Determinants of male reproductive success in wild long-tailed macaques (*Macaca fascicularis*) – male monopolisation, female mate choice or post-copulatory mechanisms?

ANTJE ENGELHARDT[ab], MICHAEL HEISTERMANN[a], J. KEITH HODGES[a], PETER NÜRNBERG[c] AND CARSTEN NIEMITZ[b]

[a] Department of Reproductive Biology, German Primate Centre

[b] Human Biology and Anthropology, Free University of Berlin

[c] Institute of Medical Genetics, Charité, Humboldt-University Berlin; now Centre for Genomics, University of Cologne

Corresponding author:

Antje Engelhardt

Institute for Mind and Biology, University of Chicago,

940 E. 57th Street, Chicago, IL 60637, U.S.A.

Phone: +1-773-834-4658

Fax: +1-773-702-0320

antje@uchicago.edu

Abstract

One of the basic principles of sexual selection is that male reproductive success should be skewed towards strong males in species with anisogamous sex. Studies on primate multi-male groups, however, suggest that other factors than male fighting ability might also affect male reproductive success. The proximate mechanisms leading to paternity in multi-male primate groups still remain largely unknown since in most primate studies mating rather than reproductive success is measured. Furthermore, little research focuses on a female's fertile phase. The aim of this study was to investigate the relative importance of male monopolisation and female direct mate choice for paternity determination. We also investigated the extent to which paternity was decided post-copulatory, i.e. within the female reproductive tract. We used a combined approach of behavioural observations with faecal hormone and genetic analysis for assessment of female cycle stage and paternity, respectively. The study was carried out on a group of wild long-tailed macaques living around the Ketambe Research Station, Gunung Leuser National Park, Indonesia. Our results suggest that both male monopolisation and post-copulatory mechanisms are the main determinants of male reproductive success, whereas female direct mate choice and alternative male reproductive strategies appear to be of little importance in this respect. Female cooperation may, however, have facilitated male monopolisation. Since paternity was restricted to alpha and beta males even when females mated with several males during the fertile phase, it seems that not only male monopolisation, but also post-copulatory mechanisms may operate in favour of high-ranking males in long-tailed macaques, thus reinforcing the reproductive skew in this species.

Keywords: reproductive strategies, primates, paternity, post-copulatory mechanisms, *Macaca fascicularis*

INTRODUCTION

A fundamental question in primate sexual selection concerns the proximate mechanisms underlying male reproductive success in multi-male groups. According to sexual selection theory, males should compete for access to receptive females, the resource that limits male reproductive success the most (Trivers 1972). Contest among males for access to mates, in turn, should lead to social systems in which the strongest male is able to monopolise access to fertile

females (priority of access to oestrus females model: Altmann 1962; see also Fedigan 1983). The finding that dominant males often sire the majority of offspring clearly shows that dominance plays an important role for male reproductive success in mammals (Ellis 1995), including primates (e.g. *Cercocebus torquatus atys*: Gust et al. 1998; *Macaca sylvanus*: Paul & Kuester 1996; *Mandrillus sphinx*: Dixson et. al. 1993; *Papio cynocephalus*: Altmann et al. 1996). Complete monopolisation of females is, however, difficult to achieve. In some primate species, subordinate and extra-group males have a significant share in paternity (e.g. *Macaca fuscata*: Inoue et al. 1993; Soltis et al. 2001; *Macaca mulatta*: Berard et al. 1993, 1994; Widdig et al. 2004), which indicates that other mechanisms operate as well in determining paternity. Thus, the importance of female and alternative male reproductive strategies as well as the interactive aspects of these has become increasingly recognised in recent years (e.g. Taub 1980; Janson 1984; Small 1989; Manson 1994; Bercovitch 1995; Chism & Rogers 1997; Sterck et al. 1997; Soltis et al. 2000, 2001, 2004).

Successful monopolisation of access to fertile females depends on several factors (reviewed in Soltis 2004). One of these factors is synchrony of female ovarian cycles, because males are hardly able to successfully monopolise more than one female at a time (Paul 1997, Nunn 1999a). Fighting ability as well as coalition forming of subordinate males are also important determinants of male mating and mate guarding success, as has been shown for savannah baboons (*Papio cynocephalus*; Packer 1977; Bercovitch 1986; Noë & Sluijter 1990; Alberts et al. 2003). A third variable that may influence monopolisation of females is the degree to which females resist or cooperate with males (Bercovitch 1995) and it seems that in at least some primate species, females are able to resist mating attempts (e.g. *Macaca mulatta*, Manson 1992; see also Soltis 2004).

Females should pursue reproductive strategies for their own best fitness increase. These strategies could also be opposing to male reproductive interests leading to inter-sexual conflict over control of reproduction (e.g. Trivers 1972; Smuts & Smuts 1993; Clutton-Brock & Parker 1995; Gowaty 1996; Nunn & van Schaik 2000). Whether females are able to exert their own reproductive strategies, however, depends on the ability and degree of male coercion. Mate guarding by dominant males may be one of the strongest forms of male coercion if it is not based on female cooperation.

Whereas probability of paternity is affected on the pre-copulatory level (Paul 2002) (i.e. the level on which a behaviour can in- or decreases the probability of mating between two individuals) by

male monopolisation and female mate choice, it will be affected on the post-copulatory level whenever mating is not concentrated on a single male during the fertile phase. As soon as several males mate with the same female during her fertile phase, sperm of the different males will compete for fertilisation and paternity will be determined within the female reproductive tract. The number and viability of sperm a male brings into competition has, in this respect, been suggested to markedly affect his chances of siring offspring (reviewed in Birkhead & Møller 1998; see also Birkhead 2000). It may also be that the female controls which male will fertilise her oocyte by, for example, discarding or destroying sperm from unfavoured males (cryptic female choice; reviewed in Eberhard 1996; Reeder 2003). It remains largely unknown to what extent post-copulatory selection of sperm from a particular male plays a role for male reproductive success in multi-male primate groups, although the potential for it seems to be apparent in the majority of primate species (Birkhead & Kappeler 2004).

Which of the pursued reproductive strategies eventually comes into effect leading to paternity depends on the events occurring during the female's fertile phase, i.e. the brief period within a female ovarian cycle when copulation can lead to conception. Since the objective assessment of female reproductive status was for a long time impossible in the wild, conclusions about primate reproductive strategies were mainly based on observations conducted over almost the whole female cycle. If studies were focused on the fertile phase, assessment of this period had to rely on secondary markers like sexual swellings that have only limited value (Nunn 1999b, Reichert 2002, Deschner 2003, Engelhardt et al. 2005). Recent studies, however, have shown that male and female reproductive behaviour can vary significantly according to the stage of the female cycle (Deschner et al. 2004; Stumpf & Boesch 2005). In this respect, concealment of the fertile phase has been interpreted as a female strategy to hamper mate guarding in order to achieve more freedom for own reproductive decisions (van Schaik et al. 2000; Heistermann et al. 2001). If the probability of ovulation is only gradually but not precisely signalled (graded-signal hypothesis; Nunn 1999b), females might be able to mate polyandrously with subordinate males during times with low (but not zero) probability of conception and to attract dominant males during times of higher probability. The ability to recognise the female fertile phase, on the contrary, can significantly affect male reproductive success. Since monopolisation of females is costly (Alberts et al. 1996), males benefit from discerning the fertile phase of a cycle by being able to restrict mating efforts and mate guarding to this period. Recognition of the fertile phase

seems to occur at least to some degree in some primate species (*Macaca fascicularis*; Engelhardt et al. 2004; but see *Trachypithecus entellus*: Heistermann et al. 2001).

In long-tailed macaques, dominant males appear to father the majority of offspring (de Ruiter et al. 1994), the proximate mechanisms leading to the observed reproductive skew in favour of dominant males are, however, still unclear. The aim of our study was therefore to explore the determinants of male reproductive success in this species by investigating (1) the degree of male monopolisation, (2) female mating preferences and freedom for mate choice, and (3) the degree to which paternity is decided post-copulatory in a group of wild long-tailed macaques living in the Gunung Leuser National Park, North Sumatra, Indonesia. For this, we have combined detailed behavioural observations with non-invasive faecal progestogen and oestrogen measurements for assessing the female fertile phase and faecal microsatellite analysis for genetic paternity determination. This integrative approach allows us to evaluate the proximate mechanisms determining male reproductive success in primate multi-male groups under completely natural conditions.

METHODS

Animals and Study Site

The study was carried out at the Ketambe Research Station (3º41'N, 97º39'E), Gunung Leuser National Park, North Sumatra, Indonesia. The research area consists of primary lowland rainforest and has been described by Rijksen (1978) and van Schaik & Mirmanto (1985). Behavioural observations and faecal sample collection occurred from February 14 until December 16, 2000.

Tab. 1

The long-tailed macaques of the study area have been studied since 1979 and were well habituated to observers. The study focused on the group "House Atas" (HA). This group was one of three daughter groups ("House Atas", "House Bawah", HB, and "House Dapur", HD) of the former House group (B. Putragayo, pers. comment). At the beginning of the study, group HA consisted of eight adult females, five adult males and several subadults/juveniles and two infants. The home range of group HA overlapped with that of groups HB and HD and further with that of a third group, the Ketambe Bawah group (KB). Males from all adjacent groups and, in addition, those from a fifth nearby group (group "Antara") entered the home range of group HA from time

to time and engaged in sexual interactions with females. The alpha male of group HB (alpha male HB) joined the group HA almost daily from beginning of March 2000 until mid-April 2000 (Fig. 2), but returned every night to sleep with his own group. All group members of the study group HA and all males that moved within the home range of HA, were individually known.

Hormone Analysis and Definition of the Fertile Phase

Faecal hormone extraction and analysis conducted for assessment of female cycle stage and timing of the fertile phase has already been described (details in Engelhardt et al. 2004). Briefly, 2–3 g faeces were collected from each adult female (Table 1) on four to seven days per week and stored in 15 ml absolute ethanol at 4°C until hormone analysis. Extracts were measured for concentrations of immunoreactive oestrogen (total oestrogens, iEtotal) and progestogen (pregnanediol-3-glucuronide, iPdG) metabolites. Both measurements have been shown to provide reliable information on female ovarian function and timing of ovulation in long-tailed macaques (Shideler et al. 1993; Engelhardt et al. 2004).

As described in Engelhardt et al. (2005), for each cycle, a defined rise in iPdG-level above a threshold value (two standard deviations above the preceding baseline level) was used to determine the presumed time of ovulation and to define the fertile phase (Fig. 1). We determined for each ovarian cycle a two-day period in which ovulation was most likely (ovulation window). This period comprised the days –2 and –3 relative to the faecal iPdG-rise (day 0). Given that mating in long-tailed macaques can be fertile when occurring up to two days before and on the day of ovulation (Behboodi et al. 1991), we defined the fertile phase to be the period comprising the two days of the ovulation window plus the two preceding days. In the following, non-conception cycles are numbered by occurrence and asterisks indicate conception cycles.

Two cycles differed from the other cycles in that in one (KA2) ovulation did not occur (as indicated by lack of iPdG rise; in the cycle prior to and after this cycle the female did ovulate, Table 1), although female oestrogen levels were elevated and followed a normal pattern. In the other (SA1), oestrogen levels were elevated more than a week before the iPdG rise. In both cycles, however, female sexual activity and male interest in the female was increased during the period of elevated female oestrogen levels, as it was in normal ovulatory cycles. Since our earlier study showed that both female sexual activity and female attractivity to males are related to female oestrogen levels (Engelhardt et al. 2005) and since the pattern of male and female

Fig. 1

behaviour was comparable to that during the fertile phases of ovulatory cycles, we included data from the four days surrounding the day of maximum female oestrogen values into our behavioural analyses. The four days included started on day –2 relative to the day of maximum oestrogen value (day 0), which was on average the third day of the fertile phase during the regular ovulatory cycles.

Genetic Paternity Analysis

Faecal samples for paternity analysis were collected from all infants that were born subsequent to the observed conception cycles $(N = 6)$ and from their mothers. Furthermore, faecal samples from all 24 males that were observed moving within the home range of group HA were collected, irrespective of whether the males had been observed to interact with females or not. From fresh faeces, 2–3 g were stored in absolute ethanol at 4°C until extraction. Primers (D1S548, D2S367, D3S1768, D5S502, D6S266, D6S501, D8S271, D8S601, D14S255, D20S476, MFGT5), DNA extraction and PCR procedures are described by Engelhardt (2004).

We used the multiple-tube approach (Taberlet et al. 1996, 1999) for individual genotyping in order to overcome false genotyping. In this respect, if possible, we genotyped three different samples for each individual. If less than three faecal samples were available, we used at least three different DNA extracts from these samples. To be taken as true alleles, alleles of a specific locus had to be confirmed twice each in three independent PCRs. When a third allele emerged, PCR was repeated until the two most frequent alleles were confirmed at least four times each in independent PCR products from at least two different extracts. These alleles were then seen as the 'true' alleles (provided the third allele did not emerge a second time). In the rare cases that it was not possible to clearly determine two alleles for a certain locus, the locus was either omitted for the individual or all appearing alleles were taken as potential alleles of this individual. Homozygosity was confirmed if a single allele occurred in six independent PCRs or if a second allele occurred only once in eleven independent PCRs.

We compared the mother and offspring genotypes to deduce which infant allele was inherited from the father. If the mother and infant had the same two alleles or if we were not able to genotype a mother at a certain locus, both infant alleles were considered as potential paternal alleles. Males who did not match with the deduced paternal alleles at anyone's locus were

212 excluded from paternity. A male was considered the likely father, if (1) all other males were
213 excluded from paternity, and (2) he was compatible with the paternal alleles in all genotyped loci
214 (at least six). In only one case, no male matched with the deduced paternal alleles in all
215 genotyped loci. In this case, the only male that had only one mismatch with the paternal alleles
216 was assumed to be the likely father. We furthermore calculated parentage likelihood using the
217 program CERVUS 2.0 (Tristan Marshall, Edinburgh, UK; Marshall et al. 1998) including only
218 those alleles that matched our definition for 'true alleles'. All deduced paternities had a
219 likelihood of ≥ 98%.
220
221
222 **Behavioural Observations**

223 Behavioural observations were conducted by A.E. supported by four experienced Indonesian
224 field-assistants (Arwin, Matplin, Rahimin, Samsu) and three students from the Universities
225 UNSYAH (Dewi, Surya) and STIKK (Azhar), Darussalam Bandah Aceh, Indonesia. Group HA
226 was followed from dawn until dusk (mean observation time: 11.1 h) every day by two to three
227 observers at the same time. During this time, sexual interactions occurring between an adult
228 group member and any other individual were recorded in detail using the all occurrence sampling
229 method (Altmann, 1974). For this, we noted the identity of the interacting partners and the
230 occurrence or absence of the following behaviours: Female approaches male, male approaches
231 female, female presents anogenital region to a male ("Präsentieren", Angst, 1974), female
232 refuses sexual interaction (by moving away), male inspects female genitalia ("Inspizieren",
233 Angst, 1974), male mounts, intromission, ejaculation pause. Furthermore all agonistic
234 interactions (threatening, chasing, biting, grabbing and pulling a fleeing female to force
235 copulation) between the sexual partners or with a third party during sexual interactions were
236 noted on occurrence. Threatening, chasing and biting was collectively called harassment. In
237 addition to agonistic interactions between group members, all agonistic interactions of males of
238 the adjacent groups were recorded ad libitum (Altmann 1974).
239 Dominance rank within males and females was determined by the display of the 'bared-teeth-
240 face', a unidirectional submissive display (van Hooff 1967), and with a sociometric matrix
241 (Altmann 1974) in which the direction of aggression was entered. It was not possible to deduce
242 the complete dominance hierarchies between males from all groups, but for each group the alpha
243 and the beta male could be determined. The rank relation between the dominant male of group

HA and the dominant male of group HB, who temporarily joined group HA (see above), was undecided.

All adult females of group HA were observed as focal animals (Altmann 1974) every day for about two hours on row (mean: 2.1 h/day, range: 1.4 – 2.6 h/day), often two to three females simultaneously. During focal animal sampling, consortships were recorded with the continuous sampling method (Martin & Bateson 1993). Consortships were defined as taking place when an adult male and a sexually active adult female maintained in proximity within 10 m (when with the group) or within 20 m (when away from the group) for at least ten consecutive minutes and when coordinated movements occurred. Usually, consort partners engaged in sexual interactions with each other, but sometimes a consorting male was replaced by a higher-ranking male before sexual interactions could take place. Maintenance of the consortship was measured in proportion to time spent in consort and was ascribed to the consort partner that followed the other. If the consort pair did not move, the maintenance of the consort was ascribed to the consort partner that had been the follower in the preceding move. During focal animal sampling, we also noted events in which a consorted female approached (i.e. came near to 5m or less to) a male other than the consort partner (event sampling; Altmann 1974). Furthermore, using the instantaneous sampling method (interval: 1 min; Altmann 1974), we measured how much time males that were lower ranking than the male consort partner spent in "proximity" to a consort pair, i.e. not more than 10 m (when with the group) or 20 m (when away from the group) away.

When a female stayed in consort for 100 minutes or more (long consorts), focal animal sampling was continued for the rest of the day. From this day on, the female was followed from dawn to dusk until she was not consorted anymore. Sometimes two or three females engaged in long consorts simultaneously, so that only one or two females could be followed the whole day through. The other female/s was/were then followed for half a day. The average observation time during long consorts per female was 6.1 h/day. When more than one female was in long consort, all non-consorting females were followed only every second day. Focal animal sampling was interrupted every half hour to check the group for composition, activity and location.

Data Analysis

All data presented here concerning consortships and sexual interactions exclusively refer to the defined fertile phases of the observed ovarian cycles and to the four days surrounding the

oestrogen peak in the two cycles in which a fertile phase could not be determined (see above). Thus, 11 cycles were included in the analysis (for female observation time see Table 1). Data for female MA was obtained only during half of the fertile phase, because on two of the four days the female moved away from the group and was lost by the observer. The fact that male behaviour varied between different cycles of the same female indicated to us that these cycles differed in quality and thus can be seen as independent events. Since cycles differed significantly for example in the time a female was monopolised by the dominant male, female mating patterns and strategies can be expected to be different in different cycles. We have nevertheless averaged data from different cycles of the same females where we do not explicitly compare different cycle-types with each other.

To test whether female attractivity differed individually, we looked at the proportion of time the group's dominant male maintained a consort with a female. We restricted analysis to this male, because he was the only one who could express his interest in females without constraints. We did also not include alpha-male HB into analysis, because he only temporarily joined group HA. Female "attractivity" parameters tested included female dominance rank, female parity status and female oestrogen levels. For comparison of parity status, females were classified into two parity categories: 1 = nulliparous and primiparous; 2 = multiparous. For females that had more than one ovarian cycle during the study period, the mean consort time of all cycles was used. The only exception occurred for hormone levels: since females can have significantly different hormone levels in different cycles, we related individual hormone levels of a given cycle to the proportion of consort time in this particular cycle.

To estimate the degree of male coercion, we looked at the frequency with which males forced females into copulation. We further looked at how dominant males responded to their female consort partner when she approached other males during the consort period.

To assess the degree of female mate choice, we looked at how active females were in soliciting males, how often they refused male attempts to engage in sexual interactions (attempts to inspect the female or to mount the female) and how they distributed solicitations over males of different dominance rank or residency status. Since females mate-guarded by dominant males were constrained in mate choice, we restricted analysis to those cycles in which females were not continuously consorted by alpha males throughout their fertile phase.

We classified males by dominance rank and residency status. All males that held alpha or beta rank position in their groups were classified as high-ranking males and all other males were

called subordinate males. The second-ranking male of group HA, which had just joined the group at the beginning of the study, often left the group or stayed at the periphery. Thus, the third-ranking male often held the functional beta position and was therefore named beta male HA and categorised as high-ranking.

Female long-tailed macaques solicit sexual interactions to males by presenting their anogenital region (Zumpe & Michael, 1983). We included only those solicitations into the analysis, which occurred after the female had approached the male. Thus, soliciting was part of a female initiated sexual contact and not the reaction to the approach of a male. We calculated for each female the proportion of solicitations that aimed at high-ranking males and the proportion that aimed at subordinate males and tested these values against each other. For females with several cycles, we used the mean of all cycles. The same was done for resident versus non-resident males. We did not look at differences in the frequency of refusals in terms of rank or residency, because females may not be as free to refuse a male as they are to solicit a male, since all males are higher ranking than females and might harass the refusing female.

To test whether paternity was related to the rate of ejaculations a female had received from specific males, we counted the number of ejaculations a likely father had with a female and tested it against the mean number of ejaculates the female had received from other males. We also looked at the timing of ejaculations within the fertile phase by calculating the proportion of ejaculates a female had received from the likely father on each day of the fertile phase. We then tested for differences in these values between the different fertile days.

Specific tests and sample sizes are given with the results. We generally applied non-parametric tests with two-tailed probabilities and a significance level of 0.05. All statistic tests were conducted with SPSS 11.0 for Windows.

RESULTS

Female Reproductive Cycles

Seven of the eight study females showed ovarian activity (Table 1). In total, eleven cycles were observed, including six conception cycles, four ovulatory non-conception cycles and one anovulatory cycle. Fertile phases were spread over seven months and, with the exception of two cycles (cycle LA*, SA1; Fig. 2), did not overlap with each other. However, eight fertile phases,

Fig. 2

including all conception cycles, occurred within the first 3.5 months (Fig. 2). All females who conceived gave birth to an infant after a mean of 163 days $(SD = 3.1)$, counting from the last day of the fertile phase.

Consortships

Females were consorted during all fertile phases, but with varying duration and varying number and identity of consort partners (Fig. 3). Cycles could be classified according to the proportion of time alpha males consorted a female during her fertile phase. In six out of eleven cycles, females were consorted by alpha males for on average 97% of the observation time (monopolisation cycles; range: 91–100% observation time). In all of these cycles, consortships were male maintained during 100% of the consort time. Monopolisation cycles could be classified again into those in which females were exclusively consorted by alpha male HA during their fertile phases (cycle SA*, KA2, KA3) and those in which they were consorted alternately by alpha male HA and alpha male HB (cycle CA*, SA1, FA*).

Fig. 3

In the remaining five cycles, alpha males consorted females on average only during 26% of the fertile phase (non-monopolisation cycles; range: 0–56% observation time). These cycles differed from monopolisation cycles in that females had significantly more consort partners (average: 4.2 partners, range: 2–8 partners; Mann-Whitney-U Test: $U = 2.5$, $N_1 = 5$, $N_2 = 6$, $P = 0.017$) and spent significantly less time in consort in general (average: 75% observation time, range: 63–94% observation time; Mann-Whitney-U Test: $U = 0$, $N_1 = 5$, $N_2 = 6$, $P = 0.004$). Furthermore, in two of these cycles, consortships were partly maintained by the female alone (cycle MA*: 57% consort time; cycle KA1: 26.3% consort time).

Number of Mating Partners

Monopolisation cycles and non-monopolisation cycles differed from each other in the number of mating partners: during fertile phases of non-monopolisation cycles, females had a mean of 5.2 mating partners (range: 4–7 partners) and thus significantly more mating partners than during monopolisation cycles (mean: 2.7 partners, range: 1–5) partners; Mann-Whitney-U Test: $U = 2.5$, $N_1 = 5$, $N_2 = 6$, $P = 0.017$). Although females in five of the monopolisation cycles

had more than one mating partner, most copulations occurred with alpha males (mean: 93.4%, range: 81.3–100% copulations).

Female status and monopolisation by the dominant male

The proportion of time females were consorted by the group's alpha male during the fertile phase did not depend on female parity (Mann-Whitney-U Test: $U = 6$, $N_1 = 3$, $N_2 = 4$, $P > 0.99$). Time in consort with the alpha-male was also neither related to mean cycle oestrogen levels (Spearman rank correlation: $rs = -0.07$, $N = 11$, $P = 0.84$), nor to the mean oestrogen: progestogen ratio of cycles (Spearman rank correlation: $rs = 0.31$, $N = 11$, $P = 0.35$). We found however a significant correlation between female dominance rank and the time with which females were consorted by the group's alpha-male, with high-ranking females being consorted for longer periods than low-ranking females (Spearman rank correlation: $rs = 0.86$, $N = 7$, $P = 0.014$, Fig. 4).

Fig. 4

Male coercion and female mate choice

During the whole observation period, we observed 19 cases (2.5% of all refusals) involving six of the seven cycling females in which a female refused to mate, but was forcedly pulled into the right position and mounted by the male. Of these copulations, 82.4% terminated in ejaculation. In five monopolisation cycles, we observed that dominant males chased their female consort partner away from other males (30.1% of all cases in which a female approached a male other than the consort partner). Only twice (7.7% of all approaches) was a female observed to solicit mating with a non-dominant male while being consorted by a dominant male.

In non-monopolisation cycles in which females were not monopolised by males throughout the entire fertile phase, females showed a low degree of soliciting behaviour and a high degree of sexual permissiveness: a mean of 19.5% of all sexual interactions (range: 3.3–33.3% sexual interactions) occurred after female solicitations and on average only 18.7% of male sexual approaches (inspection and mounting attempts; range: 9.5–37.5% of male approaches) were refused by females. Furthermore, after almost half of these refusals, females were approached

again and mated with the refused male within the next 10 minutes (mean: 44.6%, range: 14.3–100% of refusals).

Female mate choice was never restricted to a single male in non-monopolisation cycles and females solicited on average to 3.6 males (range: 2–6 males). There was further no significant preference for males of certain dominance rank or residence status in these cycles, neither for (A) high-ranking males in comparison to subordinate males nor for (B) non-resident versus resident males (Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test: A: $Z = -1{,}1$, $N = 5$, $P = 0.27$, B: $Z = 0.0$, $N = 5$, $P > 0.99$).

Behaviour of Subordinate Males

Although alpha males that were consorting a female sometimes attacked subordinate males that were in proximity to the consort pair, subordinate males were observed in proximity to alpha males and their consort partner on average for 25.4% of the consort time (range: 0–59.3% consort time). Nevertheless, the number of sneak copulations was very low: only two copulations with non-alpha males occurred while the female was consorted by an alpha male (see above). No coalition forming among subordinate males against consorting alpha males was observed.

Paternity and Copulation Rate

There was a clear relation between male rank and paternity: all six infants born during the study period were sired by high-ranking males (Fig. 3), one by alpha male HA, three by alpha male HB and one each by beta males HA and HB. At the same time, there was an overall significant relation between male dominance rank and copulation rate. Females mated more often with higher ranking males than with sub-ordinate males (Wilcoxon signed-ranks test: $Z = -2.0$, $N = 7$, $P = 0.041$). However, male ejaculation rate and timing of ejaculation was not related to paternity. Females had not received significantly more ejaculations from likely fathers than from other males (Wilcoxon signed-ranks test: $Z = 1.5$, $N = 5$, $P = 0.14$) and receipt of ejaculations from fathers was not concentrated to specific days of the fertile phase (Friedman test: $\chi^2 = 0.8$, $N = 5$, $K = 3$, $P = 0.85$; Fig. 5).

Fig. 5

DISCUSSION

Male dominance rank and reproductive success

The results presented here confirm previous findings of a study of several groups of long-tailed macaques in the same population that almost all infants are sired by alpha and beta males in this species (de Ruiter et al. 1994). Given that a strong positive correlation between male dominance rank and paternity has now been observed in multiple groups of wild long-tailed macaques during several years, it seems that a high reproductive skew in favour of high-ranking males is a consistent characteristic of this species, at least for populations living in their natural habitat. Furthermore, our data support earlier findings in macaques (e.g. *Macaca mulatta*: Stern & Smith 1984; *Macaca sylvanus*: Paul et al. 1993) that mating success is not necessarily a reliable measure of male reproductive success underlying the importance of genetic paternity analyses.

In the following, we will discuss the causes of the reproductive skew observed in long-tailed macaques as can be concluded from our results (see also Fig. 6).

Fig. 6

Mate guarding by dominant males

We demonstrated that monopolisation of fertile females by dominant males occurs in wild long-tailed macaques and that monopolisation is timed to the cycle's fertile phase and results in paternity supporting the priority of access to oestrus females model (Altman 1962). Three of the six infants conceived during our study were sired by alpha males during cycles in which these males mate guarded the female throughout the entire fertile phase and in which copulations with males other than alpha males accounted only for a minor proportion of copulations. Since in two conception cycles the group's dominant male shared mate guarding and mating with the dominant male of an adjacent group, paternity in these cases is likely to be determined post-copulatory (i.e. within the female reproductive tract). Sharing of mate guarding between alpha males of different groups has never been observed in this well studied population. Furthermore, it has never been reported that dominant long-tailed macaque males temporarily switch groups during the mating season (compare van Noordwijk 1985; van Noordwijk & van Schaik 1988, 2001; de Ruiter et al. 1994). We speculate that the alpha male HB was attracted by the higher

number of cycling females in group HA compared to his own group (A. Engelhardt unpubl. data). We presume therefore that under different conditions, more infants would have been sired by the group's dominant male as a result of mate guarding.

Although mate guarding by dominant males regularly occurred, it was not observed in all cycles and three of these cycles without male monopolisation led to conception. This is surprising in view of male ability to recognise a female's fertile phase (Engelhardt et al. 2004) and our finding of little overlap of fertile phases in our study females. Two basic models of reproductive skew provide a possible explanation for a lack of monopolisation by dominant males. According to the concession model (Vehrencamp 1983; Johnstone et al. 1999; Kokko & Johnstone 1999), high-ranking males do not always monopolise access to females provided that these males benefit from the presence of subordinate males, for example for group defence. The limited control model (Cant 1998; Clutton-Brock 1998; Reeve et al. 1998) on the other hand suggests that dominant males sometimes fail to monopolise access to females due to an assortment of factors such as female cycle synchrony, alternative male reproductive strategies or female choice. Our data does not allow to differentiate between both models for our study group. On one hand, the fact that the dominant male did not try to monopolise all females although theoretically possible supports the concession model. On the other hand, he might have disregarded some of the cycles in order to save time and energy for fighting competitors or to regenerate depleted energy reserves. Mate guarding is time and energy consuming (Alberts et al. 1996) and males should refrain from mate guarding when energetic demands are high and the available female is not of high interest (Alberts et al. 2003; Kappeler & van Schaik 2004). Given the rapid sequence with which fertile phases seem to occur in long-tailed macaques, males are from an energetic point of view possibly not able to monopolise all reproducing females during a complete mating season and, thus, might distribute mate-guarding efforts unevenly over different females. Our findings suggest that males prefer high-ranking females for consort (although we cannot not exclude that other factors than dominance rank also influenced male behaviour since our sample size was small). That dominant males prefer high-ranking females as reproductive partners is a common finding in primates (e.g. reviewed in Robinson 1982; Berenstain & Wade 1983; see also Kuester & Paul 1996), and makes perfect sense given the fact that high-ranking females often have a higher lifetime reproductive success than low-ranking females (reviewed in Silk 1987, Ellis 1995; for long-tailed macaques see van Noordwijk 1999). However, further studies will be

492 needed to identify the costs and limitations of mate-guarding in long-tailed macaques and to
493 clarify whether dominant males benefit from the presence of subordinate males.
494
495
496 **The potential of post-copulatory mechanisms for determining paternity**
497 We first show in wild long-tailed macaques, that polyandrous mating does not only occur during
498 infertile periods of the female's ovarian cycle but also to a significant extent when conception is
499 most likely. In the majority of cycles, including almost all conception cycles, polyandrous
500 mating occurred to a significant extent during the fertile phase. Polyandrous mating during the
501 fertile phase opens up the opportunity for sperm competition and female cryptic choice. From
502 our data it seems that neither the number of ejaculations a female received from a male nor the
503 timing of ejaculation affected male reproductive success (although these results should be taken
504 cautiously due to the limited data set). Thus, in our study, paternity seems to almost exclusively
505 been determined by mechanisms operating on the post-copulatory level. According to our data,
506 two factors seem to affect the potential for post-copulatory paternity determination: stability of
507 the alpha male position and male interest in females (Fig. 6). Given the special situation in our
508 study group (see above: the dominant male of one of the adjacent groups temporarily joined it),
509 the degree to which paternity was determined on the post-copulatory level might have been
510 overestimated and male monopolisation may generally play a more important role. However,
511 since three infants were conceived during cycles in which dominant males were just not
512 interested in the female (as indicated by low rates of alpha male consortship), paternity
513 determination within the female reproductive tract can be expected to occur to a significant
514 extent even when only a single dominant male is with a group. A study on Hanuman langurs also
515 provides clear evidence for the existence of post-copulatory paternity assignment (Heistermann
516 et al., 2001) and the potential for it seems to be apparent in the majority of primate species. As in
517 birds, repeated copulation, male mate-guarding and relatively large testes occur frequently in
518 primates, traits that have been interpreted as adaptations to sperm competition. Furthermore, the
519 interspecific variation found in the morphology of male primate genitalia and sperm may be
520 functionally related to sperm competition (for a review see Birkhead & Kappeler 2004). More
521 studies focusing on the period within a female cycle in which copulation can lead to conception
522 are needed in order to evaluate the extent to which post-copulatory selection actually plays a role
523 within the primates.

524
525
526 **Female mate choice and alternative male reproductive strategies**

527 The degree to which female mate choice contributed to paternity seemed to be low in our study
528 group. During cycles in which females were monopolised by dominant males, mate choice was
529 restricted through the harassment of the consorting male. We can, however, not exclude the
530 possibility that mate-guarding by the alpha-male was not only based on coercion, but also on
531 female cooperation. It has been suggested that primate females living in multi-male groups
532 should concentrate mating to the dominant male in order to get protection from this male for the
533 coming offspring (van Schaik et al. 1999). Females in our study were however not reluctant to
534 mate with other males during the time they were in consort with the alpha-male. Furthermore,
535 the observation that this male was able to force copulations and to chase female consort partners
536 away from other males suggests that monopolisation of females does not necessarily need female
537 cooperation.
538 Even when females were not monopolised, the proportion with which females solicited or
539 refused sexual interactions was low. As a result, females were usually mating with several males
540 during the fertile phase. Males, on the other hand, were insisting and often succeeded in mating
541 with a female that had rejected the same male just a few minutes before. It can be assumed that
542 female long-tailed macaques are sexually permissive in order to avoid harassment, since males
543 are significantly bigger than females (Plavcan & van Schaik 1997), have much bigger canines
544 (Plavcan & van Schaik 1992) and generally dominate females (Angst 1975). In fact, we have
545 observed forced copulations several times, but the frequency was very low. Sexual harassment
546 thus seems to be relatively rare in this species (see also Engelhardt et al. 2005), which might
547 result from female permissiveness.
548 In addition to a low degree of initiative, females did not show any mate preference concerning
549 male rank or residency. Our observations confirm results of a recent pair choice test, in which
550 female long-tailed macaques most often mated with both available males during the fertile phase,
551 irrespective of the combination of males presented (Nikitopoulos et al. in press). We therefore
552 conclude that there is a low degree of female mate choice in long-tailed macaques, not only due
553 to constraints set by males, but also to a lack of choosiness in the females. Instead females seem
554 to aim at mating with several males, possibly to receive the benefits of polyandrous mating and
555 sperm competition. These potential benefits (reviewed in Wolff & Macdonald 2004) include

avoiding inbreeding or genetic incompatibilities (Newcomer et al. 1999; Zeh & Zeh 2001; Tregenza & Wedell 2002), reducing the risk of infanticide through paternity confusion (Hrdy 1979; van Schaik et al. 2000; Heistermann et al. 2001), enhancing paternal care (Taub 1980, but see Soltis & McElreath 2001), receiving good sperm ('good-sperm' model; Yasui 1997) and facilitating cryptic female choice (Eberhard 1996). It may however be that female long-tailed macaques follow two different strategies according to their situation: cooperating with the dominant male when he is interested in the female and increasing polyandrous mating when not. In addition, females may indirectly influence with whom they mate by supporting or opposing males that try to join the group (indirect female choice; Small 1989).

Our paternity data and that of de Ruiter and colleagues (1994) suggest that alternative male reproductive strategies play no or at least only a minor role for male reproductive success in long-tailed macaques. Subordinate males often followed a consorting pair and sometimes even managed to mate with a guarded female, but none of these copulations resulted in paternity. Two questions arise from the observed behaviour of subordinate males. First, why did subordinate males refuse to form coalitions against mate guarding dominant males. There may be two explanations to this question. First of all, Henzi et al. (1999) argue that small groups afford fewer opportunities for coalition formation and thus there is weaker selection on the behavioural tendency to form social alliances that might lead to coalitions. This may also apply to long-tailed macaques, in which group size and number of males within groups are small compared to other catarrhine primate multi-male groups. Furthermore, male bonnet macaques (*Macaca sinica*: Silk 1993) and Barbary macaques (*Macaca sylvanus*: Widdig et al. 2000), species in which coalition formation among males is common, rarely form coalitions against higher-ranking opponents to avoid retaliation. So it seems that the reluctance to form coalitions against males of higher status is a general pattern amongst macaques. The second question that remains to be answered is, why were females not continuously consorted during the fertile phase when not mate guarded by dominant males. This may be explained by the observation that consorting subordinate males were often supplanted by higher-ranking males and that females often mated with males higher ranking than their current consort partner. Thus, since subordinate males were not able to exclude other males from mating with the female, they may have decided to not invest more time and energy in mate-guarding the female.

588 **Determinants of male reproductive success in wild long-tailed macaques**

589 Collectively, our data suggest that predominantly both male monopolisation of females during
590 their fertile phase and post-copulatory mechanisms determine male reproductive success in long-
591 tailed macaques. It seems that our findings can be generalised at least to those long-tailed
592 macaques living in their natural habitat, because they are supported by specific species
593 characteristics. A pronounced sexual dimorphism in body and canine size (Plavcan & van Schaik
594 1992, 1997), moderately seasonal reproduction (Kavanagh & Laurensen 1984; van Schaik & van
595 Noordwijk 1985), male ability to discern the fertile phase of a cycle (Engelhardt et al. 2004) and
596 higher mating success in high-ranking males (van Noordwijk 1985; de Ruiter et al. 1994) all
597 suggest a high degree of male monopolisation in this species. In contrast, a high testis to body
598 weight ratio (Harcourt et al. 1981) and a high number of viable sperm in male ejaculates (Schrod
599 2002) point to a high degree of sperm competition.
600 Female mate choice and alternative male reproductive strategies, in contrast, did not directly
601 affect male reproductive success. It may however be that females cooperated in monopolisation
602 by the dominant male. Although paternity determination mostly occurred within the female
603 reproductive tract in this study, infants were exclusively sired by alpha and beta males. This did
604 obviously not result from higher ejaculation rates in likely fathers or from a specific timing of
605 ejaculations within the fertile phase. Hence, although our sample size is limited, it seems that in
606 long-tailed macaques, dominant males have an advantage in sperm competition, which might
607 contribute to the high reproductive skew observed in this species. However, our knowledge on
608 post-copulatory mechanisms is still limited (reviewed in Birkhead & Kappeler 2004). Clearly
609 more investigations are needed for a better understanding of the processes leading to fertilisation
610 within the female reproductive tract, and thus, of the proximate mechanisms determining
611 paternity in primate multi-male groups.
612
613
614 # ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

615 We gratefully acknowledge the cooperation and support of the Indonesian Institute of Sciences
616 (LIPI); the General Directorate of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation (PKA); the
617 Universitas Nasional (UNAS), Jakarta (in particular Tatang Mitra Setia); and the Leuser
618 Management Unit (UML). We thank the UML staff in Medan and Ketambe for providing an

619 excellent research environment and strong logistical support; Arwin, Azhar, Bahlias, Dewi,
620 Matplin, Rahimin, Samsu and Surya for assistance in the field; and Jutta Hagedorn and Andrea
621 Heistermann for laboratory assistance. Jan de Ruiter generously provided us with blood samples
622 from the Ketambe population for the establishment of microsatellite analysis in long-tailed
623 macaques and Heike Rösler conducted most of the genetic analysis. We thank Anja Widdig and
624 three anonymous reviewers for valuable comments on the manuscript. This research was
625 financed by the German Research Council (DFG) (Ni186/14-1). A. Engelhardt was financially
626 supported by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), the State of Berlin Graduate
627 Sponsorship (Nafög), the KKGS Fund, the Lucie-Burgers Foundation for Comparative Research,
628 Arnhem, the Netherlands, and the Christian-Vogel-Funds. This study complies with the current
629 laws of the countries in which it was performed.
630
631

632 # REFERENCES

633 Alberts SC, Altmann J, Wilson ML (1996) Mate guarding constrains foraging activity of male baboons.
634 Anim Behav 51:1269–1277

635 Alberts SC, Watts HE, Altmann J (2003) Queuing and queue-jumping: long-term patterns of reproductive
636 skew in male savannah baboons, *Papio cynocephalus.* Anim Behav 65:821–840

637 Altmann J (1974) Observational study of behavior:sampling methods. Behavior 49:227–267

638 Altmann J, Albers SC, Haines SA, Dubach J, Muruthi P, Coote T, Geffen E, Cheesman DJ, Mututua RS,
639 Saiyalel SN, Wayne RK, Lacy RC, Bruford MW (1996) Behavior predicts genetic structure in a
640 wild primate group. P Natl Acad Sci, USA 93:5797–5801

641 Altmann SA (1962) A field study of the sociobiology of rhesus monkeys, *Macaca mulatta*. Ann NY Acad
642 Sci, USA 102:277–285

643 Angst W. (1974) Das Ausdrucksverhalten des Javaneraffen *Macaca fascicularis* (Raffles 1821).
644 Fortschritte der Verhaltensforschung 15:1–90

645 Angst W (1975) Basic data and concepts on the social organization of *Macaca fascicularis*. In:
646 Rosenblum LA (Ed) Primate behavior:developments in the field and laboratory research Bd 4.
647 Academic Press, New York, pp 325–388

Behboodi E, Katz DF, Samuels SJ, Tell L, Hendrickx AG, Lasley BL (1991) The use of a urinary estrone conjugates assay for detection of optimal mating time in the cynomolgus macaque (*Macaca fascicularis*). J Med Primatol 20:229–234

Berard JD, Nürnberg P, Epplen JT, Schmidtke J (1993) Male rank reproductive behavior and reproductive success in free-ranging rhesus macaques. Primates 34:481–489

Berard JD, Nürnberg P, Epplen JT, Schmidtke J (1994) Alternative reproductive tactics and reproductive success in male rhesus macaques. Behaviour 129:177–201

Bercovitch FB (1986) Male rank and reproductive activity in savanna baboons. Int J Primatol 7:533–550

Bercovitch FB (1995) Female cooperation consortship maintenance and male mating success in savanna baboons. Anim Behav 50:137–149

Berenstain L, Wade TD (1983) Intrasexual selection and male mating strategies in baboons and macaques. Int J Primatol 4:201–235

Birkhead TR (2000) Promiscuity: an evolutionary history of sperm competition and sexual conflict. Faber and Faber, London

Birkhead TR, Kappeler PM (2004) Post-copulatory sexual selection in birds and primates In: Kappeler PM, van Schaik CP (Eds) Sexual selection in primates: New and comparative aspects. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 151–171

Birkhead TR, Møller AP (1998) Sperm competition and sexual selection. Academic Press, London

Cant MA (1998) A model for the evolution of reproductive skew without reproductive suppression. Anim Behav 55:163–169

Chism J, Rogers W (1997) Male competition mating success and female choice in a seasonally breeding primate. Ethology 103:109–126

Clutton-Brock TH (1998) Reproductive skew concessions and limited control. TREE 13:288–292

Clutton-Brock TH, Parker GA (1995) Sexual coercion in animal societies. Anim Behav 49:1345–1365

de Ruiter JR, Van Hooff JARAM, Scheffrahn W (1994) Social and genetic aspects of paternity in wild long-tailed macaques (*Macaca fascicularis*). Behavior 129:203–224

Deschner T, Heistermann M, Hodges JK, Boesch C (2003) Timing and probability of ovulation in relation to sex skin swelling in wild West African chimpanzees, *Pan troglodytes verus*. Anim Behav 66:551–560

Deschner T, Heistermann M, Hodges JK, Boesch C (2004) Female sexual swelling size timing of ovulation and male behavior in wild West African chimpanzees. Horm Behav 46:204–215

679 Dixson AF, Bossi T, Wickings EJ (1993) Male dominance and genetically determined reproductive
680 success in the mandrill. Primates 34:525–532

681 Eberhard WG (1996) Female control: sexual selection by cryptic female choice. Princeton University
682 Press, Princeton

683 Ellis L (1995) Dominance and reproductive success among nonhuman animals: A cross-species
684 comparison. Ethol Sociobiol 16:257–333

685 Engelhardt A (2004) The significance of male and female reproductive strategies for male reproductive
686 success in wild long-tailed macaques (*Macaca fascicularis*). Cuvillier, Göttingen.

687 Engelhardt A, Hodges JK, Niemitz C, Heistermann M (2005) Female sexual behavior, but not sex skin
688 swelling is a reliable indicator for the timing of the fertile phase in wild long-tailed macaques
689 (*Macaca fascicularis*). Horm Behav, in press

690 Engelhardt A, Pfeifer J-B, Heistermann M, Niemitz C, van Hooff JARAM, Hodges JK (2004)
691 Assessment of female reproductive status by male long-tailed macaques (*Macaca fascicularis*)
692 under natural conditions. Anim Behav 67:915–924

693 Fedigan LM (1983) Population dynamics of Arashiyama West Japanese Macaques. Int J Primatol 26:91–
694 129

695 Gowaty PA (1996) Battles of the sexes and origins of monogamy. In: Black JM (ed) Partnership in Birds.
696 Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp 21–52

697 Gust DA, McCaster T, Gordon TP, Gergits W, Cafna N, McClure HM (1998) Paternity in sooty
698 mangabeys. Int J Primatol 19:83–94

699 Harcourt AH, Harvey PH, Larson SG, Short RV (1981) Testis weight body weight and breeding system
700 in primates. Nature 293:55–57

701 Heistermann M, Ziegler T, Van Schaik CP, Launhardt K, Winkler P, Hodges JK (2001) Loss of oestrus,
702 concealed timing of ovulation and paternity confusion in free-ranging Hanuman langurs. P Roy Soc
703 Lond B 268:2445–2451

704 Henzi SP, Weingrill T, Barret L (1999) Male behavior and the evolutionary ecology of chacma baboons.
705 S Afr J Sci 95:240–242

706 Hrdy SB (1979) Infanticide among animals: a review, classification, and examination of the implications
707 for the reproductive strategies of females. Ethol Sociobiol 1:13–40

708 Inoue M, Mitsunaga F, Nozaki M, Ohsawa H, Takenaka A, Sugiyama Y, Shimizu K, Takenaka O (1993)
709 Male dominance rank and reproductive success in an enclosed group of japanese macaques: with
710 special reference to post-conception mating. Primates 34:503–511
711 Janson CH (1984) Female choice and mating system of the brown capuchin monkey, *Cebus apella*
712 (Primates:Cebidae). Zeitschr Tierpsychol 65:177–200
713 Johnstone RA, Woodroff E, Cant MA, Wright J (1999) Reproductive skew in multimember groups. Am
714 Nat 153:315–331
715 Kappeler PM, van Schaik CP (2004) Sexual selection in primates: review and selective preview. In:
716 Kappeler PM, van Schaik CP (ed) Sexual selection in primates: New and comparative aspects.
717 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 3–23
718 Kavanagh M, Laursen E (1984) Breeding seasonality among long-tailed macaques, *Macaca fascicularis*,
719 in Peninsular Malaysia. Int J Primatol 5:17–29
720 Kokko H, Johnstone RA (1999) Social queuing in animal societies: a dynamic model of reproductive
721 skew. P Roy Soc Lond B 266:571–578
722 Kuester J, Paul A (1996) Female-female competition and male mate choice in Barbary macaques
723 (*Macaca sylvanus*). Behavior 133:763–790
724 Manson JH (1992) Measuring female mate choice in Cayo Santiago rhesus macaques. Anim Behav
725 44:405–416
726 Manson JH (1994) Female mate choice in primates. Evol Anthropol 3:192–195
727 Marshall TC, Slate J, Kruuk LEB, Pemberton JM (1998) Statistical confidence for likelihood-based
728 paternity inference in natural populations. Mol Ecol 7:639–655
729 Martin P, Bateson P (1993) Measuring behavior. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
730 Newcomer SD, Zeh JA, Zeh DW (1999) Genetic benefits enhance the reproductive success of
731 polyandrous females. P Natl Acad Sci, USA 94:10236–10241
732 Nikitopoulos E, Heistermann M, de Vries H, van Hooff JARAM, Sterck EHM (in press) A pair choice
733 test to identify female mating pattern relative to ovulation in long-tailed macaques, *Macaca*
734 *fascicularis*. Anim Behav
735 Noë R, Sluijter AA (1990) Reproductive tactics of male savanna baboons. Behavior 113:117–169
736 Nunn CL (1999a) The number of males in primate social groups: a comparative test of the
737 socioecological model. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 46:1–13

738 Nunn CL (1999b) The evolution of exaggerated sexual swellings in primates and the graded-signal
739 hypothesis. Anima Behav 58:229–246

740 Nunn CL, van Schaik CP (2000) Social evolution in primates: The relative roles of ecology and
741 intersexual conflict. In: van Schaik, CP, Janson CH (ed) Infanticide by males and its implications.
742 Cambridge Univ Press, Cambridge, pp 388–419

743 Packer C (1977) Peciprocal altruism in *Papio anubis*. Nature 265:441–443

744 Paul A (1997) Breeding seasonality affects the association between dominance and reproductive success
745 in non-human male primates. Folia Primatol 68:344–349

746 Paul A (2002) Sexual selection and mate choice. Int J Primatol 23:877–904

747 Paul A, Küster J (1996) Differential reproduction in male and female Barbary macaques. In: Fa JE,
748 Lindburg DG (eds) Evolution and ecology of macaque societies. Cambridge University Press,
749 Camridge, pp 293–317

750 Paul A, Küster J, Timme A, Arnemann J (1993) The association between rank, mating effort, and
751 reproductive success in male Barbary macaques (*Macaca sylvanus*). Primates 34:491–502

752 Plavcan JM, van Schaik CP (1992) Intrasexual competition and canine dimorphism in anthropoid
753 primates. Am J Phys Anthropol 87:461–477

754 Plavcan JM, van Schaik CP (1997) Intrasexual competition and body weight dimorphism in anthropoid
755 primates. Am J Phys Anthropol 103:37–68

756 Reeder DM (2003) The potential for cryptic female choice in primates: Behavioral, anatomical, and
757 physiological considerations. In: Jones CB (ed) Sexual selection and reproductive competition in
758 primates: new perspectives and directions. American Society of Primatologists, Norman, pp 255–
759 303

760 Reeve HK, Emlen ST, Keller L (1998) Reproductive sharing in animal societies: reproductive incentives
761 or incomplete control by dominant breeders? Behav Ecol 9:267–278

762 Reichert KE, Heistermann M, Hodges JK, Boesch C, Hohmann G (2002) What females tell males about
763 their reproductive status: Are morphological and behavioral cues reliable signals of ovulation in
764 bonobos (*Pan paniscus*)? Ethology 108:583–600

765 Rijksen H (1978) A field study on Sumatran orang-utans (*Pongo pygmaeus abelli,* Lesson 1827):
766 Ecology, Behavior and Conservation. Veenman, Wageningen

767 Robinson JG (1982) Intrasexual competition and mate choice in primates. Am J Primatol Suppl
768 1:131–144

769 Schrod A (2002) Comparative analyses of sperm-motility, -morphology and -morphometrics in primates
770 with different mating systems. PhD thesis, Tierärztliche Hochschule Hannover

771 Shideler SE, Shackleton CHL, Moran FM, Stauffer P, Lohstroh PN, Lasley BL (1993) Enzyme
772 immunoassays for ovarian steroid metabolites in the urine of *Macaca fascicularis*. J Med Primatol
773 22:301–312

774 Silk JB (1987) Social behavior in evolutionary perspective. In: Smuts BB, Cheney DL, Seyfarth RM,
775 Wrangham RW, Struhsaker TT (eds) Primate Societies. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp 318–
776 329

777 Silk JB (1993) Does participation in coalitions influence dominance relationships among male bonnet
778 macaques? Behavior 126:171–189

779 Small MF (1989) Female choice in non-human primates. Yearb Phys Anthropol 32:103–127

780 Smuts BB, Smuts RW (1993) Male agression and sexual coercion of females in nonhuman primates and
781 other mammals: Evidence and theoretical implications. Adv Stud Behav 22:1–63

782 Soltis J (2004) Mating systems. In: Thierry B, Kaumanns W (ed) Macaque societies. Cambridge
783 University Press, Cambridge, pp 135–151

784 Soltis J, McElreath R (2001) Can females gain extra paternal investment by mating with multiple males?
785 A game theoretic approach. Am Nat 158:519–529

786 Soltis J, Thomsen R, Matsubayashi K, Takenaka O (2000) Male infanticide by resident males and female
787 counter-strategies in wild Japanese macaques (*Macaca fuscata*). Behav Ecol Sociobiol 48:195–202

788 Soltis J, Thomsen R, Takenaka O (2001) The interaction of male and female reproductive strategies and
789 paternity in wild Japanese macaques *Macaca fuscata.* Anim Behav 62:485–494

790 Sterck EHM, Watts DP, van Schaik CP (1997) The evolution of female social relationships in nonhuman
791 primates. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 41:291–309

792 Stern BR, Smith DG (1984) Sexual behavior and paternity in three captive groups of rhesus monkeys
793 (*Macaca mulatta*). Anim Behav 32:23–32

794 Stumpf RM, Boesch C (2005) Does promiscuous mating preclude female choice? Female sexual
795 strategies in chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes verus*) of the Taï National Park, Côte d'Ivoire. Behav
796 Ecol Sociobiol 57:511–524

797 Taberlet P, Waits LP, Luikart G (1999) Noninvasive genetic sampling: look before you leap. TREE
798 14:323–327

799 Taberlet P, Griffin S, Goossens B, Questiau S, Manceau V, Escaravage N, Waits LP, Bouvet J (1996)
800 Reliable genotyping of samples with very low DNA quantities using PCR. Nucleic Acid Re
801 24:3189–3194

802 Taub DM (1980) Female choice and mating strategies among wild Barbary macaques (*Macaca sylvanus*).
803 In: Lindburgh DG (ed) The macaques: studies in ecology, behavior and evolution. Van Nostrand
804 Reinhold Company, New York, pp 287–344

805 Tregenza T, Wedell N (2002) Polyandrous females avoid costs of inbreeding. Nature 415:71–73

806 Trivers RL (1972) Parental investment and sexual selection. In: Campbell B (ed) Sexual selection and the
807 decent of man. Aldine Press, Chicago, pp 1871–1971

808 van Hooff JARAM (1967) The facial displays of the catarrhine monkeys and apes. In: Morris D (ed)
809 Primate ethology. Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, pp 7–68

810 van Noordwijk MA (1985) Sexual behavior of Sumatran long-tailed macaques. Zeitschr Tierpsychol
811 70:277–296

812 van Noordwijk MA (1999) The effects of dominance rank and group size on female lifetime reproductive
813 success in wild long-tailed macaques, *Macaca fascicularis*. Primates 40:105–130

814 van Noordwijk MA, van Schaik CP (1988) Male careers in Sumatran long-tailed macaques (*Macaca*
815 *fascicularis*). Behavior 107:24–43

816 van Noordwijk MA, van Schaik CP (2001) Career moves: Transfer and rank challenge decisions by male
817 long-tailed macaques. Behavior 138:359–395

818 van Schaik CP, Mirmanto E (1985) Spatial variation in the structure and litterfall of a Sumatran
819 rainforest. Biotropica 17:196–205

820 van Schaik CP, van Noordwijk MA (1985) Interannual variability in fruit abundance and reproductive
821 seasonality in Sumatran long-tailed macaques (*Macaca fascicularis*). J Zool A206:533–549

822 van Schaik CP, Hodges JK, Nunn CL (2000) Paternity confusion and the ovarian cycles of female
823 primates. In: van Schaik CP, Janson C (ed) Infanticide by males and its implications. Cambridge
824 University Press, Cambridge, pp 361–387

825 van Schaik CP, van Noordwijk MA, Nunn CL (1999) Sex and social evolution in primates. In: Lee PC
826 (ed) Comparative primate socioecology. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 204–231

827 Vehrencamp SL (1983) Optimal degree of skew in cooperative societies. Am Zool 23:327–335

828 Widdig A, Streich WJ, Tembrock G (2000) Coalition formation among male Barbary macaques (*Macaca*
829 *sylvanus*). Am J Primatol 50:37–51

830 Widdig A, Bercovitch FB, Streich WJ, Sauermann U, Nürnberg P, Krawczak M (2004) A longitudinal
831 analysis of reproductive skew in male rhesus macaques. P Roy Soc Lond B 271:819–826

832 Wolff JO, Macdonald DW (2004) Promiscuous females protect their offspring. Ecol Evol 19:127–134

833 Yasui Y (1997) A "good-sperm" model can explain the evolution of costly multiple mating by females.
834 Am Nat 149:573–584

835 Zeh JA, Zeh DW (2001) Reproductive mode and the genetic benefits of polyandry. Anim Behav
836 61:1051–1063

837 Zumpe D, Michael RP (1983) A comparison of the behavior of Macaca fascicularis and Macaca mulatta
838 in relation to the menstrual cycle. Am J Primatol 4:55–72

839

840 **Table 1** Dominance rank, parity and number of ovarian cycles of study females. Observation
841 time refers to the period a female was observed as focal animal during each of the fertile
842 phases.
843
844

Study-female	Rank	Parity	Non-conception cycles	Conception cycles	Observation time (min)
SA	1	primiparous	2	1	1180/1564/1712
FA	2	nulliparous	0	1	1430
KA	3	multiparous	3	0	2262/1352/1966
AA	4	multiparous	0	1	1313
LA	5	multiparous	0	1	659
CA	6	multiparous	0	1	1585
MA	7	nulliparous	0	1	648
IA	8	multiparous	0	0	

845

Fig. 1 Faecal oestrogen and progestogen profile in an individual female long-tailed macaque (SA). The fertile phase was defined to be the days -2 to -5 from the day of rise in progestogen levels (day 0) above a certain threshold (for more details, see methods).

Fig. 2 Distribution of the fertile phases over the study period. Black bars indicate the fertile phase of conception cycles, hatched bars those of ovulatory non-conception cycles and the open bar indicates those days of the anovulatory cycle that were included into the analyses. Grey lines mark days with full consortship and the arrow indicates the period in which the alpha male of the adjacent group HB joined group HA.

Fig. 3 Proportion of observation time females spent in consortship with alpha male HA (black bars), with alpha male HB (black bars with cross-hatching) and with other males (white bars) during the fertile phase. Values given show the number of non-alpha consort partners, if more than one. Conception cycles are marked by asterisks, non-conception cycles are numbered by occurrence. Likely fathers are stated above the conception cycles.

Fig. 4 Proportion of observation time females spent in consortship with alpha male HA in relation to female dominance rank. The figure shows mean values for females that had more than one ovarian cycle.

Fig. 5 Proportion of ejaculates females received from likely fathers on a given day of the fertile phase. Since observation of female MA was not continuous, her data are not presented.

Fig. 6 Mechanisms leading to male reproductive success depending on i) recognisability of the fertile phase, ii) male dominance over females, iii) monopolisability of females and iv) mating modus. Gray arrows indicate the factors influencing male reproductive success in this study.


Fertile
phase
Ovulation
Window
-2d
Progestin rise
Treshold
Faecal oestrogen
Faecal progestin
-10
-8
-6
-4
-2
0
2
4
Days from P-rise

Fig.1


Female
February
March
April
May
June
July
August
September
SA
FA
KA
AA
LA
CA
MA
Alpha male HB

Fig. 2



914
915
916 **Fig. 3**
917


100
90
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0
% Observation time in consort
Female dominance rank
high <----------> low

Fig. 4

924
925



926
927 **Fig. 5**
928


Males
recognize the fertile phase
Males
do not recognize the fertile phase
and are
but are not
able to coerce females
and are
able to monopolise females
but are not
and females prefer to mate with
several males
dominant males
depends on:
Female cycle synchrony
Stability of male dominance hierarchy
Coalition formation
Male monopolization
‘Priority-of-access model‘
‘Graded-signal hypothesis'
Postcopulatory mechanisms
(sperm competition/
female cryptic choice)
Female mate choice
‘Best-male hypothesis’

Fig. 6