



Indirect genetic effects on the sociability of several group members



Blake B. Anderson¹, Andrew Scott², Reuven Dukas^{*}

Animal Behaviour Group, Department of Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 30 June 2016

Initial acceptance 4 August 2016

Final acceptance 26 August 2016

MS. number: A16-00579

Keywords:

Drosophila melanogaster
fruit fly

indirect genetic effects

nearest-neighbour distance

social behaviour

Indirect genetic effects (IGEs) are a major driver of social evolution, but much of the experimental work pertaining to IGEs on social behaviour has focused on the effect of stimulus individuals on single focal individuals. We extended IGE research to examine how stimulus individuals influence social interactions among several focal individuals. Specifically, we relied on recent work on social behaviour in fruit flies to examine whether IGEs cause 12 stimulus flies of distinct genotypes to alter social interactions within groups of six focal flies. The social behaviour of focals was significantly affected by the genotype of the stimulus flies. Focals were closer together when grouped with stimulus flies from genotypes that were close together than when grouped with stimulus flies from genotypes that were farther apart. A mechanism mediating this effect was the encounter rate between focal flies, which was lowest when the focal flies were grouped with stimulus flies of the more cohesive genotypes.

© 2016 The Association for the Study of Animal Behaviour. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

It has long been recognized that the observed behaviour of a social group reflects the characteristics of its individual members, and that some individuals might disproportionately determine group performance (Allee, 1938; Modlmeier, Keiser, Watters, Sih, & Pruitt, 2014; Pentland, 2014). For example, the average social sensitivity of group members was the best predictor of performance on a variety of collective tasks by human groups (Woolley, Chabris, Pentland, Hashmi, & Malone, 2010). And in the social spider *Stegodyphus dumicola*, the presence of a few mature females increased the frequency of attacking prey in small juvenile groups and decreased attack latencies in large juvenile groups (Modlmeier et al., 2015).

When individual traits that influence social behaviour are heritable, the performance of one group member is partially determined by the genotypes of other members. Such indirect genetic effects (IGE) (Griffing, 1967; Moore, Brodie, & Jason, 1997; Scott, 1977) have been documented in a variety of traits and taxa including aggression in deer mice, *Peromyscus maniculatus* (Wilson, Gelin, Perron, & Réale, 2009), domestic pigs, *Sus scrofa* (Camerlink, Ursinus, Bijma, Kemp, & Bolhuis, 2015) and fruit flies, *Drosophila melanogaster* (Saltz, 2013), mate choice in field crickets,

Teleogryllus oceanicus (Bailey & Zuk, 2012) and tree hoppers, *Enchenopa binotata* (Rebar & Rodríguez, 2013), chemical signalling in fruit flies (*Drosophila* spp.) (Kent, Azanchi, Smith, Formosa, & Levine, 2008; Petfield, Chenoweth, Rundle, & Blows, 2005), and antipredatory behaviour in guppies, *Poecilia reticulata* (Bleakley & Brodie, 2009).

Much of the experimental work on IGEs on social behaviour has focused on the effect of stimulus individuals on focals. The only exception we know of (Saltz, 2013) considered the effect of a stimulus individual on interactions between two focal individuals. Saltz (2013) termed the classically considered interactions between the stimulus and focal individual 'first-order IGEs', and the effect of the stimulus individual on interactions between the two focals 'second-order IGEs'. Social behaviour often involves many individuals. Because theory indicates that IGEs can profoundly influence both the rate and direction of the evolution of social traits (Moore et al., 1997; Wolf & Moore, 2010), it is pertinent that we examine IGEs of stimulus individuals on social interactions among several focal individuals. To this end, we relied on the recent work on social behaviour in fruit flies (Battesti, Moreno, Joly, & Mery, 2012; Krupp et al., 2008; Saltz, 2011; Sarin & Dukas, 2009; Simon et al., 2012) and on our own research documenting significant genetic variation in social behaviour in fruit flies (Anderson, Scott, & Dukas, 2016) to test whether stimulus flies of distinct social genotypes determine social features among groups of six focal flies. While there are different ways to define and measure social behaviour, our focus here is on the tendency of conspecifics to be close to others (Ward & Webster, 2016).

* Correspondence: R. Dukas, Animal Behaviour Group, Department of Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street West, Hamilton, ON L8S 4K1, Canada.

E-mail address: dukas@mcmaster.ca (R. Dukas).

¹ E-mail address: anderbb@mcmaster.ca (B. B. Anderson).

² E-mail address: scottam3@mcmaster.ca (A. Scott).

Specifically, we predicted that six focal flies would be closer together when grouped with 12 flies of stimulus genotypes that were close together than when grouped with 12 flies of stimulus genotypes that were farther apart. In a follow-up experiment, we examined the behavioural mechanism mediating the IGEs.

METHODS

General

We maintained all populations at low density in 40 ml vials each containing 5 ml of standard food (1 litre of which contained 90 g of sucrose, 32 g of yeast, 75 g of cornmeal, 20 g of agar and 2 g of methyl paraben), at 25 °C and 60% relative humidity, on a 12:12 h light cycle with lights on at 1000 hours. These conditions are optimal for fruit fly well-being. Furthermore, we handled flies either by gentle aspiration or with a soft brush following brief anaesthetization with CO₂, and applied no harmful manipulations. Our focal flies belonged to an inbred line of Canton-S, which has been in captivity for decades and in our laboratory for 6 years. Our three stimulus fly lines were two lines of the *Drosophila* Genetic Reference Panel (DGRP; Mackay et al., 2012) and the Canton-S (CS) line. We chose the two DGRP lines (304 and 427) based on our previous work (Anderson et al., 2016) as well as the preliminary experiment described below.

Preliminary Experiment

We collected flies within 8 h of eclosion on day 1 and housed them in mixed-sex vials each containing 20 males and 20 females. On day 4 at 0800 hours, we transferred groups of 18 males from each line each into an 85 mm food dish. The petri dishes contained standard food, with cornmeal omitted to minimize variation in surface texture. The volume of food was sufficient to minimize headspace, such that flies were constrained to two dimensions during observations. At 1300 hours, we placed the dishes inside test boxes (53 × 31 × 30 cm; length × width × height) made of semi-opaque plastic and illuminated by diffused room light. After an additional 2 h of acclimatization, we videorecorded the dishes for 1 h with high-resolution webcams (Logitech C920) through a hole in the centre of each box lid.

During video analyses, we sampled the Cartesian coordinates of each fly at 30 s intervals and calculated a single nearest-neighbour index for the 18 flies in each dish. The nearest-neighbour index is defined by the ratio between the mean observed nearest-neighbour distance and that expected by chance at the given density. Nearest-neighbour indices range from 0, where all points occupy the same region in space, to 2.15, which represents a perfectly uniform distribution (Anderson et al., 2016; Clark & Evans, 1954). Calculations were similar to those illustrated in Fig. 1a for experiment 1 but were based on 18 flies belonging to a single line. Similar measures have been used successfully in numerous studies on social behaviour in a variety of species (Durisko, Kemp, Mubasher, & Dukas, 2014; Evans & Harris, 2008; White & Chapman, 1994). The distance among individuals reflects some balance between the degree of attraction to and avoidance of others, with the latter being either a response to the presence of a nearby individual or a result of some aggressive interactions (Brown & Orrians, 1970; Conder, 1949). Hence the average nearest-neighbour distance in a group provides us with a comprehensive and objective measure for comparisons between genotypes and treatments of the outcomes of social interactions among individuals. Nevertheless, a complete characterization of social behaviour will benefit from using a variety of protocols (Saltz, 2011; Schneider, Dickinson, & Levine, 2012).

We intended to use in the main experiment, and hence tested in the preliminary experiment, six DGRP lines (304, 360, 362, 365, 427 and 437) as well as our Canton-S line. We expected to observe two discrete levels of social behaviour from our DGRP lines based on our previous work, which employed a distinct protocol (Anderson et al., 2016). However, only line 304 expressed a social phenotype that was significantly different from the other DGRP lines (all $P < 0.001$, uncorrected pairwise t tests). The nearest-neighbour scores of the remaining five DGRP lines were indistinguishable from one another (all $P > 0.77$), although line 427 was the least variable DGRP line tested. We thus proceeded using only lines 304, 427 and our Canton-S line, which was the least social line of the three (all $P < 0.05$; Fig. 1b).

Experiment 1

We collected flies within 8 h of eclosion on day 1 and housed stimulus and focal males in different mixed-sex vials each containing 14 males and 14 females. Focal and stimulus Canton-S flies always came from distinct vials. On day 4 at 0800 hours, we marked focal and stimulus males with either pink or blue fluorescent powder, which was counterbalanced across days. An hour after marking, we briefly anaesthetized the flies under light CO₂ and transferred six focal males from one vial and 12 stimulus males from another vial into each 85 mm petri dish with food as described above. That is, each experimental dish contained 18 males. At 1300 hours, we transferred six dishes of flies into each of four test boxes described above. Following an additional 2 h of acclimatization, we videorecorded the flies for 60 min as described above. During video analyses, we sampled Cartesian coordinates of each fly at 60 s intervals. Observers blind to fly treatment verified the position of all 18 males and distinguished the six focals from the 12 stimulus males based on colour.

To quantify social behaviour, we calculated two nearest-neighbour indices independently for each dish and time point: one for the six focal males and one for the 12 stimulus males (Fig. 1a). We observed a total of 126 dishes ($N = 42$ per stimulus line), and analysed the data in R version 3.2 (R Core Team, 2014) with a linear mixed model with focal male nearest-neighbour index as a response variable, stimulus genotype and focal colour as fixed effects, day, box and dish as random effects, and time as a repeated measure. Although there was a significant effect of colour ($\chi^2_1 = 14.38$, $P < 0.001$), there was no effect of day ($P = 1.0$), box ($P = 0.15$), nor changes over time ($\chi^2_1 = 0.01$, $P = 0.93$).

Our preliminary data indicated that the nearest-neighbour index is sensitive to the number of individuals when a group of flies is divided into two subgroups of different sizes. This was relevant here, as we observed six focal flies and 12 stimulus flies within the same dish. To verify this outcome, we performed a simulation in which we sampled dishes from our preliminary experiment (with replacement), randomly partitioning each dish into subgroups of six and 12 and calculating a nearest-neighbour index for each subgroup. The nearest neighbour indices were greater for subgroups of six flies (mean and 95% CI = 1.0 (0.46, 1.38)) than for subgroups of 12 flies (0.89 (0.47, 1.14)). This most likely explains the difference in nearest-neighbour indices between the 12 stimulus and six focal Canton-S flies observed when comparing Fig. 1c and d.

To quantify the magnitude of the indirect genetic effect on focal phenotype, we fitted a second model to estimate the interaction coefficient (Ψ) based on the partial regression coefficient between focal and stimulus fly nearest-neighbour indices (Equation 2b in Moore et al., 1997). This model was identical to our initial model, but included stimulus fly nearest-neighbour index and its interaction with genotype as fixed effects. Although the IGE is

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5538574>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5538574>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)