2001; Gage & Freckleton, 2003; Simmons & Fitzpatrick, 2012) and is validated as a proxy

12 for sperm competition (Rowley et al., 2019; Lüpold et al., 2020). Indeed, larger relative testes

13 size is often associated with genetic and social mating systems in which females have multiple

14 mates, such as in promiscuous, polyandrous, and polygynandrous mating systems (Ramm et

15 al., 2005; Soulsbury, 2010; Baker et al., 2020). Furthermore, testes size varies with mating

16 season length (Iossa et al., 2008; Soulsbury, 2010), reproductive lifespan (Iossa et al., 2008),

17 ovulation mode (Iossa et al., 2008; Soulsbury, 2010) and other forms of paternal investment

18 such as sexual ornaments and weaponry (Fitzpatrick et al., 2012, Lüpold et al., 2019) and

19 parental care (Pitcher 2005), demonstrating that the evolution of testes size is complex and

20 driven by environmental and social factors.

21 Large testes sizes resulting in high sperm production levels may be advantageous when

22 fertilization success is determined according to a 'raffle principle' (Parker 1997). However,

23 ejaculates are costly to produce (Dewsbury, 1982). As the number of mates a female has

24 affects the degree of reproductive competition between males, the advantages of higher levels

1 of sperm production may vary with mating systems (Soulsbury, 2010). As social systems may

2 influence the opportunity for males to employ alternative forms of reproductive investment,

3 sperm production levels may vary with social system. For example, in animals that live in pairs

4 or groups, males may have the opportunity to contribute towards parental care, which may

5 increase the survival of their offspring (Rymer & Pillay, 2018), and in species where females live

6 in groups, males might have the opportunity to employ pre-copulatory strategies such as

7 competing for territories and investing in weaponry, which may increase access to females

8 (Lüpold et al., 2014). In some mating and social systems, sperm competition may be an

9 important male investment because males are not able to employ other reproductive strategies

10 (Lüpold et al., 2014).

11 For females, the number and mass of each offspring in one reproductive event (e.g., litter,

12 clutch) represent resources allocated towards reproduction by females at a given time (Sibly et

13 al., 2012). Single breeding opportunities, small litter size and/or offspring mass may represent a

14 limitation to the amount of resources that a female could allocate, which may be offset by the

15 care of males (West & Capellini, 2016). For example, in mammalian species with paternal care,

16 lactation time is shorter for females, the relative number of litters per year is higher and the

17 relative litter size is larger when males provision females, providing more opportunities to sire

18 offspring (West & Capellini, 2016).

19 To males, litter size represents the number of offspring that a male could sire at a given

20 copulation event (oestrus, female receptive period), and the total annual number of offspring

21 represents offspring that could be sired over the course of the breeding season. An individual's

22 investment in reproduction (e.g., testes size) may be limited by the need to invest resources into

23 growth and maintenance (van Noordwijk & de Jong, 1986) or other 'expensive' tissues or

24 activities (Isler & van Schaik, 2006) necessary for their life history. One strategy to maintain

25 'expensive' tissues or activities, is to limit the investment (e.g., energy) in those tissues/activities

1 to particular periods. For example, as migratory birds have high energetic requirements

2 associated with reproduction, plumage growth (i.e., feather moults), and migration; these key

3 events occur at different periods throughout the year (Dawson et al. 2007). Therefore, it is

4 important to consider reproductive investment within differing time scales when studying the

5 evolution of reproductive investment (e.g., testes size).

6 The amount of resources that a female allocates towards reproduction may directly affect male

7 fitness because this investment represents a male's opportunity to sire offspring. However, few

8 studies have examined the relationship between male reproductive investment strategies and

9 female reproductive strategies (Soulsbury, 2010). Soulsbury et al. (2010) found a positive

10 association between litter size and testes size. However, testes size also increased in mating

11 systems with multiple paternity suggesting that the relationship between testes mass and litter

12 size may differ between mating systems.

13 Mammals are excellent species for examining the association between male and female

14 reproductive investment because of the variety of mating systems and social characteristics

15 they exhibit. In mammals, testes size (Iossa et al., 2008; Soulsbury, 2010) and litter size vary (1-

16 8 offspring) with smaller species (e.g., rodents) typically having at least two offspring per

17 gestation (Carranza 1996), and larger species having fewer offspring (Soulsbury, 2010).

18 Mammals also vary in the reproductive strategies and parental care exhibited by males and

19 females (Lukas & Clutton-Brock, 2013; West & Capellini, 2016; Heldstab et al., 2019; Lukas &

20 Huchard, 2019; Sinervo et al., 2020).

21 We compiled the largest and most detailed dataset of relative testes size (RTS) in mammals

22 until now, and using this dataset we examined the association between RTS (male reproductive

23 investment) and two litter characteristics representing female reproductive investment (litter size

24 and litters per year). Additionally, we also examined the association between RTS and

1 longevity, mating system, and paternal care. We hypothesized that the relationship between

2 RTS and female reproductive output would differ between mammal species exhibiting different

3 mating systems. Specifically, in species where females mate with multiple males per breeding

4 attempt, we predicted larger RTS with smaller litter sizes and fewer total annual offspring,

5 because smaller litters represent more intense competition due to fewer potential offspring

6 available to be sired. In species where females mate with a single male per breeding attempt,

7 we predicted larger RTS with larger litter sizes and greater numbers of total annual offspring,

8 despite less competition with other males, because males would have an increased need to

9 fertilize eggs. Also, to maximize fitness, males should invest in sperm production regardless of

10 the number of breeding opportunities, so we predicted that RTS would not be associated with

11 the number of litters/year. Given that longevity increases the time males have to obtain

12 paternity, and thus may represent opportunities to trade off survival with reproduction (Stearns,

13 1992), we predicted that longer-lived species may have on average smaller RTS compared to

14 shorter-lived animals. Furthermore, as paternal care represents a form of post-copulatory

15 reproductive investment, in species with paternal care, males may be selected for traits

16 indicative of the quality of caregiving. Thus, we predicted that RTS would be inversely related to

17 the level of parental care; species that give more parental care will have smaller testes than

18 species that give less parental care.

19   **Materials & Methods**

20 Data collection

21 We obtained testes and body mass data from different sources (Breed & Taylor, 2000; Gage &

22 Freckleton, 2003; Soulsbury, 2010). We also included the testes size data of squirrels from our

23 own compiled dataset (see the data file on the GitHub repository for references, van der Marel

24 et al. 2023). If multiple sources provided different testes size data for a species, we included

1   both sources as a data point. We excluded mammalian orders that are completely aquatic, i.e.,

2   Cetacea and Sirenia.

3   We obtained life history trait data, litter size, litter rate (number of litters per year), and longevity,

4   for the terrestrial mammal species with testes size data from Capellini et al. (2015). The life

5   history data was not complete, therefore we included data from Myhrvold et al. (2015) or

6   performed a literature search for the species in question (see the datafile on the GitHub

7   repository for references, van der Marel et al. 2023).

8   For the mating system, we included data from Soulsbury (2010), Sinervo et al. (2020), and

9   Baker et al. (2020). In the past, genetic mating systems have largely been defined by the

10   number of mates that a male has obtained and have largely neglected the number of mates a

11   female has obtained. However, an increasing number of molecular studies have found that

12   some mammal mating systems that had been described as polygynous (e.g., dusky-footed

13   woodrats, *Neotoma fuscipes*) have females that mate multiply or promiscuously (Waterman,

14   2007; McEachern et al., 2008). Indeed, promiscuous mating in mammals is quite common

15   (Wolff & Macdonald, 2004; Waterman, 2007). As such, we have defined mating systems based

16   on the number of mates that both the male and female have obtained. However, it is important

17   to note that some studies define mating systems from the viewpoint of spatial relationships

18   between individuals during the breeding season (e.g., territory range overlap, Lin et al. 2009);

19   this definition is referred to as the social mating system. Thus, a species, or population of

20   species, may be categorised as socially monogamous, even if the genetic evidence indicates

21   that individuals mate with multiple partners (Clutton-Brock & Isvaran, 2006).

22   Therefore, we cross-referenced the mating system with our own literature search (see GitHub

23   repository, van der Marel et al. 2023) to ensure that we defined the mating system based on

24   genetic mating patterns. We classified the mating system as *monogamous*, one male, one

1 female; *polygynous*, one male, multiple females; and *promiscuous*, multiple males, one or

2 multiple females following Soulsbury (2010). If we had multiple mating systems for the same

3 species from different sources, we considered them equally valid but only kept the recording of

4 the mating system of the highest level of complexity following Baker et al. (2020). The order of

5 complexity went from monogamy to polygyny, to promiscuity. To account for multiple mating of

6 the females, we combined monogamous and polygynous mating systems as systems without

7 multiple mating by the female and compared that to systems where females do mate multiply,

8 i.e., promiscuous mating systems.

9 We included paternal care data from Heldstab et al. (2019), Lukas & Huchard (2019), and

10 Sinervo et al. (2020). Overall, all sources defined paternal care as help provided to the care of

11 offspring (weaned or unweaned), which could constitute huddling, grooming or carrying

12 offspring, and food provisioning. We excluded protection of the offspring as a form of paternal

13 care as this behaviour could be confused with territorial behaviour or antipredator behaviour

14 (West & Capellini, 2016) and is not considered to be energetically costly (Heldstab et al., 2019).

15 Sinervo et al. (2020) included the protection of young as a form of paternal care and Lukas &

16 Huchard (2019) were not clear in their description of whether they only included paternal care or

17 also non-parental group members. As such, if we have paternal care data for the same species

18 of different sources that did not correspond with each other, we followed Heldstab et al. (2019)

19 followed by Lukas & Huchard (2019).

20 For the comparative analyses, we inferred the phylogenetic relatedness between species from

21 the updated mammalian supertree (Upham et al., 2019). To represent phylogenetic uncertainty,

22 we downloaded a sample of 100 phylogenetic trees of the selected species with testes size from

23 http://vertlife.org/phylosubsets.

1   We obtained body mass and testes mass for 571 unique terrestrial mammal species. We found

2   a slightly less than linear relationship between body mass and testes mass (Fig. S1), as found

3   in previous studies (Kenagy & Trombulak, 1986; Hayward & Gillooly, 2011). Given that in 133

4   mammal species, males of smaller species had relatively larger testes than larger species

5   (Kenagy & Trombulak, 1986), and smaller mammals have proportionally higher gonadal mass in

6   relation to somatic mass in mammals (Hayward & Gillooly, 2011), we calculated relative testes

7   size (RTS) following the equation $y = 0.035x^{0.72}$, where the mass of the testes is y and the

8   body mass is x, as in Kenagy and Trombulak (1986). We note that this body-mass corrected

9   testes size is the ratio of observed testes size to the testes size predicted by this equation

10 (Kenagy & Trombulak, 1986). However, we believe this slightly less than linear relationship with

11 body size may represent an ecological constraint to a minimum testis size, as seen in minimum

12 sizes of expensive tissues such as brains (e.g., Quesada et al., 2019), and given the complex

13 architecture of testes (Ramm & Schärer, 2014). Thus, accounting for the non-linear allometric

14 relationship between testes and body mass may be important to consider.

15

16 Statistical Analyses

17 We fit phylogenetically controlled multinomial generalized linear mixed models using R

18 packages 'brms' v2.18.0 (Bürkner, 2017, 2018) in the Stan environment using the 'rstan'

19 package v2.21.7 (Stan Development Team, 2022) in R version 4.1.2 (R Core Team, 2021).

20 Figures were made using 'ggplot' (Wickham, 2016).

21 To examine the effect of environmental and social factors on testes size in mammals, we ran

22 several models as follows:

23   1) An intercept-only model (M1).

2) Mixed effect model (M2) with species as a random effect to account for data non-independence (for some species, we had multiple observations of testes mass and body mass) and to account for the phylogenetic signal between species. Our global model included litter size, litters per year, longevity, paternal care, and mating system as predictor variables.

3) Mixed effect model with added variability (M3) of the dependent variable within species (accounting for different measures of RTS per species) on one selected phylogenetic tree. However, this model did not converge therefore we did not include this analysis.

4) An interaction model (M4), which included a three-way interaction between litter size, litters per year and mating system.

5) In species that only have one offspring in a litter (monotocous species), we can not detect the extent of female multi-male mating (i.e., multiple paternity), and thus, the level of post-copulatory selection (i.e., sperm competition). Therefore, models containing monotocous species may restrict our ability to detect a relationship between testes size and litter size. Thus, we also ran additional models on a subset of our data (M5): species with a litter size ≤ 1. As we only had one species with a litter size of one and a

monogamous mating system, we used the dichotomous variable of whether females mate multiply as our dependent factor instead of using mating system. We excluded paternal care from these models as our dataset only included one species with paternal care. Similar to the above, we standardized litters per year and longevity and included species as a random effect. Our global model included litters/year, longevity, and female multiple mating (y/n) as predictor variables. Our interaction model included longevity and an interaction between litters/year and females multiple mating. We used the same model settings as before and ran the models over the 100 sampled phylogenetic trees.

1   6) To account for the derived calculation of RTS, we also ran the interaction model (see

2   M4) with RTS calculated as testes mass divided by body mass (M6) following Charlton &

3   Reby (2016).

4   For each model, we checked for collinearity but none of our predictor variables had a variance

5   inflation factor above 3, so we included all variables. We standardized the life history data by z-

6   transformation. We looped the models over the 100 sampled phylogenetic trees. For our

7   models, we used four chains, six cores, 5000 iterations, and 3000 as the warmup (burnin), and

8   we set the 'adapt_delta' to 0.99 and the 'max_treedepth' to 15. We visually confirmed model

9   convergence and assessed mixing by ensuring that the effective sample sizes for all parameters

10   were above 400 and that the scale reduction factor was close to 1. We selected the model with

11   the lowest loo information criterion (Vehtari et al., 2017). We also calculated the phylogenetic

12   signal lambda for lognormal distribution for all models.

13   **Results**

14   We obtained RTS data for 571 mammalian species. However, values for all our predictor

15   variables were available for 224 unique terrestrial mammalian species across 15 orders. The

16   model with the lowest loo information criterion (LooIC) across models M1 to M4 was our 3-way

17   interaction model (M4, Table 1; see supplemental material 2 for a full summary of the other

18   models). Species with greater numbers of litters per year (Fig. 1, Table 2) and a promiscuous

19   mating system (Fig. 2, Table 2) had larger RTS. We also found a significant interaction between

20   litters per year and mating system (Fig. 3, Table 2). In species exhibiting polygynous or

21   promiscuous mating systems, species that had more litters per year had larger RTS than

22   species with fewer litters per year. We found the opposite trend for monogamous species:

23   Species with a monogamous mating system, that had multiple litters per year, had smaller RTS

24   than species with fewer litters per year. Our results showed weak phylogenetic signal across

1   terrestrial mammals in both models (mean Pagel's λ and 95% credible interval (CI) for

2   interaction model = 0.19, 0.0 – 0.46; for global model = 0.23, 0.00 – 0.50).

3   We obtained values for our predictor variables for 88 unique terrestrial mammalian species

4   which typically have only a single offspring per reproductive attempt (average litter size of ≤1).

5   (Table 3). Our results were not fundamentally different from models using our full dataset (see

6   supporting information 2 for a full summary). RTS was larger in species where females multiple

7   mated, i.e., promiscuous species (Table 4; Fig. 4). We also found a weak phylogenetic signal for

8   both the global and interaction model across the 88 terrestrial mammals (mean Pagel's λ and

9   95% CI = 0.29, 0.00 – 0.65, and 0.26 [0.00 – 0.60], respectively).

10   Finally, the results of the interaction model with RTS calculated as testes mass/body mass (M6)

11   instead of a derived calculation did not differ from our original model (M4) results. Litter rate, a

12   promiscuous mating system, and the interaction between litter rate and polygynous and

13   promiscuous species influenced testes size (Table S2.5).

14   **Discussion**

15   We examined the effects of litter size, litter rate, longevity, mating system, and paternal care on

16   relative testes size (an indicator of sperm competition intensity) in 224 unique terrestrial

17   mammalian species across 15 orders. As hypothesized, we found that the effects of female

18   reproductive strategies on testes size were nuanced and varied with the mating system, but the

19   effects were different than predicted. In contrast to our predictions, we found that litter size did

20   not affect RTS, while litter rate did affect RTS. Furthermore, we found no evidence for an

21   inverse relationship between paternal care and testes size. Also, we found no relationship

22   between longevity and testes size, indicating no trade-off in this form of reproductive investment

23   nor in traits related to longevity such as life history (Stearn, 1992). The results were consistent

1 between models using all 224 species regardless of litter size and the subset of 88 species that

2 typically have only a single offspring per reproductive attempt. Overall, our results highlight the

3 importance of considering the effect of female reproductive strategies in light of the different

4 mating systems influencing sperm competition intensity.

5 Our results are concordant with earlier studies that found larger RTS in birds (Baker et al., 2020)

6 and mammals (Kenagy & Trombulak, 1986; Iossa et al., 2008; Soulsbury, 2010) and in species

7 where females mate with multiple males. In these mating systems, the sperm of multiple males

8 compete to fertilize the female's eggs, which results in more intense sperm competition than in

9 systems where only one male mates with the female. We note that sperm competition can still

10 occur in monogamous systems as a result of within-ejaculate sperm competition (Sutter &

11 Immler, 2020). However, there may be a mixed relationship between testes size and mating

12 system when examining this relationship within particular lineages of animals. For example, no

13 relationship between testes size and mating system in carnivore mammals exists (Iossa, 2008).

14 However, Iossa (2008) focused on social mating systems, but in carnivorous mammals, some

15 species classed as socially monogamous have females that mate multiply (e.g., red foxes,

16 Baker et al. 2004). Thus, the observed difference in the relationship between testes size and

17 mating system observed in our study may be partially attributed to defining a mating system

18 socially versus genetically.

19 Contrary to our prediction, we found a positive relationship between litter rate and RTS in

20 promiscuous and polygynous species. This relationship may be possible in species with

21 prolonged or continual breeding (e.g., tropical species, such as Cape ground squirrels, *Xerus*

22 *inauris*; Waterman, 1996) because reproductive investment can be spread over several

23 breeding opportunities, increasing the selective pressure to maintain sperm production

24 continuously or over a prolonged period. For example, continually breeding Cape ground

25 squirrels maintain large testes throughout the year, and have among the largest testes in the

1   Sciurids (Kenagy & Trombulak, 1986; Manjerovic et al., 2008). Indeed, mammal testes size was

2   larger in species with longer mating seasons (Soulsbury, 2010). However, in carnivores, testes

3   size was larger in species with shorter mating seasons, which is associated with higher female

4   mating synchrony (Iossa et al., 2008), demonstrating that the effect of female reproductive

5   features may differ between different mammalian orders.

6   A positive association between RTS and litter rate would be expected if it is costly for males to

7   invest in testes (Schulte-Hostedde et al., 2005; Hayward & Gillooly, 2011). If large testes size

8   represents an 'expensive' investment, then investment in large testes may result in a trade-off

9   with the maintenance of other tissues ('expensive-tissue hypothesis'; Aiello & Wheeler, 1995) or

10   other energetically expensive costs of body maintenance, locomotion, or reproduction ('energy

11   trade-off hypothesis'; Isler & van Schaik, 2006). Our findings could suggest that, on average,

12   testes are 'expensive' enough for promiscuous and polygynous species to decrease size

13   investment in species with fewer litters per year (resulting in fewer opportunities for males to

14   mate). However, if testes tissue is inexpensive to maintain, while the activities associated with

15   reproductive activity are expensive (Isler & van Schaik, 2006), then perhaps the combined effect

16   of maintaining high sperm production and behavioural competition to inseminate females (e.g.,

17   competitive searching for females over large areas, Waterman 1998) would drive the observed

18   trend between RTS and litter rate in promiscuous and polyandrous species. However, testes

19   may not actually be expensive to maintain in a variety of mammals, including rodents,

20   ungulates, primates, and carnivores (Lemaître et al., 2009). Thus, future work could include

21   mating season length to study the relationship between testes size and litter rate in more detail.

22   We did not find the same positive association between litter rate and RTS in monogamous

23   species, but rather a trend for the opposite pattern. The lack of an effect in monogamous

24   systems may have been due to low sample sizes (N = 18 species (8%) in our dataset). The low

25   proportion of monogamous species in our dataset is not surprising, given that in many lineages

1 of mammals, females mate multiply (e.g., rodents, Waterman 2007; primates, Stumpf et al.,

2 2011). We would, however, expect monogamous systems to have differing energetic

3 expenditures regarding testes maintenance, so future studies should consider the effect of

4 energy expenditure/allocation on testes in differing mating systems.

5 In contrast to our predictions and Soulsbury (2010), we did not find a significant relationship

6 between litter size and RTS. However, litter size was included in our top model and showed a

7 positive slope. Furthermore, the inclusion of differing life history variables in our study (e.g.,

8 litters per year) versus Soulsbury (e.g., multiple paternity rates) may have influenced the

9 relationship between litter size and RTS. Additionally, our study examines a larger number of

10 mammal species including Soulbury's (2010) data set, and as such may include more of the

11 variability in testes size measured in mammals. However, it is important to note that Soulsbury

12 (2010) specifically examined the relationship between multiple paternity and testes size, and

13 thus, the sample size was limited by fewer molecular paternity studies in mammals at that time.

14 Clearly, the relationship between testes size and life history variables is complex.

15 Although we had predicted that longer-lived species would have smaller RTS compared to

16 shorter-lived animals, we found no relationship between longevity and RTS, as has been found

17 in terrestrial carnivores (Iossa et al., 2008). However, a lack of relationship between longevity

18 and RTS is still surprising given that long-lived species are predicted to invest more in survival

19 while shorter-lived species invest more in current reproduction (Stearn, 1992). Indeed, in bats

20 longer life spans are associated with fewer offspring (Garbino et al., 2021). Furthermore, Hamel

21 et al. (2010) found more evidence of reproductive costs in longer-lived ungulate species and

22 greater survival costs in shorter-lived rodent species (Hamel et al., 2010). Our results thus

23 suggest that RTS in mammals may not be influenced by an individual's lifespan but instead by

24 reproductive opportunities within each breeding season, consistent with our finding of a positive

25 relationship between the number of litters per year and RTS.

1   Contrary to our prediction of smaller testes sizes in species that give more paternal care, we

2   found no evidence of a relationship between paternal care and RTS. The absence of this

3   relationship may be because paternal care is only present in 21.9% of species in our dataset,

4   which is a bit higher than in mammalian species where approximately 10% provide parental

5   care (Woodroffe & Vincent, 1994; West & Capellini, 2016). However, as our study broadly

6   covered many mammal lineages, the association between parental care and RTS is likely

7   nuanced and species-specific. For instance, in mammals, paternal care is associated with

8   greater female reproductive success (West & Capellini, 2016), and evolves when the benefits

9   outweigh the costs of caring for males. Indeed, in birds, testes size was smaller in species

10 where males participated in feeding their offspring (Pitcher, 2005). Perhaps the costs in species

11 with paternal care are on average low enough in mammals for the males to be able to also

12 allocate resources to sperm production, which may result in an absence of a relationship

13 between RTS and paternal care.

14

15 Study limitations

16 We used RTS as a proxy for sperm competition. Other characteristics of male gonads, such as

17 ejaculate composition (Perry et al., 2013; Ramm, 2020), sperm length and quality (Lüpold et al.,

18 2020), and the size of other reproductive tissues (e.g., Sertoli cells, (Russell et al., 1990;

19 seminal vesicles, Lemaître et al., 2011) may be additional indicators of sperm competition

20 intensity (Lüpold et al., 2009, 2020), and may affect a male's reproductive success (Anderson &

21 Dixson, 2002). Additionally, as testes are also used for testosterone production, testes size may

22 be correlated with testosterone production, especially in species where males compete through

23 overt aggression for access to females (Preston et al., 2012). Also, different factors, such as the

24 number of rival males, the option to use mating plugs, male condition and age, or social status,

25 can have an effect on resource allocation in the gonad (Bayram et al., 2020; Ramm, 2020).

Furthermore, variation in RTS may differ within species (Firman & Simmons, 2008) and may be driven by a variety of ecological factors (Firman et al. 2015). Our study covers many mammalian species, therefore, the lack of relationship may be due to variations in female reproductive strategies among different mammal lineages, thus, studying this relationship with further lineage or other groupings of mammals (e,g, guilds) may have revealed different patterns.

Beyond the influence of female mating multiply on testes size, females may also play an active role in determining the success of a male's sperm (Firman, 2020) through mechanisms such as cryptic female choice (Thornhill, 1983) or through female reproductive fluids (Gasparini et al., 2020). For example, in cryptic female choice, females control which male sires offspring in a larger litter rather than siring being determined by competition among the sperm. Females may benefit from sperm competition by 'selecting' sperm that increases the chance of obtaining high genetic quality offspring (Firman, 2020). Potentially, a female's reproductive state may also influence ejaculate composition and function, which may in turn affect a male's chances of fertilizing an egg (Perry et al., 2013). Thus, females not only play a role in sperm competition but may influence the evolution of male reproductive anatomy and physiology.

We focused our study on post-copulatory sexual selection, yet, many species also use pre-copulatory strategies (e.g., Ferrandiz-Rovira et al., 2014; Dines et al., 2015), and a trade-off between pre- and post-copulatory sexual selection likely varies among different lineages because of differences in life history traits and ecological conditions (Dines et al., 2015; Simmons et al., 2017). For example, where female monopolization is not possible or not common, mate searching and postcopulatory selection may be more important (Lüpold et al., 2014).

Conclusion

1   Using the largest dataset for mammals to date for this meta-analysis, including relative testes

2   size data for 631 mammalian species resulting in 224 unique terrestrial mammalian species

3   across 15 orders to examine the relationships between RTS and litter size and rate. We found

4   that testes size was larger in species where females mate with multiple males and when there

5   are more opportunities within a breeding season/or year (higher litter rate) to mate, reflecting

6   more intense sperm competition in these species. In contrast, in monogamous species, species

7   that had multiple litters per year had smaller relative testes sizes compared to species with

8   fewer litters per year. Overall, our extensive dataset shows that the effect of female reproductive

9   strategies on relative testes size is nuanced and varies between mating systems.

10

11 **Data availability**

12 Data and code are available on the GitHub repository

13 https://github.com/annemarievdmarel/meta-analysis_mammal_testessize (Marel et al., 2023).

14

15 **Conflict of interest**

16 We declare that we have no conflict of interest.

17

18 **Author's contributions**

19 All authors contributed to the conception of the study and data collection. AM analysed the data

20 and prepared the figures and supplementary material; AM and MHW drafted the manuscript; all

21 authors edited and approved its final version.

22

Funding

Acknowledgements

References

Aiello, L. C., & Wheeler, P. (1995). The expensive-tissue hypothesis: The brain and the digestive system in human and primate evolution. *Current Anthropology*, **36**, 199–221. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2744104

Anderson, M. J., & Dixson, A. F. (2002). Motility and the midpiece in primates. *Nature*, **416**, 496-496. https://doi.org/10.1038/416496a

Baker, P. J., Funk, S. M., Bruford, M. W., & Harris, S. (2004). Polygynandry in a red fox population: Implications for the evolution of group living in canids? *Behavioral Ecology*, **15**, 766–778. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arh077

Baker, J., Humphries, S., Ferguson-Gow, H., Meade, A., & Venditti, C. (2020). Rapid decreases in relative testes mass among monogamous birds but not in other vertebrates. *Ecology Letters*, **23**, 283–292. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13431

Balshine, S., Leach, B. J., Neat, F., Werner, N. Y., & Montgomerie, R. (2001). Sperm size of African cichlids in relation to sperm competition. *Behavioral Ecology*, **12**, 726–731. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/12.6.726

1   Bayram, H. L., Franco, C., Brownridge, P., Claydon, A. J., Koch, N., Hurst, J. L., Beynon, R. J.,

2   & Stockley, P. (2020). Social status and ejaculate composition in the house mouse.

3   *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **375**, 20200083.

4   https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0083

5   Breed, W. G., & Taylor, J. (2000). Body Mass, Testes Mass, and Sperm Size in Murine

6   Rodents. *Journal of Mammalogy*, **81**, 758–768. https://doi.org/10.1644/1545-

7   1542(2000)081<0758:BMTMAS>2.3.CO;2

8   Bürkner, P. C. (2017). brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *Journal*

9   *of Statistical Software*, **80**. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v080.i01

10   Bürkner, P. C. (2018). Advanced Bayesian multilevel modeling with the R package brms. *The R*

11   *Journal*, **10**, 395–411. https://doi.org/10.32614/rj-2018-017

12   Capellini, I., Baker, J., Allen, W. L., Street, S. E., & Venditti, C. (2015). The role of life history

13   traits in mammalian invasion success. *Ecology Letters*, **18**, 1099–1107.

14   https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12493

15   Carranza, J. (1996). Sexual selection for male body mass and the evolution of litter size in

16   mammals. *The American Naturalist*, **148**, 81–100. https://doi-

17   org.uml.idm.oclc.org/10.1086/285912

18   Charlton, B. D., & Reby, D. (2016). The evolution of acoustic size exaggeration in terrestrial

19   mammals. *Nature Communications*, **7**, 12739. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms12739

20   Clutton-Brock, T. H. & Isvaran, K. (2006). Paternity loss in contrasting mammalian societies.

21   *Biology Letters*, **2**, 513-516. https://doi-org.uml.idm.oclc.org/10.1098/rsbl.2006.0531

22   Dawson, A. (2007). Control of the annual cycle in birds: Endocrine constraints and plasticity in

23   response to ecological variability. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:*

24   *Biological Sciences*, **363**, 1621–1633. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2007.0004

25   Dewsbury, D. A. (1982). Ejaculate cost and male choice. *The American Naturalist*, **119**, 601–

26   610. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2461181

Dines, J. P., Mesnick, S. L., Ralls, K., May-Collado, L., Agnarsson, I., & Dean, M. D. (2015). A trade-off between precopulatory and postcopulatory trait investment in male cetaceans. *Evolution*, **69**, 1560–1572. https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.12676

Ferrandiz-Rovira, M., Lemaître, J.-F., Lardy, S., López, B. C., & Cohas, A. (2014). Do pre- and post-copulatory sexually selected traits covary in large herbivores*? BMC Evolutionary Biology*, **14**, 79. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2148-14-79

Firman, R. C., & Simmons, L. W. (2008). The frequency of multiple paternity predicts variation in testes size among island populations of house mice. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology,* **21**, 1524–1533. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2008.01612.x

Firman, R. C., Garcia-Gonzalez, F., Thyer, E., Wheeler, S., Yamin, Z., Yuan, M., & Simmons, L. W. (2015). Evolutionary change in testes tissue composition among experimental populations of house mice. *Evolution*, **69**, 848–855. https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.12603

Firman, R. C. (2020). Of mice and women: Advances in mammalian sperm competition with a focus on the female perspective. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **375**, 20200082. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0082

Firman, R. C., Gasparini, C., Manier, M. K., & Pizzari, T. (2017). Postmating Female Control: 20 Years of Cryptic Female Choice. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **32**, 368–382. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2017.02.010

Fitzpatrick, J. L., Almbro, M., Gonzalez-Voyer, A., Kolm, N., & Simmons, L. W. (2012). Male contest competition and the coevolution of weaponry and testes in pinnipeds. *Evolution*, *66*, 3595–3604. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01713.x

Gage, M. J. G., & Freckleton, R. P. (2003). Relative testis size and sperm morphometry across mammals: No evidence for an association between sperm competition and sperm length. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, **270**, 625–632. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2002.2258

Garbino, G. S. T., Feijó, A., Beltrão-Mendes, R., & Da Rocha, P. A. (2021). Evolution of litter

1   size in bats and its influence on longevity and roosting ecology. *Biological Journal of the*

2   *Linnean Society*, **132**, 676–684. https://doi.org/10.1093/biolinnean/blaa203

3   Gasparini, C., Pilastro, A., & Evans, J. P. (2020). The role of female reproductive fluid in sperm

4   competition. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*,

5   **375**, 20200077. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0077

6   Hamel, S., Gaillard, J. M., Yoccoz, N. G., Loison, A., Bonenfant, C., & Descamps, S. (2010).

7   Fitness costs of reproduction depend on life speed: Empirical evidence from mammalian

8   populations. *Ecology Letters*, **13**, 915–935. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-

9   0248.2010.01478.x

10   Hayward, A., & Gillooly, J. F. (2011). The Cost of Sex: Quantifying Energetic Investment in

11   Gamete Production by Males and Females. *PLOS ONE*, **6**, e16557.

12   https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0016557

13   Heldstab, S., Isler, K., Burkart, J. M., & van Schaik, C. P. (2019). Allomaternal care, brains and

14   fertility in mammals: Who cares matters. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, **73**, 71.

15   https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-019-2684-x

16   Iossa, G., Soulsbury, C. D., Baker, P. J., & Harris, S. (2008). Sperm competition and the

17   evolution of testes size in terrestrial mammalian carnivores. *Functional Ecology*, **22**,

18   655–662. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2008.01409.x

19   Isler, K., & van Schaik, C. (2006). Costs of encephalization: The energy trade-off hypothesis

20   tested on birds. *Journal of Human Evolution*, **51**, 228–243.

21   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2006.03.006

22   Kenagy, G. J., & Trombulak, S. C. (1986). Size and function of mammalian testes in relation to

23   body size. *Journal of Mammalogy*, **67**, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.2307/1380997

24   Lemaître, J.-F., Ramm, S. A., Barton, R. A., & Stockley, P. (2009). Sperm competition and brain

25   size evolution in mammals. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **22**, 2215–2221.

26   https://doi.org /10.1111/j.1420-9101.2009.01837.x

1   Lemaître, J.-F., Ramm, S. A., Hurst, J. L., & Stockley, P. (2011). Social cues of sperm

2   competition influence accessory reproductive gland size in a promiscuous mammal.

3   *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences,* **278**, 1171–1176.

4   https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2010.1828

5   Lin, T.-T., You, E.-M., & Lin, Y. K. (2009). Social and Genetic Mating Systems of the Asian

6   Lesser White-Toothed Shrew, *Crocidura shantungensis*, in Taiwan. *Journal of*

7   *Mammalogy*, **90**, 1370–1380. https://doi.org/10.1644/08-MAMM-A-346R1.1

8   Lukas, D., & Clutton-Brock, T. H. (2013). The Evolution of Social Monogamy in Mammals.

9   *Science*, **341**, 526–530. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1238677

10 Lukas, D., & Huchard, E. (2019). The evolution of infanticide by females in mammals.

11   *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **374**, 20180075.

12   https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0075

13 Lüpold, S., Simmons, L. W., & Grueter, C. C. (2019). Sexual ornaments but not weapons trade

14   off against testes size in primates. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*

15   *Sciences*, **286**, 20182542. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.2542

16 Lüpold, S., de Boer, R., Evans, J., Tomkins, J., & Fitzpatrick, J. (2020). How sperm competition

17   shapes the evolution of testes and sperm: A meta-analysis. *Philosophical Transactions*

18   *of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **375**, 20200064.

19   https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0064

20 Lüpold, S., Linz, G. M., Rivers, J. W., Westneat, D. F., & Birkhead, T. R. (2009). Sperm

21   competition selects beyond relative testes size in birds. *Evolution*, **63**, 391–402.

22   https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00571.x

23 Lüpold, S., Tomkins, J. L., Simmons, L. W., & Fitzpatrick, J. L. (2014). Female monopolization

24   mediates the relationship between pre- and postcopulatory sexual traits. *Nature*

25   *Communications*, **5,** 3184. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms4184

26 Manjerovic, M. B., Kinahan, A. A., Waterman, J. M., Bennett, N. C., & Bateman, P. W. (2008).

Structure and allometry of genitalia in males and females of a social African ground squirrel with high polygynandry. *Journal of Zoology*, **275**, 375–380. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.2008.00449.x

Marel, A. van der, Warrington, M. H., & Waterman, J. M. (2023). *annemarievdmarel/meta-analysis_mammal_testessize: Code and data for meta-analysis studying the association between male and female reproductive investment in mammals* (v1.0). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7853370

McEachern, M. B., McElreath, R. L., Van Vuren, D. H., & Eadie, J. M. (2009). Another genetically promiscuous 'polygynous' mammal: Mating system variation in *Neotoma fuscipes. Animal Behaviour*, **77**, 449–455. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2008.10.024

Myhrvold, N. P., Baldridge, E., Chan, B., Sivam, D., Freeman, D. L., & Ernest, S. K. M. (2015). An amniote life-history database to perform comparative analyses with birds, mammals, and reptiles. *Ecology*, **96**, 3109–3109. https://doi.org/10.1890/15-0846R.1

Parker, G. A. (1970). Sperm Competition and Its Evolutionary Consequences in the Insects. *Biological Reviews*, **45**, 525–567. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.1970.tb01176.x

Parker, G. A. (2020). Conceptual developments in sperm competition: A very brief synopsis. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **375***, 20200061. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0061

Parker, G. A., Ball, M. A., Stockley, P., & Gage, M. J. G. (1997). Sperm Competition Games: A Prospective Analysis of Risk Assessment. *Proceedings: Biological Sciences*, **264,** 1793–1802.

Perry, J. C., Sirot, L., & Wigby, S. (2013). The seminal symphony: How to compose an ejaculate. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **28**, 414–422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2013.03.005

Pitcher, T. E., Dunn, P. O., & Whittingham, L. A. (2005). Sperm competition and the evolution of testes size in birds. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **18**, 557–567.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2004.00874.x

Preston, B. T., Stevenson, I. R., Lincoln, G. A., Monfort, S. L., Pilkington, J. G., & Wilson, K.

(2012). Testes size, testosterone production and reproductive behaviour in a natural

mammalian mating system. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **81**, 296–305.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01907.x

Quesada, R., Triana, E., Vargas, G., Douglass, J. K., Seid, M. A., Niven, J. E., Eberhard, W. G.,

& Wcislo, W. T. (2011). The allometry of CNS size and consequences of miniaturization

in orb-weaving and cleptoparasitic spiders. *Arthropod Structure & Development*, **40**,

521–529. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asd.2011.07.002

R Core Team. (2021). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. In *R Foundation

for Statistical Computing*. https://www.r-project.org/

Ramm, S. A. (2020). Seminal fluid and accessory male investment in sperm competition.

Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, **375**, 20200068.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0068

Ramm, S. A., Parker, G. A., & Stockley, P. (2005). Sperm competition and the evolution of male

reproductive anatomy in rodents. *Proceedings of the The Royal Society B: Biological

Sciences*, **272**, 949–955. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2004.3048

Ramm, S. A., & Schärer, L. (2014). The evolutionary ecology of testicular function: Size isn't

everything. *Biological Reviews*, **89**, 874–888. https://doi-

org.uml.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/brv.12084

Rowley, A. G., Daly-Engel, T. S., & Fitzpatrick, J. L. (2019). Testes size increases with sperm

competition risk and intensity in bony fish and sharks. *Behavioral Ecology*, **30**, 364–371.

https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/ary174

Russell, L. D., Ren, H. P., Hikim, I. S., Schulze, W., & Hikim, A. P. S. (1990). A comparative

study in twelve mammalian species of volume densities, volumes, and numerical

densities of selected testis components, emphasizing those related to the Sertoli cell.

American Journal of Anatomy, **188**, 21–30. https://doi.org/10.1002/aja.1001880104

Rymer, T. L., & Pillay, N. (2018). An integrated understanding of paternal care in mammals: Lessons from the rodents. *Journal of Zoology*, **306**, 69–76. https://doi.org/10.1111/jzo.12575

Schulte-Hostedde, A., Millar, J., & Hickling, G. (2005). Condition dependence of testis size in small mammals. *Evolutionary Ecology Research*, **7**, 143–149.

Sibly, R. M., Witt, C. C., Wright, N. a, Venditti, C., Jetz, W., & Brown, J. H. (2012). Energetics, lifestyle, and reproduction in birds. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **109**, 10937–10941. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1206512109

Simmons, L. W., & Fitzpatrick, J. L. (2012). Sperm wars and the evolution of male fertility. *Reproduction*, **144**, 519–534. https://doi.org/10.1530/REP-12-0285

Simmons, L. W., Lüpold, S., & Fitzpatrick, J. L. (2017). Evolutionary Trade-Off between Secondary Sexual Traits and Ejaculates. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **32**, 964–976. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2017.09.011

Simmons, L. W., & Wedell, N. (2020). Fifty years of sperm competition: The structure of a scientific revolution. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **375**, 20200060. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0060

Sinervo, B., Chaine, A. S., & Miles, D. B. (2020). Social Games and Genic Selection Drive Mammalian Mating System Evolution and Speciation. *The American Naturalist*, **195**, 247–274. https://doi.org/10.1086/706810

Soulsbury, C. D. (2010). Genetic Patterns of Paternity and Testes Size in Mammals. *PLOS ONE*, **5**, e9581. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0009581

Stan Development Team. (2022). RStan: The R interface to Stan (R package version 2.21.7). https://mc-stan.org/

Stearns, S.C. (1992) The evolution of life histories. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

1 Stumpf, R. M., Martinez-Mota, R., Milich, K. M., Righini, N., & Shattuck, M. R. (2011). Sexual

2   conflict in primates. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews*, **20**, 62–75.

3   https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.20297

4 Sutter, A., & Immler, S. (2020). Within-ejaculate sperm competition. *Philosophical Transactions*

5   *of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **375**, 20200066.

6   https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0066

7 Thornhill, R. (1983). Cryptic Female Choice and Its Implications in the Scorpionfly *Harpobittacus*

8   *nigriceps. The American Naturalist*, **122**, 765–788. https://doi.org/10.1086/284170

9 Upham, N. S., Esselstyn, J. A., & Jetz, W. (2019). Inferring the mammal tree: Species-level sets

10   of phylogenies for questions in ecology, evolution, and conservation. *PLOS Biology*, **17**,

11   e3000494. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000494

12 van Noordwijk, A. J., & de Jong, G. (1986). Acquisition and Allocation of Resources: Their

13   Influence on Variation in Life History Tactics. *The American Naturalist*, **128**, 137–142.

14   https://doi.org/10.1086/284547

15 Vehtari, A., Gelman, A., & Gabry, J. (2017). Practical Bayesian model evaluation using leave-

16   one-out cross-validation and WAIC. *Statistics and Computing*, **27,** 1413–1432.

17   https://doi.org/10.1007/s11222-016-9696-4

18 Waterman, J. M. (1996). Reproductive Biology of a Tropical, Non-Hibernating Ground Squirrel.

19   *Journal of Mammalogy*, **77**, 134–146. https://doi.org/10.2307/1382715

20 Waterman, J. M. (1998). Mating tactics of male Cape ground squirrels, *Xerus inauris*:

21   Consequences of year-round breeding. *Animal Behaviour*, **56**, 459–466.

22   https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.1998.0780.PMID:9787037.

23 Waterman, J. 2007. "Male mating strategies in rodents. In 'Rodent Societies: An Ecological and

24   Evolutionary Perspective'. Editors JO Wolff and PW Sherman. The University of Chicago

25   Press, Chicago, USA.

26 West, H. E. R., & Capellini, I. (2016). Male care and life history traits in mammals. *Nature*

Communications, *7*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms11854

Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer-Verlag.

https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org

Wolff, J. O., & Macdonald, D. W. (2004). Promiscuous females protect their offspring. *Trends in*

Ecology & Evolution, **19**, 127–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2003.12.009

Woodroffe, R., & Vincent, A. (1994). Mother's little helpers: Patterns of male care in mammals.

Trends in Ecology & Evolution, **9**, 294–297. https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-

5347(94)90033-7

1   **Figures**

2

3   **Figure 1.** Relative testes size and litters per year for 224 terrestrial mammals. Colours

4   represent species by order.

5

6

7

1 **Figure 2.** Relative testes size and mating system across 224 terrestrial mammalian species.

2 The dark line is the median, the box edges are the upper and lower quartiles, the whiskers are

3 50% from the median, and the closed circles are the outliers, calculated as the values smaller or

4 larger than 1.5 times the box length (i.e., upper-lower quantile).

5

6

7

8

1 **Figure 3.** The interaction between litters per year and mating system on relative testes size in

2 224 terrestrial mammals.

3

4

5

1   **Figure 4.** The effect of the presence of multiple mating of females (promiscuity) or absence

2   (monogamy or polygyny) on relative testes size in 88 terrestrial mammals that have a litter size

3   ≤ 1. The dark line is the median, the box edges are the upper and lower quartiles, the whiskers

4   are 50% from the median, and the closed circles are the outliers, calculated as the values

5   smaller or larger than 1.5 times the box length (i.e., upper-lower quantile).

6

7

8

1 **Tables**

2

3 **Table 1.** Loo Information Criterion of the models describing relative testes size in 224 terrestrial

4 mammals.

5

Model	Predictor variables	LooIC mean (lwr95CI - upr95CI)	Number of species
Intercept only	1	341.5 (337.9 – 345.2)	224
Global model	Litter size + litters/year + longevity + mating system + paternal care	330.8 (326.9 – 335.4)	224
Interaction model	Litter size * litters/year * mating system + longevity + paternal care	320.4 (316.6 – 324.8)	224

6

7

1 **Table 2.** Full summary of the factors affecting relative testes size in terrestrial mammals

2 (interaction model). All estimates are summarized by the mean and 95% credible interval

3 ("lwr95CI" – "upr95CI") of the posterior distribution of the model run across 100 sampled

4 phylogenetic trees. The factors highlighted in bold represent the variables that have an

5 influential effect on relative testes size.

Parameter	Mean	lwr95CI	upr95CI
Intercept	**-1.09**	**-2.09**	**-0.16**
Litter size	0.14	-0.36	0.67
Litters per year	**-0.93**	**-1.38**	**-0.46**
Mating system (polygynous)	0.42	-0.03	0.86
Mating system (promiscuous)	**0.70**	**0.26**	**1.13**
Longevity	-0.01	-0.19	0.18
Paternal care present	-0.15	-0.49	0.18
Litter size:litters/year	0.35	-0.41	1.11
Litter size:polygynous mating system	-0.06	-0.61	0.48
Litter size:promiscuous mating system	-0.13	-0.64	0.39
Litters/year:polygynous mating system	**1.09**	**0.60**	**1.59**
Litters/year:promiscuous mating system	**0.97**	**0.51**	**1.44**
Litter size:litters/year:polygynous mating system	-0.40	-1.22	0.40
Litter size:litters/year:promiscuous mating system	-0.36	-1.13	0.43
Phylo SD	**0.30**	**0.00**	**0.52**
Species SD	**0.06**	**0.03**	**0.09**

6

1 **Table 3.** Loo Information Criterion of the models describing relative testes size in terrestrial

2 mammals across 16 orders that have a litter size of 1.

Model	Predictor variables	LooIC mean (lwr95CI - upr95CI)	Number of species
Global model	Litters/year + female multiple mating + longevity	74 (72.7 – 75.4)	88
Interaction model	Litters/year * female multiple mating + longevity	75.3 (74.1 – 76.9)	88

3

4

5 **Table 4.** Full summary of the factors affecting relative testes size in a subset of terrestrial

6 mammals with a litter size ≤ 1 (global model). All estimates are on the log-odds scale and

7 summarized by the mean and 95% credible interval ("lwr95CI" – "upr95CI") of the posterior

8 distribution of the model ran across 100 sampled phylogenetic trees. The factors highlighted in

9 bold represent the variable that has an influential effect on relative testes size.

Parameter	Mean	lwr95CI	upr95CI
Intercept	**-0.99**	**-1.53**	**-0.38**
Litters per year	0.07	-0.11	0.25
Longevity	0.14	-0.07	0.35
Female multiple mating present	**0.54**	**0.22**	**0.87**
Phylo SD	0.33	0	0.58
Species SD	0.03	0	0.07

10

11