

LJMU Research Online

Swaney, WT, Cabrera-Álvarez, MJ and Reader, SM

Behavioural responses of feral and domestic guppies (Poecilia reticulata) to predators and their cues.

https://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/1334/

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Swaney, WT, Cabrera-Álvarez, MJ and Reader, SM (2015) Behavioural responses of feral and domestic guppies (Poecilia reticulata) to predators and their cues. Behavioural Processes, 118. pp. 42-46. ISSN 1872-8308

LJMU has developed LJMU Research Online for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/

1 Behavioural responses of feral and domestic guppies (Poecilia

2 reticulata) to predators and their cues

- 3 William T. Swaney^{a,b}*, María J. Cabrera-Álvarez^{a,c}, Simon M. Reader^{a,c}
- 4 ^aDepartment of Biology and Helmholtz Institute, Utrecht University, PO Box 80.086, 3508
- 5 TB Utrecht, The Netherlands
- 6 ^bPresent address: School of Natural Sciences and Psychology, Liverpool John Moores
- 7 University, James Parsons Building, Byrom Street, Liverpool, L3 3AF, United Kingdom
- 8 ^cPresent address: Department of Biology, McGill University, 1205 avenue Docteur Penfield,
- 9 Montreal QC, H3A 1B1, Canada
- 10
- 11 *corresponding author:
- 12 William T. Swaney
- 13 School of Natural Sciences and Psychology, Liverpool John Moores University, James
- 14 Parsons Building, Byrom Street, Liverpool, L3 3AF, United Kingdom.
- 15 phone: +44 (0)151 2312160
- 16 email: w.t.swaney@ljmu.ac.uk
- 17
- 18

19 Abstract

20 Predation is an important factor during adaptation to novel environments and the feralisation 21 of introduced domestic species often involves responding appropriately to allopatric 22 predators despite a background of domestication and inbreeding. Twenty years ago domestic 23 guppies were introduced to a semi-natural environment at Burgers' Zoo in the Netherlands, 24 where they have since been exposed to avian predation. We compared predation-linked 25 behaviours in this feral population and in domestic guppies akin to the original founders. We 26 found that both populations responded to a novel predator and to conspecific alarm cues. 27 However shoaling, an important anti-predator behaviour, was higher among feral guppies 28 both at baseline and when exposed to the novel predator. We did not observe a linked suite of anti-predator behaviours across shoaling, predator inspection, alarm substance sensitivity and 29 30 boldness, suggesting that these responses may be decoupled from one another depending on 31 local predation regimes. As we compared two populations, we cannot identify the causal 32 factors determining population differences, however, our results do suggest that shoaling is 33 either a particularly consequential anti-predator adaptation or the most labile of the 34 behaviours we tested. Finally, the behavioural adaptability of domestic guppies may help to 35 explain their success as an invasive species.

36

37

38 Keywords

39 predation; feralization; shoaling; grouping behaviour; domestication; guppy

41 **1. Introduction**

Predation is a major driver of variation across taxa, influencing behaviours that may lessen predation risk such as social grouping (Hass and Valenzuela, 2002; Magurran, 1990a; Quinn and Cresswell, 2006) and vigilance (Forslund, 1993; Lung and Childress, 2007). However, these behaviours may also carry costs. For example, grouping may increase competition for resources or exposure to parasites (Krause and Ruxton, 2002). Thus anti-predator behaviours are expected to vary across populations experiencing different levels of predation.

48

49 Studies of wild guppies (Poecilia reticulata) on the Caribbean island of Trinidad have shown 50 that populations under high levels of predation form tighter shoals (Magurran and Seghers, 51 1991; Seghers, 1974); engage in less risky predator inspection (Magurran and Seghers, 1990, 52 1994) and exhibit changes in sensitivity to conspecific alarm cues (Brown et al., 2009). While 53 extensive study of wild guppies has provided strong evidence for evolved adaptation to 54 predation in Trinidad, the guppy is also an important invasive species affecting local ecology, 55 with feral populations identified in 60 countries across six continents (Froese and Pauly, 56 2012). These feral populations are often derived from inbred ornamental guppies (Lindholm 57 et al., 2005), artificially selected for traits that may not be adaptive in the wild (Huntingford, 58 2004). Their success in novel habitats with allopatric predators suggests that domestic 59 guppies retain traits that are adaptive in new environments (Deacon et al., 2011) or have 60 sufficient genetic diversity to adapt to new environmental challenges.

61

We examined the influence of feralization and predation on the behaviour of guppies from
Burgers' Zoo in Arnhem, the Netherlands. The zoo contains a 120 m³ manatee (*Trichechus manatus*) pool which also houses a feral population of guppies, derived from an initial

65 introduction of mixed-strain domestic guppies released by a zoo visitor in 1989, and subsequently left untended. The release was observed by zoo curators, who estimate that it 66 67 consisted of approximately 100 individuals (Max Janse, Burgers' Zoo curator, personal 68 communication, 2015). The population has subsequently expanded considerably and is 69 estimated to number well over 100.000 guppies (Max Janse, personal communication; 70 Albers, 2000). These now-feralized guppies forage on plentiful manatee food and faeces, but 71 are subject to predation from three resident African darters (Anhinga rufa) which dive 72 regularly each day for guppies (personal observation) and have been reported to eat up to 73 1000 guppies each per day (Albers, 2000). The feral guppies resemble wild guppies in 74 appearance and have lost the bright colours and extravagant tails typical of domestic guppies 75 (fig. 1A). A previous study examined body colouration in these fish, and anecdotally reported 76 dense shoaling among these feral guppies (Albers, 2000). We compared this feral population 77 with mixed-strain domestic guppies akin to the ancestral founders and measured predation-78 linked behaviours: shoaling, predator inspection behaviour, alarm substance sensitivity, and 79 boldness/exploration. We predicted the feral guppies would shoal more, inspect predators 80 more cautiously, be more sensitive to alarm substance and be less bold and exploratory as a 81 consequence of feralization and adaptation to predation.

82

83 2. Materials and Methods

84 2.1. Subjects and housing

Nineteen domestic and 19 feral male guppies were used as experimental subjects, with a
further 14 domestic and 14 feral males used either as shoaling companions or for alarm
substance extraction. Domestic guppies were from a mixed strain population of
approximately 1400 fish, first established in 2003 within the Utrecht University Biology

89 aquarium and based on a founder population of approximately 480 domestic guppies 90 purchased from two commercial suppliers (Ruinemans, Montfoort and Ruisbroek, Maassluis, 91 both The Netherlands). Feral guppies were caught with dip nets from the manatee pool at 92 Burgers' Zoo. Feral guppies were sampled in November 2009, four months before the study, 93 and rehoused in our aquarium. Thus the feral guppies had both an evolutionary history and 94 direct experience of predation. Given an estimate of two generations per year (Magurran, 95 2005; Reznick et al., 1997), the domestic guppies are estimated to have bred for 10-15 96 generations in the Utrecht aquarium and the feral guppies for 35-45 generations at Burgers' 97 Zoo. Feral guppies were treated to remove ectoparasites after capture by 15 minute 98 immersion in 2.5% salt solution as a precautionary measure. Domestic guppies had brighter 99 and more varied colouration patterns than feral guppies, but subjects of each population were 100 similarly sized. Two male red rainbowfish (Glossolepsis incisus) from our aquarium were 101 used as potential predators as they represented a novel, allopatric threat to both domestic and 102 feral guppies. Two weeks before the study, all experimental animals were moved to our 103 experimental laboratory.

104

Laboratory lights were on from 08:00 to 20:00. Fish were housed separately by population/species in $80 \times 50 \times 40$ cm tanks except for shoaling companion guppies which were housed in a $90 \times 50 \times 25$ cm tank, with domestic and feral guppies separated by an opaque partition. Tanks contained gravel, plastic plants and terracotta pots, and were filtered and heated to $26\pm1^{\circ}$ C. Fish were fed TetraMin flake food (Tetra, Germany) daily and fresh bloodworm (*Chironomidae* larvae) three times a week.

112 *2.2. Experimental procedures*

113 Subjects were tested for: i) boldness and exploration, ii) responses to alarm substance, and iii) 114 shoaling and predator inspection, with 3-7 days between tests. Test order was consistent so 115 any carry-over effects from each test were the same across individuals. Housing tanks were 116 divided with plastic partitions to create separate areas for subjects after testing. On test days, fish were fed at the conclusion of testing. Some fish were excluded from tests due to illness 117 118 or for methodological reasons: 19 guppies per group were used in boldness/exploration tests, 119 17 guppies per group in alarm substance response tests, and 17 domestic and 15 feral guppies 120 in shoaling and predator inspection tests.

121

122

2.2.1. Boldness and exploration

The test tank (fig. 1B) consisted of a "sheltered" area with gravel, plastic plants and a terracotta pot, and a bare, brightly lit "exposed" area, which also contained a suspended opaque partition creating a novel "hidden" area not visible from the sheltered area. Notional boundaries of these areas and the upper and lower halves of the tank were marked on the front of the tank. At test, individual subjects were released into the sheltered area and behaviour recorded for 10 minutes.

129

Latencies to enter exposed and hidden areas were analysed by Wilcoxon-Gehan survival test
(subjects that did not enter were assigned the maximum latency of 600 seconds). Time in the
exposed area data were log transformed and analysed by independent *t* test, time in the
hidden area was analysed by Mann-Whitney *U*-test. Activity was assessed by analysing
number of transitions between tank quadrants by independent *t* test.

135

136

2.2.2. Alarm substance responses

Mixed-population alarm substance was prepared each test day following established
protocols (Brown and Godin, 1999; Brown et al., 2009): a feral and a domestic male guppy
were euthanized in ice water and skin and skeletal muscle homogenized with 50 µl ddH₂O,
then filtered through glass wool with ddH₂O to a final volume of 100 ml, which was kept on
ice.

142

143 Tests were conducted in a $40 \times 25 \times 25$ cm tank containing 20 cm depth of water and covered 144 on three sides with white plastic. After 2 minutes for the subject to habituate, 4 ml of ddH₂O 145 was added with a pipette to start the 20 minute test. Ten minutes later, 4 ml of alarm 146 substance solution was added. Tested subjects were placed in a holding tank to prevent 147 interaction with untested subjects, then moved to the 'tested' division of their home tanks at 148 the end of each day. The test tank was cleaned and refilled before each test. Time immobile 149 ("freezing") and distance swum were analysed by repeated measures ANOVA, with experimental phase (before and after addition of alarm substance) as the repeated factor and 150 151 population as the independent factor. Freezing data were log transformed before analysis.

152

153

2.2.3. Shoaling and predator inspection behaviour

The test tank (fig. 1C) was lined with gravel and divided with plastic partitions into left (shoal), central (subject) and right (predator) sections. The transparent left partition was "oneway glass" so the shoal could not see the predator or subject (Mathis et al., 1996). The right partition consisted of an impermeable silicone-sealed transparent partition and a removable

opaque partition. The shoal section was lit with a 3W LED spotlight to ensure the
effectiveness of the one-way glass. Two interlocked plastic cups with matching 3 cm
diameter holes were suspended in the subject section, and a shoaling zone adjacent to the
companion shoal was marked on the front of the tank, 6 cm (2 body lengths) from the left
partition.

163

164 On each test day, 5 same-population companion fish were placed in the shoal section and a 165 red rainbowfish was placed in the predator section. A subject was placed in the suspended 166 cups, with the holes misaligned. After 2 minutes' habituation, the holes were aligned and 167 when the subject exited, the 20 minute test began. After 10 minutes, the opaque partition was 168 removed to reveal the red rainbowfish. We recorded time spent in the shoaling zone and 169 number of predator inspection bouts by each subject over the whole test. At the end of each 170 day, the red rainbowfish and shoaling companion fish were returned to their home tanks. 171 Populations were tested on alternate days to balance test order. Shoaling time data were 172 square root transformed and analysed by repeated measures ANOVA, with experimental 173 phase (before and after the predator was revealed) as the repeated factor and population as the 174 independent factor. Frequency of predator inspection was analysed by independent samples t 175 test.

176

177

2.2.4. Correlations between anti-predator behaviours

178 Relationships between responses to predation cues (the potential predator or alarm cues) were 179 analysed by correlation of behavioural difference scores. A single measure was calculated for 180 the behaviours modulated by exposure to predation cues (shoaling duration, number of 181 predator inspection bouts and freezing duration) by subtracting pre-exposure performance

182 from post-exposure performance. These three difference scores were then analysed by
183 Pearson's correlations. Shoaling data difference scores were log transformed prior to analysis.

184

185	2.3.	Analysis
		~

186 Tests were videoed using a Logitech Pro 9000 webcam and VirtualDub video capture

187 software. Boldness and exploration tests, and shoaling and predator inspection tests were

188 scored with JWatcher 1.0. Alarm substance tests were analysed with Ethovision XT (Noldus

189 Information Technology, Netherlands). Statistical analyses were conducted with IBM SPSS

190 Statistics 20.

191

192 2.4. Ethics statement

All procedures were carried out in accordance with Dutch law and approved by the Utrecht
animal experimentation commission ("Dierexperimentencommissie Utrecht") under licence
2010.I.03.036.

196

197 **3. Results**

3.1. Boldness and exploration

199 Feral and domestic guppies did not significantly differ in their latency to enter the exposed

area (Wilcoxon-Gehan statistic = 0.10, df = 1, P = 0.92) or total time in the exposed area (t

- 201 test, $t_{36} = 0.70$, P = 0.49). There was a non-significant trend for feral guppies to enter the
- hidden area faster (Wilcoxon-Gehan statistic = 3.30, df = 1, P = 0.069, fig. 2A) and to spend
- 203 more time in the hidden area (Mann-Whitney U test, U = 240, N = 19 per group, P = 0.085;

fig. 2B). Populations did not significantly differ in number of transitions between quadrants (*t* test, $t_{36} = 0.43$, P = 0.67).

206

Subjects responded differently to the sheltered and exposed areas, spending significantly less time in the exposed area than would be expected by chance (one-sample *t* test, $t_{37} = -2.63$, *P* = 0.012). Similarly, subjects spent significantly less time in the hidden area after entering the exposed area than would be expected by chance (one-sample Wilcoxon signed rank test, *W* = 180, *N* = 38, *P* = 0.005; chance expectations were based on the relative volume of each area). This avoidance of the exposed and hidden areas supports the use of time spent in these areas as combined measures of boldness and exploration (sensu Réale et al., 2007).

214

215 *3.2. Alarm substance responses*

Alarm substance significantly increased freezing (repeated measures ANOVA, $F_{1,32} = 44.98$,

217 P < 0.001, fig. 2C), and decreased distance swum ($F_{1,32} = 7.79$, P = 0.009), but these

218 responses did not differ significantly between populations, nor were there significant

interactions between population and alarm substance exposure (all: $F_{1,32} \le 0.74$, $P \ge 0.40$).

220

221 *3.3. Shoaling and predator inspection behaviour*

Exposure to the red rainbowfish significantly increased shoaling (repeated measures ANOVA, $F_{1,30} = 14.00$, P = 0.001), and feral guppies spent longer shoaling than domestic guppies ($F_{1,30} = 10.71$, P = 0.003). There was no significant interaction between population and predator exposure ($F_{1,30} = 0.86$, P = 0.36). Both populations only engaged in predator inspection once the red rainbowfish was visible (mean rate: 4.2 inspections/trial), however predator inspection frequency did not significantly differ between populations (*t* test, $t_{30} = 1.52$, P = 0.14).

229

230 *3.4. Correlations between anti-predator behaviours*

We found no significant correlations between the difference scores for shoaling, predator inspection and freezing in either domestic or feral guppies (Pearson's correlations, $-0.39 \le r \le$ 0.19, N = 14 - 17, all $P \ge 0.17$).

234

235 **4. Discussion**

Both feral and domestic guppies increased their shoaling behaviour and engaged in predator inspection when a novel predator was revealed, and both were sensitive to alarm substance. Feral guppies shoaled more than domestic guppies, both before and after exposure to a novel predator, but the populations did not significantly differ in predator inspection, responses to alarm substance or in exploration and boldness. There was no evidence that the anti-predator responses formed a suite of coupled behaviours.

242

Predation levels have been strongly implicated in population differences in shoaling among wild guppies (Magurran, 2005), and adaptation to predation at Burgers' Zoo may have driven the shoaling phenotype in the feral guppies. Predators have been shown to target individuals within a group that exhibit less cohesive grouping behaviour (Ioannou et al., 2012; Quinn and Cresswell, 2006) and thus prey selection by predators would be expected to increase the population-level shoaling phenotype over time. We did not find evidence for covariance of the different anti-predator behaviours we measured, a result that suggests anti-predator

250 behaviours were uncoupled, and that shoaling was the most labile of the behaviours we 251 tested, perhaps because it carries the most significant costs and benefits. The different anti-252 predator behaviours may be independently responsive, reflecting differences in the adaptive 253 value of each behaviour depending on the specific predator threat. Alternatively, the 254 uncoupling may reflect limits on the variation that can emerge, for example as a result of 255 differences in allelic diversity at loci which regulate each behaviour. Larger sample sizes may 256 have helped reveal differences in the other behaviours measured, however predation effects 257 on guppy behaviours are not always consistent (Brown et al., 2009; Seghers and Magurran, 258 1995) indicating that other factors can have an influence.

259

260 We used an allopatric fish predator to allow us to test the responses of both populations to a novel predator, and sensitivity to predators was evident in both feral and domestic guppies' 261 262 shoaling, predator inspection behaviour and alarm substance responses. Many generations of 263 domestication and artificial selection has thus not eliminated predator sensitivity in domestic 264 guppies and this may help to explain the success of introduced guppies despite novel local allopatric predators (Deacon et al., 2011). Predation-linked behaviours have previously been 265 266 implicated in the success or failure of species introductions (Holway and Suarez, 1999) and 267 other invasive poeciliid species show elevated anti-predator behaviour compared to non-268 invasive species (Rehage et al., 2005). Our finding that anti-predator responses are 269 maintained despite domestication has implications for captive breeding and reintroduction 270 programmes for endangered fish (see e.g. Brown and Day (2002)).

271

We cannot discount the possibility that aspects other than predation may have shaped theferal phenotype as our study compared only two populations, and additional feral populations

274 would clearly be essential to eliminate alternative explanations for our results (Dingemanse et 275 al., 2009; MacLean et al., 2012; Reader and Hrotic, 2012). While both the feral and the 276 domestic populations were originally derived from mixed domestic strains, making it 277 unlikely that phenotypic differences were due to differential levels of inbreeding, they are not 278 derived from the same source populations and so founder effects cannot be discounted. We 279 also considered other environmental influences, however differences in food availability 280 between domestic and feral guppies are unlikely to have been a factor as feral guppies are 281 able to feed ad libitum due to the manatees' feeding regime. While the manatee pool is 282 constantly filtered and tested and water quality resembles that of an aquarium, guppy 283 ectoparasites such as *Gyrodactylus* spp., are present at low levels. However, the feral guppies 284 were treated to remove parasites after capture, four months prior to the study. Moreover, any 285 direct effects of surviving parasites would be predicted to result in reduced shoaling, as 286 infected individuals are avoided within shoals (Croft et al., 2011), and Gyrodactylus infection 287 reduces shoal cohesion (Hockley et al., 2014). Residual developmental or evolutionary 288 effects of *Gyrodactylus* presence are also unlikely to explain the observed shoaling 289 phenotype, because these ectoparasites are transmitted socially. Consequently, a population 290 history of *Gyrodactylus* infection would be predicted to lead to reduced grouping as an 291 adaptation to avoid infection.

292

Caution should be taken when drawing conclusions about adaptation from two-population
studies such as our own, since any two populations are likely to differ on numerous
characteristics, not just the factor proposed to favour adaptation. However, comparisons of
two populations or species is a commonly used approach, and one that has made many useful
contributions (Dingemanse et al., 2009; Reader, 2014). Such comparisons can provide a

298 starting point, demonstrating population differences that suggest plausible hypotheses for 299 further work. They are particularly valuable when experimental manipulation of the proposed 300 causal variable presents ethical or logistical problems. The specific circumstances of the 301 Burgers' zoo population provides an independent and rare opportunity to examine 20 years of 302 guppy evolution in well-characterised and semi-controlled feral conditions. The general 303 background of the introduced fish is known, and the zoo environment affords a relatively 304 stable environment with minimal variation in factors such as water quality, temperature, or 305 food availability that can vary extensively in most feral or wild environments, often varying 306 together with predation regime (Magurran 2005). The above considerations, in combination 307 with previous work on predation and shoaling tendencies (Huizinga et al., 2009; Magurran, 1990b; Magurran and Seghers, 1991), suggest that 20 years of predation in a feral 308 309 environment is the most likely explanation for the observed increase in shoaling behaviour in 310 these guppies. Despite years of artificial selection, ornamental fish such as domestic guppies 311 retain both behavioural sensitivity to predator threats and the capacity to adapt to these.

312

313 Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Utrecht University's 'High Potentials' and 'Stimulus Fund' programmes, the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) 'Evolution and Behaviour' programme, and the Lucie Burgers Foundation for Comparative Behaviour Research, Arnhem, The Netherlands. We thank Henk Schriek, Ko van Rootselaar and Cor Nijhoff for animal care assistance; Felipe Dargent and Lisa Jacquin for comments, and the administration of Burgers' Zoo and the Bush exhibit curator Max Janse for permission to study the feral guppies and for their generous advice and help.

322 **References**

- Albers, P.C.H., 2000. Evidence for evolution of guppies in a semi-natural environment. Neth.
 J. Zool. 50, 425-433.
- Brown, C., Day, R.L., 2002. The future of stock enhancements: lessons for hatchery practice
 from conservation biology. Fish Fish. 3, 79-94.
- Brown, G.E., Godin, J.-G.J., 1999. Chemical alarm signals in wild Trinidadian guppies
 (*Poecilia reticulata*). Can. J. Zool. 77, 562-570.
- 329 Brown, G.E., Macnaughton, C.J., Elvidge, C.K., Ramnarine, I., Godin, J.-G.J., 2009.
- 330 Provenance and threat-sensitive predator avoidance patterns in wild-caught Trinidadian
- 331 guppies. Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol. 63, 699-706.
- 332 Croft, D.P., Edenbrow, M., Darden, S.K., Ramnarine, I.W., van Oosterhout, C., Cable, J.,
- 333 2011. Effect of gyrodactylid ectoparasites on host behaviour and social network structure
- in guppies *Poecilia reticulata*. Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol. 65, 2219-2227.
- 335 Deacon, A.E., Ramnarine, I.W., Magurran, A.E., 2011. How reproductive ecology
- contributes to the spread of a globally invasive fish. PLoS ONE 6, e24416.
- 337 Dingemanse, N.J., Van der Plas, F., Wright, J., Réale, D., Schrama, M., Roff, D.A., Van der
- 338 Zee, E., Barber, I., 2009. Individual experience and evolutionary history of predation
- affect expression of heritable variation in fish personality and morphology. Proc. R. Soc.
- 340 Lond. B Biol. Sci. 276, 1285-1293.
- 341 Forslund, P., 1993. Vigilance in relation to brood size and predator abundance in the barnacle
- 342 goose, Branta leucopsis. Anim. Behav. 45, 965-973.
- 343 Froese, R., Pauly, D. 2012. Fishbase. World Wide Web electronic publication.,
- 344 http://www.fishbase.org, version (10/2012).
- Hass, C., Valenzuela, D., 2002. Anti-predator benefits of group living in white-nosed coatis
- 346 (*Nasua narica*). Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol. 51, 570-578.

- 347 Hockley, F.A., Wilson, C.A.M.E., Graham, N., Cable, J., 2014. Combined effects of flow
- 348 condition and parasitism on shoaling behaviour of female guppies *Poecilia reticulata*.

349 Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol. 68, 1513-1520.

- 350 Holway, D.A., Suarez, A.V., 1999. Animal behavior: an essential component of invasion
- biology. Trends Ecol. Evol. 14, 328-330.
- 352 Huizinga, M., Ghalambor, C.K., Reznick, D.N., 2009. The genetic and environmental basis
- 353 of adaptive differences in shoaling behaviour among populations of Trinidadian guppies,
- 354 *Poecilia reticulata*. J. Evol. Biol. 22, 1860-1866.
- 355 Huntingford, F.A., 2004. Implications of domestication and rearing conditions for the
- behaviour of cultivated fishes. J. Fish Biol. 65 (Supplement A), 122-142.
- Ioannou, C.C., Guttal, V., Couzin, I.D., 2012. Predatory fish select for coordinated collective
 motion in virtual prey. Science 337, 1212-5.
- 359 Krause, J., Ruxton, G.D. 2002. Living in Groups. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- 360 Lindholm, A.K., Breden, F., Alexander, H.J., Chan, W.-K., Thakurta, S.G., Brooks, R., 2005.
- 361 Invasion success and genetic diversity of introduced populations of guppies *Poecilia*
- 362 *reticulata* in Australia. Mol. Ecol. 14, 3671-3682.
- Lung, M.A., Childress, M.J., 2007. The influence of conspecifics and predation risk on the
 vigilance of elk (*Cervus elaphus*) in Yellowstone National Park. Behav. Ecol. 18, 12-20.
- 365 MacLean, E.L., Matthews, L.J., Hare, B.A., Nunn, C.L., Anderson, R.C., Aureli, F., Brannon,
- 366 E.M., Call, J., Drea, C.M., Emery, N.J., Haun, D.B., Herrmann, E., Jacobs, L.F., Platt,
- 367 M.L., Rosati, A.G., Sandel, A.A., Schroepfer, K.K., Seed, A.M., Tan, J., van Schaik, C.P.,
- 368 Wobber, V., 2012. How does cognition evolve? Phylogenetic comparative psychology.
- 369 Anim. Cogn. 15, 223-38.
- 370 Magurran, A.E., 1990a. The adaptive significance of schooling as an antipredator defense in
- 371 fish. Ann. Zool. Fenn. 27, 51-66.

- Magurran, A.E., 1990b. The inheritance and development of minnow antipredator behavior.
 Anim. Behav. 39, 834-842.
- 374 Magurran, A.E. 2005. *Evolutionary Ecology: The Trinidadian Guppy*. Oxford University
 375 Press, Oxford.
- 376 Magurran, A.E., Seghers, B.H., 1990. Population differences in predator recognition and
- attack cone avoidance in the guppy *Poecilia reticulata*. Anim. Behav. 40, 443-452.
- Magurran, A.E., Seghers, B.H., 1991. Variation in schooling and aggression amongst guppy
 (*Poecilia reticulata*) populations in Trinidad. Behaviour 118, 214-234.
- 380 Magurran, A.E., Seghers, B.H., 1994. Predator inspection behaviour covaries with schooling
- tendency amongst wild guppy, *Poecilia reticulata*, populations in Trinidad. Behaviour
- 382 128, 121-134.
- Mathis, A., Chivers, D.P., Smith, R.J.F., 1996. Cultural transmission of predator recognition
 in fishes: intraspecific and interspecific learning. Anim. Behav. 51, 185-201.
- 385 Quinn, J.L., Cresswell, W., 2006. Testing domains of danger in the selfish herd:
- 386 sparrowhawks target widely spaced redshanks in flocks. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.
- 387 273, 2521-2526.
- Reader, S.M. 2014. Evolution of Cognition. In: J.B. Losos (Editor), Oxford Bibliographies in
 Evolutionary Biology, Oxford University Press, New York.
- 390 Reader, S.M., Hrotic, S.M., 2012. The limits of chimpanzee-human comparisons for
- 391 understanding human cognition. Behavioral Brain Sciences 35, 238-9.
- Réale, D., Reader, S.M., Sol, D., McDougall, P.T., Dingemanse, N.J., 2007. Integrating
 animal temperament within ecology and evolution. Biol. Rev. 82, 291-318.
- 394 Rehage, J.S., Barnett, B.K., Sih, A., 2005. Behavioral responses to a novel predator and
- 395 competitor of invasive mosquitofish and their non-invasive relatives (*Gambusia* sp.).
- 396 Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol. 57, 256-266.

- 397 Reznick, D.N., Shaw, F.H., Rodd, F.H., Shaw, R.G., 1997. Evaluation of the rate of evolution
- in natural populations of guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*). Science 275, 1934-1937.
- 399 Seghers, B.H., 1974. Schooling behavior in the guppy (*Poecilia reticulata*): an evolutionary
- 400 response to predation. Evolution 28, 486-489.
- 401 Seghers, B.H., Magurran, A.E., 1995. Population differences in the schooling behavior of the
- 402 Trinidad guppy, *Poecilia reticulata* adaptation or constraint? Can. J. Zool. 73, 1100-
- 403 1105.
- 404
- 405













Figure 1. (A) Example photos of domestic (left) and feral (right) guppies (W.T. Swaney). (B) Sketch of boldness and exploration test apparatus. The 80 cm \times 50 cm \times 40 cm tank comprised a "sheltered" area and a brightly lit "exposed" area containing the "hidden" area which subjects could not see into from their starting position in the sheltered area. (C) Sketch of shoaling and predator inspection test apparatus. The 90 cm \times 50 cm \times 25 cm tank was divided into a 10 cm wide shoal section (left), a 20 cm wide predator section (right) and a subject section (centre) containing the cups from which subjects started.

414

Figure 2. (A) Cumulative timeline of subjects' latency to reach the hidden area and (B) total time in the hidden area in exploration and boldness tests (feral N = 19, domestic N = 19). (C) Total time subjects spent frozen after addition of water and alarm substance in alarm substance tests (feral N = 17, domestic N = 17). (D) Total time subjects spent in proximity to the shoal in "no predator" and "predator visible" parts of shoaling and predator inspection tests (feral N = 15, domestic N = 17). Data are means \pm SEM, $** = P \le 0.01$, $*** = P \le 0.001$.