1 **Patterns of philopatry and longevity contribute to the evolution of post-reproductive**

2 **lifespan in mammals**

3 Nichols H.J.*†[1], Zecherle L.[1]*, Arbuckle, K.[2]

4   1. Liverpool John Moores University, School of Natural Science and Psychology, Liverpool, UK

5   L3 3AF.

6   2. University of Liverpool, Institute of Integrative Biology, Liverpool, UK L69 7ZB.

7 * These authors contributed equally to the manuscript

8 † Corresponding author: h.j.nichols@ljmu.ac.uk

9   **Abstract**

10   While menopause has long been known as a characteristic trait of human reproduction, evidence for

11   post-reproductive lifespan (PRLS) has recently been found in other mammals. Adaptive and non-

12   adaptive hypotheses have been proposed to explain the evolution of PRLS, but formal tests of these

13   are rare. We use a phylogenetic approach to evaluate hypotheses for the evolution of PRLS among

14   mammals. In contrast to theoretical models predicting that PRLS may be promoted by male

15   philopatry (which increases relatedness between a female and her group in old age), we find little

16   evidence that male philopatry led to the evolution of a post-reproductive period. However, the

17   proportion of life spent post-reproductive was related to lifespan and patterns of philopatry,

18   suggesting that the duration of PRLS may be impacted by both non-adaptive and adaptive processes.

19   Finally, the proportion of females experiencing PRLS was higher in species with male philopaty and

20   larger groups, in accordance with adaptive models of PRLS. We suggest that the origin of PRLS

21   primarily follows the non-adaptive 'mismatch' scenario, but that patterns of philopatry may

22   subsequently confer adaptive benefits of late-life helping.

23   **Key Words**

24   Menopause, life-history evolution, kin-selection, dispersal, primate, cetacean

25

26   **Introduction**

27   Menopause has long been known as a characteristic of human reproduction [1] but the

28   existence of post-reproductive lifespan (PRLS) in other mammalian species has been recognised

29   relatively recently [2, 3]. Post-reproductive periods of 20+ years (similar to that observed in humans)

30   have been found in two long-lived cetacean species [4]. Shorter periods of PRLS have been identified

31   in a wide range of mammalian species, including cetaceans, primates and rodents [2]. However, the

32   existence of post-reproductive lifespan is an evolutionary paradox; natural selection would be

33   expected to disfavour the premature cessation of reproduction. Why then is PRLS so widespread?

34   PRLS may have an adaptive value. For example, menopause could be favoured if mothers

35   provide help to adult offspring, thereby increasing the production of grand-offspring [5]. Lahdenperä

36   et al. [6] showed that human grandmothers are able to boost the reproductive success of their

37   children. Similarly, in killer whales, post-reproductive females appear to extend the longevity of their

38   adult offspring [7]. This adaptive 'grandmother hypothesis' for the evolution of PRLS depends on the

39   presence of kin towards whom help can be directed.

40   Johnstone and Cant [8] developed a model to explain the involvement of kin selection in the

41   evolution of prolonged PRLS in cetaceans and humans which suggested parallel routes for the

42   evolution of PRLS. While early humans are believed to have been male-philopatric, in killer whales

43   and short-finned pilot whales neither sex disperses and mating occurs outside the family group.

44   These dispersal strategies are predicted to lead to an increase in relatedness to other group

45   members throughout the lifetime of a female. In both situations, females begin their reproductive

46   life away from their father and other paternal relatives (either because she has dispersed or because

47   she was the product of an extra-group mating). However, her sons remain within the social group,

48   and hence relatedness between the female and local males (and therefore average relatedness to

49   group members) increases over the female's lifespan, thereby leading to the evolution of an

50   adaptive period of post-reproductive helping behaviour [8].

51   While the literature focuses on PRLS as an adaptive trait, it could simply be a non-adaptive

52   by-product of other life history traits. PRLS is of short duration in most mammals, leading to the

53   proposal that PRLS is a consequence of mismatch in somatic versus reproductive senescence [2].

54   This mismatch may be more likely to occur in long-lived species as the associated variability in

55   maximum lifespan leads to an increased probability that some individuals exceed the age by which

56   oocytes are depleted.

57   Attempts to test the predictions of adaptive versus non-adaptive hypotheses for the

58   evolution of PRLS are lacking, despite a theoretical framework for both classes of explanation [2, 8].

59   In this study, we use a comparative approach to investigate whether natural history traits can

60   predict the existence and extent of PRLS among mammals. If PRLS has arisen adaptively due to kin

61   selection, we expect sex-specific dispersal dynamics to be important in the evolution of PRLS [8].

62   Alternatively, if PRLS arises primarily due to a mismatch between somatic and reproductive ageing,

63   then we would expect PRLS to be seen in longer-lived species.

64   **Methods**

65   *Data Collection*

66   A literature search was conducted to identify all mammalian species for which reliable PRLS

67   data is available (see supplementary material for our strategy for categorising PRLS including

68   caveats, and Table S1 for the data obtained). We recorded the presence or absence of PRLS, the

69   duration of PRLS, and the frequency with which PRLS is experienced in the population. For species

70   which we had data on the presence or absence of PRLS we continued our literature search to obtain

71   data on natural history variables likely to influence local relatedness (male philopatry, female

72   philopatry, and group-size), and lifespan (in years), which could influence the mismatch between

73   somatic and reproductive ageing. Only data from wild populations was used since captivity can alter

74   the incidence and details of PRLS [9] and therefore arguably adds no information to evolutionary

75   studies of the trait. A dated phylogenetic tree of mammals was obtained from the literature [10] and

76   pruned in Mesquite [11] to leave the 26 mammal species for which we had PRLS data (note that we

77   included three populations of humans in some analyses so some sample sizes were greater than 26).

78   This pruned tree was used for all comparative analyses conducted.

79   *Statistical analysis*

80   *What influences the presence of PRLS?*

81   We fit generalised linear mixed models (GLMMs) with a binomial error structure using

82   Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) with an inverse gamma hyperprior to investigate whether each

83   natural history variable (male philopatry, female philopatry, group size and lifespan) was a predictor

84   of the presence of PRLS. We coded the absence or presence of PRLS as having states 0 and 1

85   respectively and used this as our response variable. The phylogeny was included as a random effect

86   to account for evolutionary history and these models were run in the MCMCglmm package in R [12].

87   To avoid over-parameterisation each model contained only one explanatory variable. Each MCMC

88   GLMM was run for 15 million generations, the first 500,000 of which were conservatively discarded

89   as burnin. The chain was sampled every 10,000 generations, giving 1,450 posterior samples for each

90   model.

91   For significant predictors of the presence/absence of PRLS we also reconstructed ancestral

92   states to further assess how the traits evolved with respect to each other. Ancestral state

93   reconstruction was conducted using Bayesian stochastic mapping in phytools [13] and inference

94   made based on 10,000 simulations.

95   ***What influences the duration of PRLS?***

96   We measured relative duration of PRLS as the proportion of maximum lifespan spent post-

97   reproductive (Table S1). We tested for effects of each natural history variable (male philopatry,

98   female philopatry, group-size, and lifespan) individually on the relative duration of PRLS using

99   generalised estimating equations (GEEs), which were fitted in the ape package in R [14]. The

100   variance-covariance matrix for the GEEs was specified based on the phylogeny, which controls for

101   phylogenetic relationships between species by including this information within the model.

102   ***What influences the frequency of PRLS?***

103   To investigate which factors influence the proportion of individuals that experience PRLS, we

104   modelled this variable as a function of each natural history variable (male philopatry, female

105   philopatry, group-size, and lifespan). We used GEEs to control for any influence of phylogeny which

106   were fit as described in the preceding section.

107

108   **Results and Discussion**

109   We took a phylogenetic approach to investigate natural history factors influencing post-

110   reproductive lifespan in mammals with the aim of assessing whether adaptive or non-adaptive

111   scenarios best explain its evolution. In accordance with theoretical work by Johnstone and Cant [8],

112   we found a significant association between the presence of PRLS and male philopatry (MCMC

113   GLMM: β=340.52, P=0.018, Table S2). However, Johnstone and Cant's model predicts that male

114   philopatry is a key (but not the only) evolutionary driver of PRLS, which was not supported by our

115   results. All 5 species with confirmed male philopatry exhibited PRLS, but ancestral state

116   reconstructions suggest that PRLS evolves first, followed by male philopatry (at least in primates)

117   (Figure 1). Furthermore, 50% of the 18 species with dispersing males also exhibited PRLS, again

118   suggesting that male philopatry is unlikely to explain the origin of PRLS in mammals.

119   If PRLS is typically of short duration then it is possible that patterns of philopatry are

120   important in the evolution of an extended period of PRLS due to their influence on kinship [4].

121   Supporting this, we found that species with female philopatry had significantly shorter periods of

122   PRLS (GEE: $\beta \pm SE$=-1.573±0.681, $t_{1,20}$=-2.308, P=0.048, Table S3, Figure 2a), and species with male-

123   philopatry had a (non-significant) trend for increased periods of PRLS (GEE: $\beta \pm SE$=1.394±0.676,

124   $t_{1,20}$=2.063, P=0.071, Table S3). However we note that we cannot rule out the possibility that male

125   philopatry is associated with PRLS via its positive relationship with lifespan (pGLS: t=4.06, df=1,20,

126   P=0.001). Furthermore, factors other than dispersal patterns are expected to influence the adaptive

127   evolution of PRLS, such as the opportunity for late-life helping and competition (which we did not

128   fully investigate here), but Johnstone and Cant [8] propose dispersal as an important driver.

129   We found that the relative duration of PRLS was greater in longer-lived species (GEE:

130    $\beta \pm SE = 0.038 \pm 0.011$, $t_{1,23} = 3.482$, $P = 0.007$, Table S3, Figure 2b). While a previous study [15] found a

131   relationship between time spent postreproductive and lifespan, they modelled the total duration of

132   PRLS, rather than the relative duration (as we have calculated here). Our measure is unlikely to be

133   inherently associated with lifespan, and therefore suggests that the relationship between PRLS and

134   lifespan is not simply an artefact of longer living species spending more months/years post-

135   reproductive. Instead, our results are consistent with the idea that extended PRLS can occur due to

136   mismatching of somatic and reproductive ageing [2]. It could also be related to selection on

137   increased male lifespan, which could in turn lead to extended female lifespan via intersexual genetic

138   correlations, even if they are not reproductive [2, 16, 17]. Disentangling these alternative non-

139   adaptive scenarios would require detailed investigation into the evolutionary genetic constraints on

140   lifespan across a wide range of mammals.

141   The proportion of females experiencing PRLS was higher in male philopatric species (GEE:

142    $\beta \pm SE = 1.900 \pm 0.786$, $t_{1,15} = 2.418$, $P = 0.047$, Table S3, Figure 2c), suggesting that male philopatry could

143   drive the evolution of widespread PRLS in a species [7]. We also found that PRLS was more prevalent

144   in larger groups (GEE: $\beta \pm SE = 0.051 \pm 0.014$, $t_{1,15} = 3.762$, $P = 0.0075$, Table S3, Figure 2d), possibly

145   because these contain more philopatric young, and hence greater opportunities for helping.

146   However, there was significant covariation between male philopatry and group size (GEE:

147    $\beta \pm SE = 43.680 \pm 18.437$, $t_{1,20} = 2.369$, $P = 0.045$), making it difficult to distinguish between their effects,

148   especially with the limited number of species for which data is currently available. Future models of

149   the evolution of PRLS may benefit from exploring these relationships further by investigating the

150   impacts of both group size and philopatry on kinship dynamics.

151

152   **Conclusions**

153   We tested the predictions of the most common adaptive model for the evolution of PRLS [8]

154   and our results provide mixed support for such a model. We suggest that adaptive models such as

155   that by Johnstone and Cant [8] may be important in explaining prolonged periods of PRLS (as they

156   were intended to do), but do not provide a good explanation for the occurrence of shorter periods

157   of PRLS that seem to be prevalent across mammals [2, 5]. Rather, the evolutionary origin of PRLS

158   appears to primarily follow a non-adaptive scenario such as the 'mismatch' hypothesis [2, 18].

159   Patterns of philopatry may subsequently confer adaptive benefits of late-life helping which extends

160   the duration and frequency of PRLS [5, 7, 8]. Under this scenario we suggest that the prolonged

161   periods of PRLS found in a few species such as humans and cetaceans are a consequence of non-

162   adaptive origins followed by adaptive evolutionary 'tinkering'. Our results also demonstrate that for

163   some analyses, it may be important to consider different components of PRLS separately, rather

164   than combined in a single measure such as PrR [15]. Different factors are likely to govern the

165   evolution of the presence, absence and duration of PRLS and conflation of these elements in a single

166   index limits our ability to evaluate many ideas.

167

168   **Data Accessibility**

169   Data are provided in Table S1.

170

171   **Ethical Statement**

172   This study did not use human or animal subjects and therefore there were no ethical concerns which

173   required evaluation.

174

175   **Competing Interests**

176   The authors declare that there are no competing interests.

177

178   **Author Contributions**

179   HJN and KA devised the study. LZ collected the majority of the data. KA and LZ analysed the data. KA

180   and HJN wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors commented on the manuscript,

181   approved the final version for publication, and accept accountability for all aspects of the work.

182

185

186   **Figure Legends**

187   Figure 1. Summary of ancestral state reconstructions for PRLS (left) and male philopatry (right).

188   Posterior probabilities (PP) of state 1 (trait is present) are represented by a greyscale gradient.

189   Figure 2. Relationships between the duration of PRLS and (a) female philopatry, (b) maximum

190   lifespan, and between the prevalence of PRLS and (c) male philopatry and (d) group size.

191

192   **References**

193   1.   Blurton-Jones, N.G., Howkes, K., O'Connell, J.F. 2002 Antiquity of post-reproductive life: are
194   there modern impacts on hunter-gatherer postreproductive lifespans? *American Journal of Human*
195   *Biology* **14**,184-205.
196   2.   Cohen, A.A. 2004 Female post-reproductive lifespan: a general mammalian trait. *Biological*
197   *Reviews* **79**,733-750.
198   3.   Packer, C., Tatar, M., Collins, A. 1998 Reproductive cessation in female mammals. *Nature*
199   **392**,807-811.

200   4.   Croft, D.P., Brent, L.J.N., Franks, D.W., Cant, M.A. 2015 The evolution of prolonged life after
201   reproduction. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **30**,407-416.
202   5.   Shanley, D.P., Kirkwood, T.B. 2001 Evolution of the human menopause. *Bioessays* **23**,282-
203   287.
204   6.   Lahdenperä, M., Lummaa, V., Helle, S., Tremblay, M., Russell, A.F. 2004 Fitness benefits of
205   prolonged post-reproductive lifespan in women. *Nature* **428**,178-181.
206   7.   Foster, E.A., Franks, D.W., Mazzi, S., Darden, S.K., K.C., B., Ford, J.K.B., Croft, D.P. 2012
207   Adaptive prolonged postreproductive life span in killer whales. *Science* **337**,1313.
208   8.   Johnstone, R.A., Cant, M.A. 2010 The evolution of menopause in cetaceans and humans: the
209   role of demography. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B, Biological Sciences*
210   **277**,3765-3771.
211   9.   Levitis, D.A., Burger, O., Lackey, L.B. 2013 The human post-fertile lifespan in comparative
212   evolutionary context. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews* **22**,66-79.
213   10.   Bininda-Emonds, O.R.P., Cardillo, M., Jones, K.E., MacPhee, R.D.E., Beck, R.M.D., Grenyer, R.,
214   Price, S.A., Vos, R.A., Gittleman, J.L., Purvis, A. 2007 The delayed rise of present-day mammals.
215   *Nature* **446**,507 - 512.
216   11.   Maddison, W.P., Maddison, D.R. Mesquite: a modular system for evolutionary analysis.
217   Version 2.75. http://mesquiteproject.org2011.
218   12.   Hadfield, J.D. 2010 MCMC Methods for Multi-Response Generalized Linear Mixed Models:
219   The MCMCglmm R Package. *Journal of Statistical Software* **33**,1-22.
220   13.   Revel, L.J. 2012 Phytools: an R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other
221   things). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **3**,217-223.
222   14.   Paradis, E., J., C. 2002 Analysis of comparative data using generalized estimating equations.
223   *Journal of Theoretical Biology,* **218**,175-185.
224   15.   Levitis, D.A., Lackey, L.B. 2011 A measure for describing and comparing postreproductive life
225   span as a population trait. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **2**,446-453.
226   16.   Bonduriansky, R., Chenoweth, S.F. 2009 Intralocus sexual conflict. *Trends in Ecology and*
227   *Evolution* **24**,280-288.
228   17.   Tuljapurkar, S.D., Puleston, C.O., Gurven, M.D. 2007 Why Men Matter: Mating Patterns Drive
229   Evolution of Human Lifespan. *PLoS ONE* **2**,e785.
230   18.   Ricklefs, R.E., Scheuerlein, A., Cohen, A. 2003 Age-related patterns of fertility in captive
231   populations of birds and mammals. *Experimental Gerontology* **38**,714-745.

232