Dear R. L. Hammond

Here are the electronic proofs of your article.

- You can submit your corrections **online** or by **fax**. Together with your proof corrections you must return the *Copyright Transfer Statement* to complete the proof process.
- **Print out** the *proof.* (If you do not already have Acrobat Reader, just download it from http://www.adobe.com.)
- Check the metadata sheet to make sure that the header information, especially author names and the corresponding affiliations, are correctly shown.
- Check that the text is complete and that all figures, tables and their legends are included. Also check the accuracy of special characters, equations, and electronic supplementary material if applicable. If necessary refer to the *Edited manuscript*.
- The publication of inaccurate data such as dosages and units can have serious consequences. Please take particular care that all such details are correct.
- Please **do not** make changes that involve only matters of style. We have generally introduced forms that follow the journal's style. Substantial changes in content, e.g., new results, corrected values, title and authorship are not allowed without the approval of the responsible editor. In such a case, please contact the Editorial Office and return his/her consent together with the proof.
- For **online** submission please insert your corrections in the online correction form. Always indicate the line number to which the correction refers.
- For **fax** submission, please ensure that your corrections are clearly legible. Use a fine black pen and write the correction in the margin, not too close to the edge of the page.
- The cover sheets (including the *Copyright Transfer Statement* and the *Offprint Order Form*) can either be scanned and sent electronically or sent by fax.
- If we do not receive your corrections within 48 hours, we will send you a reminder.

Please note

Your article will be published **Online First** approximately one week after receipt of your corrected proofs. This is the **official first publication** citable with the DOI. **Further changes are, therefore, not possible.**

After online publication, subscribers (personal/institutional) to this journal will have access to the complete article via the DOI using the URL:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00265-006-0257-2

If you would like to know when your article has been published online, take advantage of our free alert service. For registration and further information go to: <u>http://www.springerlink.com</u>.

Due to the electronic nature of the procedure, the manuscript and the original figures will only be returned to you on special request. When you return your corrections, please inform us if you would like to have these documents returned.

The **printed version** will follow in a forthcoming issue.

Fax to: +1-703-5621873



From: Re:	Hazel Bacolod for Springer Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology DOI 10.1007/s00265-006-0257-2
	A test of reproductive skew models in a field population of a multiple-queen ant
Authors:	Hammond · Bruford · Bourke

I. Permission to publish

Dear Hazel Bacolod for Springer

I have checked the proofs of my article and

I have **no corrections.** The article is ready to be published without changes.

I have a few corrections. I am enclosing the following pages:

I have made **many corrections.** Enclosed is the **complete article**.

II. Offprint order

Offprint order enclosed

I do not wish to order offprints

Remarks:

Date / signature

III. Copyright Transfer Statement (sign only if not submitted previously)

The copyright to this article is transferred to Springer-Verlag (for U.S. government employees to the extent transferable) effective if and when the article is accepted for publication. The author warrants that his/her contribution is original and that he/she has full power to make this grant. The author signs for and accepts responsibility for releasing this material on behalf of any and all co-authors. The copyright transfer covers the exclusive right to reproduce and distribute the article, including reprints, translations, photographic reproductions, microform, electronic form (offline, online) or any other reproductions of similar nature.

An author may self-archive an author-created version of his/her article on his/her own website and his/her institution's repository, including his/her final version; however he/she may not use the publisher's PDF version which is posted on www.springerlink.com. Furthermore, the author may only post his/her version provided acknowledgement is given to the original source of publication and a link is inserted to the published article on Springer's website. The link must be accompanied by the following text: "The original publication is available at www.springerlink.com."

The author is requested to use the appropriate DOI for the article (go to the Linking Options in the article, then to OpenURL and use the link with the DOI). Articles disseminated via www.springerlink.com are indexed, abstracted and referenced by many abstracting and information services, bibliographic networks, subscription agencies, library networks, and consortia.

After submission of this agreement signed by the corresponding author, changes of authorship or in the order of the authors listed will not be accepted by Springer.

Date / Author's signature __

Offprint Order Form

- To determine if your journal provides free offprints, please check the journal's instructions to authors.
- If you do not return this order form, we assume that you do not wish to order offprints.
- If you order offprints **after** the issue has gone to press, costs are much higher. Therefore, we can supply offprints only in quantities of 300 or more after this time.

Please enter my order for:

•	For orders involving more than 500 copies, please ask the
	production editor for a quotation.

Ple	ease ente	r my orde	er for:													
Pages	1-4	1-4	5-8	5-8	9-12	9-12	13-16	13-16	17-20	17-20	21-24	21-24	25-28	25-28	29-32	29-32
Copies	EUR	USD	EUR	USD	EUR	USD	EUR	USD	EUR	USD	EUR	USD	EUR	USD	EUR	USD
50	250.00	275.00	300.00	330.00	370.00	405.00	430.00	475.00	500.00	550.00	525.00	575.00	575.00	630.00	610.00	670.00
100	300.00	330.00	365.00	405.00	465.00	510.00	525.00	580.00	625.00	685.00	655.00	720.00	715.00	785.00	765.00	840.00
200	400.00	440.00	525.00	575.00	645.00	710.00	740.00	815.00	860.00	945.00	925.00	1,015.00	1,005.00	1,105.00	1,105.00	1,190.00
300	500.00	550.00	680.00	750.00	825.00	910.00	955.00	1,050.00	1,095.00	1,205.00	1,190.00	1,310.00	1,295.00	1,425.00	1,425.00	1,530.00
400	610.00	670.00	855.00	940.00	1,025.00	1,130.00	1,195.00	1,315.00	1,360.00	1,495.00	1,485.00	1,635.00	1,615.00	1,775.00	1,775.00	1,915.00
500	720.00	790.00	1,025.00	1,130.00	1,225.00	1,350.00	1,430.00	1,575.00	1,625.00	1,780.00	1,780.00	1,960.00	1,930.00	2,125.00	2,090.00	2,300.00

Orders will only be processed if a credit card number has been provided. For German authors, payment by direct debit is also possible.

I wish to be charged in 📮 Euro 📮 USD	Prices include surface mail postage and handling. Customers in EU countries who are not registered for VAT should add VAT at the rate applicable in their country. VAT registration number (EU countries only):
Please charge my credit card Eurocard/Access/Mastercard American Express Visa/Barclaycard/Americard Number (incl. check digits):	For authors resident in Germany: payment by direct debit: I authorize Springer to debit the amount owed from my bank account at the due time. Account no.:
	Bank code:
Valid until: /	Bank:
Date / Signature:	Date / Signature:
Send receipt to:	Ship offprints to:
R. L. Hammond Department of Ecology and Evolution, Biophore, University of Lausanne, CH 1015, Lausanne, Switzerland	R. L. Hammond Department of Ecology and Evolution, Biophore, University of Lausanne, CH 1015, Lausanne, Switzerland
<u>_</u>	

Metadata of the article that will be visualized in OnlineFirst

1	Article Title	A test of reproductive skew models in a field population of a multiple-queen ant					
2	Journal Name	Behavioral Ecolog	y and Sociobiology				
3		Family Name	Hammond				
4		Particle					
5		Given Name	R. L.				
6		Suffix					
7		Organization	University of Lausanne				
8	Corresponding	Division	Department of Ecology and Evolution, Biophore				
9	Author	Address	Lausanne CH 1015, Switzerland				
10		Organization	Zoological Society of London				
11		Division	Institute of Zoology				
12		Address	Regent's Park, London NW1 4RY, UK				
13		e-mail	Rob.Hammond@unil.ch				
14		Family Name	Bruford				
15		Particle					
16		Given Name	M. W.				
17	A softe a s	Suffix					
18	Author	Organization	Cardiff University				
19		Division	School of Biosciences				
20		Address	Cathays Park, Cardiff CF10 3TL, UK				
21		e-mail					
22		Family Name	Bourke				
23		Particle					
24		Given Name	A. F. G.				
25	A with a m	Suffix					
26	Author	Organization	Zoological Society of London				
27		Division	Institute of Zoology				
28		Address	Regent's Park, London NW1 4RY, UK				
29		e-mail					
30		Received	7 April 2006				
31	Schedule	Revised	16 June 2006				
32		Accepted	6 July 2006				
33	Abstract	Determining the erspective sharing of reprodu- because skew var skew evolution pe based on microsa (<i>n</i> =32.3 eggs per- field population of	volutionary basis of variation in reproductive skew (degree of action among coexisting individuals) is an important task both ies widely across social taxa and because testing models of rmits tests of kin selection theory. Using parentage analyses tellite markers, we measured skew among female eggs colony, range=20–68) in 17 polygynous colonies from a UK the ant <i>Leptothorax acervorum</i> . We used skew among eggs				

		as our principal measure of skew because of the high degree of queen turnover in the study population. Queens within colonies did not make significantly unequal contributions to queen and worker adult or pupal offspring, indicating that skew among female eggs reflected skew among daughter queens. On average, both skew among female eggs (measured by the <i>B</i> index) and queen– queen relatedness proved to be low (means±SE=0.06±0.02 and 0.28±0.08, respectively). However, contrary to current skew models, there was no significant association of skew with either relatedness or worker number (used as a measure of productivity). In <i>L. acervorum</i> , predictions of the concession model of skew may hold between but not within populations because queens are unable to assess their relatedness to other queens within colonies. Additional phenomena that may help maintain low skew in the study population include indiscriminate infanticide in the form of egg cannibalism and split sex ratios that penalize reproductive monopoly by single queens within polygynous colonies.
34	Keywords separated by ' - '	Kin selection - Polygyny - Reproductive skew - Social evolution - Social insect
35	Foot note information	Communicated By K. Ross

A test of reproductive skew models in a field population of a multiple-queen ant

6 R. L. Hammond · M. W. Bruford · A. F. G. Bourke

Received: 7 April 2006 / Revised: 16 June 2006 / Accepted: 6 July 2006
 © Springer-Verlag 2006

Abstract Determining the evolutionary basis of variation 1213 in reproductive skew (degree of sharing of reproduction among coexisting individuals) is an important task both 14because skew varies widely across social taxa and because 1516testing models of skew evolution permits tests of kin 17selection theory. Using parentage analyses based on microsatellite markers, we measured skew among female eggs 18 19(*n*=32.3 eggs per colony, range=20–68) in 17 polygynous colonies from a UK field population of the ant Leptothorax 20acervorum. We used skew among eggs as our principal 2122measure of skew because of the high degree of queen turnover in the study population. Queens within colonies 2324did not make significantly unequal contributions to queen and worker adult or pupal offspring, indicating that skew 25among female eggs reflected skew among daughter 2627queens. On average, both skew among female eggs (measured by the B index) and queen-queen relatedness 2829proved to be low (means \pm SE=0.06 \pm 0.02 and 0.28 \pm 0.08, 30 respectively). However, contrary to current skew models, there was no significant association of skew with either 31

Communicated By K. Ross

R. L. Hammond · A. F. G. Bourke Institute of Zoology, Zoological Society of London, Regent's Park, London NW1 4RY, UK

M. W. Bruford School of Biosciences, Cardiff University, Cathays Park, Cardiff CF10 3TL, UK

R. L. Hammond (⊠) Department of Ecology and Evolution, Biophore, University of Lausanne, CH 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland e-mail: Rob.Hammond@unil.ch relatedness or worker number (used as a measure of 32productivity). In L. acervorum, predictions of the concession 33 model of skew may hold between but not within populations 34because queens are unable to assess their relatedness to other 35queens within colonies. Additional phenomena that may help 36 maintain low skew in the study population include indis-37 criminate infanticide in the form of egg cannibalism and split 38sex ratios that penalize reproductive monopoly by single 39queens within polygynous colonies. 40

KeywordsKin selection · Polygyny · Reproductive skew ·41Social evolution · Social insect42

Introduction

The extent to which coexisting breeding individuals share 44 reproduction varies greatly across animal societies. Societies 45with high reproductive skew are those in which one or a few 46individuals monopolize reproduction; societies with low 47reproductive skew occur when breeders share reproduction 48 more evenly. The extension by Reeve (1991) and Reeve and 49Ratnieks (1993) of the original skew models of Vehrencamp 50(1979, 1983) and Emlen (1982a,b) has led to a wealth of 51new models aimed at explaining skew variation within and 52between species, along with a growing number of empirical 53tests of these models. The importance of these studies arises 54because skew models offer a potential explanation for the 55wide variation in skew observed across animal societies. In 56principle, skew models also provide a means of testing kin 57selection theory (Hamilton 1964), on which they are based. 58

The many skew models now present in the literature 59 differ in both their assumptions and in the predictions they 60 make regarding the expected genetic, ecological, demographic and social correlates of skew (Table 1). Empirical 62

43

t1.1 Table 1 Assumptions of models of reproductive skew and the models' predicted correlations

		Transactional models			Compromise	Synthetic	Results	
t1.2 t1.3		Concession models	Resource inheritance models	Restraint models	Tug-of-war models	model	study	
t1.4	Main assumptions:	1. Dominant controls group membership	1. Dominant controls group membership	1. Dominant controls group membership	1. Limited control by both parties	1. Synthesized assumptions of transactional and compromise models		
t1.5		2. Dominant controls skew	2. Dominant controls skew	2. Subordinate controls skew	2. Gaining share of reproduction is costly			
t1.6			3. Subordinate inherits dominant's resource					
t1.7	Predictions:							
	1. Skew vs	Positive ^{a,b,c}	Positive	Negative	Negative or no	Positive	No	
t1.8	relatedness	or Negative ^{b,c}	or Negative		correlation	or negative	correlation	
t1.9	2. Skew vs degree of ecological constraint	Positive ^{a,b}	_	Negative	No correlation	Positive or negative	Not studied	
	3. Skew vs	Positive ^a	-	Negative	No correlation	Positive	No	
t1.10	per capita productivity					or negative	correlation	
t1.11	4. Relatedness vs group productivity	No correlation ^a	-	No correlation	Positive	-	No correlation	
t1.12	Selected references	Reeve and Ratnieks (1993) ^a ; Cant and Johnstone (1999) ^b ; Johnstone et al. (1999) ^c	Kokko and Johnstone (1999); Ragsdale (1999)	Johnstone and Cant (1999b)	Reeve et al. (1998)	Johnstone (2000)		

t1.13 Superscripts indicate predictions varying depending on detailed assumptions. –, no prediction made or not considered in this study. See also Cant (1998, 2006), Johnstone and Cant (1999a), Cant and Johnstone (2000), Reeve (2000), Reeve and Emlen (2000), Kokko (2003) and Zink and Reeve (2005).

studies of skew in both invertebrates and vertebrates 63 (reviews in: Keller and Reeve 1994; Emlen 1997; Reeve 64and Keller 2001) have tended to lag behind the develop-65 ment of new models. This is because the assumptions of 66 skew models are either not met or are difficult to verify, 67 skew and its predicted correlates are not always simple to 68 measure and different skew models make overlapping 69 predictions (Clutton-Brock 1998; Magrath and Heinsohn 70712000; Table 1). The social Hymenoptera have been 72recognized as a particularly apt group for empirical tests of skew models because skew varies widely even among 73 closely related species, a relatively large number of social 74groups can be sampled and insects lend themselves to 75experimental manipulation. However, conclusions from 76 77 empirical studies have been mixed. Some studies have 78 found support for concession models of reproductive skew (e.g., social wasps: Reeve et al. 2000; Sumner et al. 2002; 79see also Nonacs et al. 2004), some for tug-of-war models 80

(e.g., social wasps: Seppä et al. 2002; social bees: Langer et 81 al. 2004, 2006) and others have found no clear support for 82 any current model (e.g., social wasps: Field et al. 1998; 83 Fanelli et al. 2005; Liebert and Starks 2006; Nonacs et al. 84 2006; ants: Fournier and Keller 2001; Rüppell et al. 2002; 85 Hannonen and Sundström 2003a; Fournier et al. 2004). One 86 reason for these mixed results could be that not all tested 87 species share the same model assumptions (Table 1). 88 Whatever its causes, this situation creates a clear need for 89 additional empirical studies so that the balance of evidence 90 can be properly assessed. 91

The leptothoracine ants represent a group in which an 92 understanding of the factors underlying variation in skew 93 would be especially valuable because some species exhibit 94 multiple-queen societies in which a single queen monopolizes reproduction (i.e., functional monogyny), whereas in 96 other multiple-queen (polygynous) species, reproduction is 97 more evenly distributed among queens (Buschinger 1974; 98 99 Bourke and Heinze 1994). Leptothoracines most closely 100 match the assumptions of concession models of skew (Bourke and Heinze 1994; Rüppell et al. 2002). For 101example, the maintenance of functional monogyny by 102103aggressive dominance (Heinze and Lipski 1990; Heinze and Smith 1990) suggests that complete control of skew by 104105dominants is possible (Table 1). In addition, the presence of subordinates increases the productivity of dominant queens, 106107 although the mechanism underlying this effect is unclear 108 (Heinze and Oberstadt 2003). Consistent with concession models, broad-scale comparisons in leptothoracines (i.e., at 109the between-population and between-species level) suggest 110positive correlations of skew with relatedness (Heinze 111 1995; Heinze et al. 1995b; Bourke et al. 1997) and inferred 112levels of ecological constraint (Bourke and Heinze 1994; 113Felke and Buschinger 1999). In contrast, a comprehensive 114115study of L. rugatulus on skew variation among colonies (which either had been kept in the laboratory for 11 months 116or were artificially composed) found no support for 117concession models (Rüppell et al. 2002). However, to date, 118 no study has examined skew as a function of predicted 119correlates among colonies within a field population of 120121leptothoracines.

122We investigated the covariation of skew, relatedness and productivity within a field population of the facultatively 123124polygynous Leptothorax acervorum. We did not include ecological constraint (Table 1) in our study. This is because it 125is unlikely that L. acervorum queens are able to assess 126127within-population levels of ecological constraint since readopted queens in polygynous colonies almost certainly 128129mate near the nest and, if they disperse following the 130initiation of reproduction, do so on foot (Douwes et al. 1987; Bourke and Heinze 1994; Felke and Buschinger 1999; 131Hammond et al. 2001). Therefore, queens are most likely to 132133 have evolved to adjust their reproductive output in response to the average, population-level degree of ecological con-134straint, which is invariant for queens within a population. 135

136 Methods

137 Field collection and colony sampling

138We studied L. acervorum in Thetford Forest, Norfolk, UK. In this population, approximately 20-50% of colonies are 139140polygynous with a mean of two to five related queens per colony, 95% of which are singly mated (Chan and Bourke 1411994; Heinze et al. 1995a; Bourke et al. 1997; Hammond et 142al. 2001-2003). Sex ratios are split, with monogynous 143colonies producing mainly females and polygynous 144colonies producing mainly males (Chan and Bourke 1451461994; Chan et al. 1999; Hammond et al. 2002). Collections of colonies were made in 1999 ('SD99' colonies) and 2000 147

('SD00' colonies). The SD99 colonies (n=46, collected on 148 June 3 and June 10) are the same as those whose collection 149is described by Hammond et al. (2001) and for which we 150have previously presented genetic analyses of traits other 151than reproductive skew (Hammond et al. 2001-2003). The 152SD00 colonies (n=100, collected between July 27 and 153August 24) came from a site approximately 1 km away. We 154have not previously presented data on the SD00 colonies. 155All SD99 colonies and 39 SD00 colonies were located by 156random searching (the remaining 61 SD00 colonies were 157located by searching in the area defined by a circle of 2-m 158radius centred on each of the focal 39 colonies). Only data 159from the 39 SD00 colonies located by random searching are 160presented in the current paper. After discovery, all colonies 161in both samples were collected using methods described in 162Chan and Bourke (1994). All adults and brood were 163extracted from their twigs within a few days of collection 164and frozen for later genetic analysis. Colony composition 165therefore reflected that found in the field at the time of 166collection. 167

We investigated reproductive skew in a subset of 17 168polygynous colonies (9 SD99 colonies and 8 SD00 169colonies). Polygynous colonies were defined as those 170containing more than one dealate, mated queen (henceforth, 171queens'; dealate queens are those that have shed their 172wings). We determined the insemination status of queens by 173noting the presence of a full or empty sperm receptacle 174upon ovarian dissection (Bourke 1991; Hammond et al. 1752001). We selected 9 polygynous colonies with 2-8 queens 176per colony (mean±SD=3.6±1.8 queens) from the SD99 177 sample (i.e., the 9 polygynous colonies in Table 1 of 178Hammond et al. 2001). In the SD00 sample, 11 of the 39 179focal colonies proved to be polygynous, but we omitted 3 180 of these 11 colonies from our skew analysis. In two of the 181 omitted colonies, parentage analyses could not be con-182ducted because both colonies contained high numbers (16 183and 17) of closely related queens, which therefore shared 184many alleles. Omitting these colonies is unlikely to have 185biased our results since, in the remaining colonies, 186relatedness varied across the whole spectrum of likely 187 values (-0.01-0.89), indicating that the exclusion of these 188two colonies did not truncate variability in relatedness. 189The third SD00 colony was omitted because it contained 190no eggs. In the eight SD00 colonies in which we 191measured skew, there were 2-7 queens per colony 192(mean \pm SD=3.4 \pm 2.0 queens). 193

Molecular methods

We genotyped individuals using the microsatellite loci 195 LXAGT1, LXAGA1, LXAGA2 (Bourke et al. 1997), 196 MYRT3 (Evans 1993), LXGT223 (Hamaguchi et al. 197 1993) and L18 (Foitzik et al. 1997), using methods 198

194

199described by Hammond et al. (2001). In the Thetford Forest 200 population, these loci have a mean expected heterozygosity of 0.88 and a mean of 23 alleles per locus (Hammond et al. 2012022001). In the SD99 colonies, a total of 32 queens and the contents of 29 corresponding sperm receptacles (3 were lost 203204during dissection) were genotyped at a mean of 6.0 loci (range=4-6), as described in Hammond et al. (2001). In the 205SD00 colonies, a total of 27 queens and the contents of 27 206corresponding sperm receptacles were genotyped at a mean 207208 of 3.6 loci (range=2-4). Genotyping of the contents of sperm receptacles had a high failure rate (38% in SD99 209samples and 30% in SD00 samples). In SD99 colonies, as 210described in Hammond et al. (2001), we also typed a per 211colony mean of 12.8 adult workers ('old workers', 212range=0-15), 13.9 callow workers or worker pupae ('new 213workers', range=0-19), 10.3 adult males (range=0-19) and 2142156.7 alate (winged) queens or queen pupae ('new queens', range=0-21) at a mean of 6.0 loci. Finally, across both sets 216of colonies, we genotyped a mean of 42.6 eggs per colony 217at a mean of 2.0 loci (range=1-4). These consisted of a 218219mean (range) of 54.9 (36-89) eggs from the SD99 colonies 220(the samples described in Hammond et al. (2003) plus a 221few additional SD99 eggs) and a mean (range) of 28.8 (20-38) eggs from the SD00 colonies. Eggs were genotyped 222 223at loci found to be diagnostic for parentage analyses on the 224basis of the genotypes of queens and the queens' mates (the genotypes of the queens' mates being deduced from 225those of the contents of the sperm receptacles or those of 226227 female progeny). Within colonies, we attributed female (diploid) eggs to one of the queens using exclusion criteria. 228The high degree of genetic variation per locus, together with 229the absence of relatedness between L. acervorum queens 230and their mates and between mates of coexisting queens 231(Hammond et al. 2001), meant that almost all eggs could be 232233assigned to individual queens (see 'Parentage analysis' under 'Results'). 234

235 Relatedness

236We estimated regression relatedness among coexisting queens in the SD00 colonies and, for the SD99 colonies, 237238used relatedness values calculated previously (Hammond et al. 2001-2003). In the SD00 colonies, we calculated 239Queller and Goodnight's (1989) regression relatedness 240241from genotype data with the program RELATEDNESS 5.07 (Goodnight Software: http://www.gsoft.smu.edu/ 242Gsoft.html). 243

244 Colony productivity

In both the SD99 and SD00 colonies, we used the number
of adult workers as a surrogate measure of colony
productivity. This was justified because, based on previous

254

285

data from polygynous colonies in the study population in 248 Chan et al. (1999), we found colony sexual production 249 (measured as biomass of either new queens, or males or 250 new queens and males combined) to be highly correlated 251 with number of adult workers (all Pearson's r>0.47, all 252 n=30, all P<0.009). 253

Queen turnover

Previous work has shown that polygynous colonies of 255L. acervorum in the study population have a high rate of 256queen turnover, with large proportions of old workers, new 257queens and males being unattributable to resident queens 258(Bourke et al. 1997; Hammond et al. 2001). In the present 259study, we estimated the degree of queen turnover in SD99 260colonies only since no adults or pupae were genotyped in 261SD00 colonies. We estimated the genetically effective 262 turnover of queens (t) across pairs of female age cohorts 263using Eq. 4 in Pedersen and Boomsma (1999). This defines 264100% turnover as occurring when all queens contribute to 265one cohort only and 0% turnover as occurring when all 266queens contribute to both cohorts. The variables used in the 267estimation of t are the relatednesses within and between the 268two age cohorts being compared. We measured related-269nesses within and between female eggs, new workers, old 270workers and new queens. Relatednesses were averaged 271across colonies for the estimation of population-level 272turnover. Since L. acervorum workers overwinter once as 273larvae, whereas queens usually overwinter twice 274(Buschinger 1973), we assumed that, relative to eggs, new 275workers were 0-1 years older, old workers were >1 year 276older and new queens were 2 years older. These relative 277ages are approximate because some workers may be close 278in the year that they were laid as eggs, the longevity of 279adult workers in unknown, and some queens may overwin-280ter as larvae only once. Nonetheless, comparing relatedness 281within and between female eggs and these cohorts allowed 282us to estimate queen turnover across an ever-increasing age 283interval. 284

Reproductive skew

The likely occurrence of high queen turnover meant that 286reproductive skew could not easily be calculated from the 287genotypes of adult or pupal progeny. We therefore 288measured skew in samples of female eggs (SD99 colonies: 289mean=44.8 female eggs per colony, range=28-77; SD00 290colonies: mean=25.0 female eggs per colony, range=20-33). 291This assumed that individual queens within colonies did 292 not differ in the queen-to-worker ratio among their 293progeny (we consider other assumptions in 'Discussion'). 294We were able to test this assumption by comparing the 295proportion of either caste attributable to each queen in four 296

297SD99 colonies with sufficient numbers of new workers and 298new queens. In one of these colonies (SD99.54), we included as a maternal queen an individual that was not present at 299collection but whose existence could be inferred from the 300 genotypes of her daughters, i.e., a 'lost' queen (Hammond et 301 302 al. 2003). In each colony, a minority of new workers and 303 new queens could be not be assigned to either resident or lost queens. We therefore grouped these progeny into a 304 305 'queen unknown' parentage class.

306 We did not investigate reproductive skew among male eggs for two reasons. First, the sample sizes for male eggs 307 in each colony were small because in L. acervorum, only a 308 309 small minority of eggs laid by queens (16%) are male and workers lay very few male eggs (Hammond et al. 2002, 310 2003). Second, parentage assignment of males, being 311 312haploid, was much more difficult than for females because 313queens often shared a high proportion of alleles (frequently, it was the paternal alleles in females that allowed parentage 314assignment). However, in five SD99 colonies, the sample 315size of adult, queen-produced males was large enough and 316parentage assignment was possible. In these colonies, we 317318 investigated whether reproductive skew differed between 319 sexes of progeny by comparing the proportion of adult males and new workers attributable to each queen within 320321 the colonies. We did not compare adult males and new 322queens because such a comparison would have been confounded by year since usually queens take 2 years to 323 develop, whereas workers and males take only 1 year 324325 (Buschinger 1973). As in our comparison of skew between castes, progeny that could not be assigned to either resident 326 or lost queens were grouped into a 'queen unknown' 327 328 parentage class.

We used Nonacs's B index (Nonacs 2000, 2003) to 329 quantify skew in female eggs. Using the program SKEW 330 331 CALCULATOR 2003 (Nonacs 2003), we calculated B, the 95% confidence limits of *B* (using 10,000 randomizations) 332 and, given the queen number in each colony, the maximum 333334 (where only one queen reproduces in each colony) and 335 minimum (where all queens reproduce equally) possible values of B. To control for the maximum and minimum 336values of B varying across colonies (P. Nonacs, personal 337 338 communication), we also calculated an adjusted B index 339 (B_{adi}) . We calculated this as the absolute difference between 340 the observed and minimum B values divided by the 341 absolute difference between the maximum and minimum 342 B values.

343 Statistical methods

344 Queen-queen relatedness ('relatedness'), colony size 345 ('worker number', i.e., number of old workers), reproduc-346 tive skew (as measured by *B* or B_{adj}) and the number of 347 queens per colony ('queen number') were all normally distributed (Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests, all P>0.05). There 348 was no significance difference in any variable across 349 sampling years (SD99 vs SD00: all $t_{15} < 1.07$, all P > 0.30), 350so data were pooled across years for further analyses. We 351tested relationships predicted by the skew models (Table 1) 352 in two general linear models (GLM). First, in 'skew GLM', 353 we tested whether skew (B or B_{adj}) varied with relatedness, 354queen number and worker number (as a measure of 355productivity). We also tested whether skew varied with 356productivity per queen by testing in these analyses for an 357 interaction between queen and worker number. Second, in 358 'productivity GLM', we tested whether worker number 359varied with relatedness. In addition, in 'queen number 360 GLM', we tested whether relatedness varied with queen 361 number. All GLM analyses were carried out with SPSS 362 (version 12.0.0). To compare skew between castes (new 363 queens vs new workers) and sexes (males vs new workers), 364 we used exact tests calculated by the program $R \times C$ [Miller 365 MP (1997) $R \times C$: a program for the analysis of contingency 366 tables, 1.0 edn. Department of Biological Sciences, North-367 ern Arizona University, Flagstaff]. Where multiple tests 368 were performed on the same data, we applied sequential 369 Bonferroni correction (Rice 1989). 370

Results

Relatedness and queen turnover 372

Average queen-queen relatedness (mean±SE) was 373 0.28 ± 0.08 (n=59 queens from 17 colonies). The genetical 374effective turnover of queens (t) was 50.3% (comparing 375eggs vs new workers, n=8 colonies), 43% (comparing eggs 376 vs old workers, n=8 colonies) and 67.2% (comparing eggs 377 vs new queens, n=5 colonies). Therefore, queen turnover 378 was substantial and, as expected, showed evidence of rising 379 as the age interval between cohorts increased (with the 380 reversal of values between eggs vs new workers and eggs 381 vs old workers, relative to those expected, presumably 382 stemming from high overlap between the ages of new and 383 old workers and from sampling error in the underlying 384relatedness estimates). These results, coupled with the 385complementary finding that a mean of 27% of new 386 workers, new queens and old workers were not assignable 387 to resident queens (see below) and with previous findings 388from the same population (Bourke et al. 1997), provided 389 support for measuring skew among eggs in this study. 390

Parentage analysis

We could successfully attribute 91% (550 out of a total 392 n=603) of all female eggs to individual resident queens. 393 The remaining 9% were either not attributable to any 394

391

371

395 resident collected gueen (8%) or were equally likely to be the offspring of two or more resident queens (1%). Almost 396 half of the eggs that were unattributable to resident queens 397 were found in two colonies (SD99.74 and SD99.96); 398 399 omitting these raised the proportion of successfully assigned eggs to 95%. In our analysis of skew (see below), 400401 we ignored the small fraction of unattributed eggs and analyzed skew in the large majority of eggs whose 402 403 maternity we could deduce. Furthermore, we included all 404 colonies since the omission of the two colonies with the highest proportions of unattributable eggs did not alter the 405results. Compared to female eggs, a lower proportion of 406 407 adult males (82%), new queens (64%), new workers (69%) and old workers (85%) could be attributed to resident 408 409queens.

410 Variation in skew as measured across castes and sexes

411 There were no significant differences between the proportion of new queens and new workers attributable to each 412 resident queen in all four SD99 colonies where compar-413isons were possible (Table 2), supporting our assumption 414 415that skew in female eggs provides an accurate estimate of reproductive skew in new queens. However, there were 416significant differences between the proportion of males and 417 418 new workers attributable to each resident queen in all five 419SD99 colonies where comparisons were possible (Table 3). Queens coexisting within the same colony therefore 420 421 differed in their relative success at producing male and female offspring, with some concentrating on male produc-422 423 tion and others on female production.

424 Average reproductive skew

425 Reproduction was relatively equitably distributed among 426 queens, with only 4 of 59 resident queens (6.8%) failing to 427 contribute any female eggs (Fig. 1). The highest proportion of eggs contributed by a single queen was 69.2% in a 428colony with 3 queens (colony SD00.129; Fig. 1). Average 429skew across colonies was low, with the overall mean $(\pm SE)$ 430of B equalling 0.06±0.02 and of B_{adj} equalling 0.12±0.03 431(Fig. 2). The mean level of B (randomization test, 432 P < 0.0001) and skew in 5 of 17 colonies (randomization 433test, P < 0.004, corresponding to an overall alpha of 0.05) 434was significantly greater than that expected by chance 435(Fig. 2). However, even in the 5 colonies with significant 436 skew, skew estimates were nearer their minimum than their 437 maximum level (Fig. 2). 438

Relationship of reproductive skew with relatedness, worker 439 number and queen number 440

We found no significant relationship of skew with 441relatedness, queen number or worker number (skew GLM, 442 B: $F_{4,12}=0.99$, P=0.45; B_{adj} : $F_{4,12}=0.73$, P=0.59; Fig. 3). 443There was also no significant interaction between queen 444 number and worker number (B: $F_{1,12}=2.91$, P=0.11; B_{adj} : 445 $F_{1,12}=2.52$, P=0.14). Bivariate linear regressions showed 446 that our analyses had relatively high power because the 447 standard deviations of the relevant regression coefficients 448 were small (B vs relatedness: $b\pm SD = -0.03\pm 0.06$, 449 $F_{1,15}=0.18$, $r^2=0\%$, P=0.67; B vs queen number: 450 $b\pm$ SD=0.01±0.01, $F_{1,15}$ =0.96, r^2 =0%, P=0.34; B vs worker 451number: $b\pm$ SD=0.00±0.00, $F_{1.15}$ =0.08, r^2 =0%, P=0.79; B452vs worker number per queen: $b\pm$ SD=0.00±0.00, $F_{1.15}$ =0.21, 453 $r^2=0\%$, P=0.65; B_{adj} vs relatedness: $b\pm SD=-0.03\pm 0.09$, 454 $F_{1.15}=0.12$, $r^2=1\%$, P=0.74; B_{adj} vs queen number: 455 $b\pm$ SD=0.00±0.02, $F_{1,15}$ =0.68, r^2 =1%, P=0.80; B_{adj} vs 456worker number: $b\pm$ SD=0.00±0.00, $F_{1,15}$ =0.01, r^2 =0%, 457P=0.95; B_{adi} vs worker number per queen: $b\pm SD=$ 458 $0.00\pm0.00, F_{1.15}=0.09, r^2=1\%, P=0.77$). We also found that 459relatedness did not vary significantly with worker number 460(productivity GLM: $F_{1,15}=0.04$, P=0.84) or queen number 461(queen number GLM: $F_{1,15}=0.01$, P=0.91). 462

t2.1 Table 2 Number of new queens and new workers attributable to individual queens in four polygynous L. acervorum colonies

t2.2	Colony		А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	U	Totals	P value
t2.3	SD99.53	New queens	0	2	7	2	_	_	_	_	4	15	0.630
t2.4		New workers	0	1	4	3	_	_	_	_	7	15	
t2.5	SD99.54	New queens	0	2	0	10	_	_	_	_	9	21	0.247
t2.6		New workers	1	3	0	4	_	_	_	_	11	19	
t2.7	SD99.55	New queens	2	4	4	_	_	_	_	_	5	15	0.681
t2.8		New workers	3	5	5	_	_	_	_	_	2	15	
t2.9	SD99.94	New queens	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	5	0.196
t2.10		New workers	1	2	2	3	1	2	0	1	3	15	

t2.11 Individual queens (differing across colonies) are labelled A, B, C, etc. The final column (U) in each sequence per colony includes progeny of unknown parentage (i.e., progeny that could not be attributed to any queen within the colony). The queens in SD99.54 also include one 'lost' queen whose presence was inferred from progeny genotypes (see 'Reproductive skew' under 'Methods'). *P* value is from exact probability tests of the null hypothesis that, within colonies, individual queens do not differ in the ratio of new workers and new queens produced.

Behav Ecol Sociobiol

t3.1	Table 3	Number of males	and new wo	rkers attributable	to individual	queens in	n five polygy	nous L. a	<i>icervorum</i> colonies
------	---------	-----------------	------------	--------------------	---------------	-----------	---------------	-----------	---------------------------

Colony		А	В	С	D	Е	U	Totals	P value
SD99.55	Males	0	9	0	_	_	6	15	0.008
	New workers	3	5	5	-	-	2	15	
SD99.61	Males	0	7	_	-	-	9	16	0.005
	New workers	0	14	_	-	-	1	15	
SD99.64	Males	10	0	2	-	-	2	14	< 0.0001
	New workers	0	7	8	-	-	8	23	
SD99.74	Males	0	0	0	1	6	0	7	< 0.0001
)	New workers	1	1	1	4	0	8	15	
1 SD99.78	Males	0	0	17	-	-	0	17	< 0.0001
2	New workers	2	8	4	_	_	1	15	

t3.13 Individual queens (differing across colonies) are labelled A, B, C, etc. The final column (U) in each sequence per colony includes progeny of unknown parentage (i.e., progeny that could not be attributed to any queen within the colony). The queens in SD99.64 and SD99.74 also each include one 'lost' queen whose presence was inferred from progeny genotypes (see 'Reproductive skew' under 'Methods'). *P* value is from exact probability tests of the null hypothesis that, within colonies, individual queens do not differ in the ratio of males and new workers produced. All *P* values are also significant after sequential Bonferroni correction.

463 **Discussion**

Using parentage analyses based on microsatellite markers, we measured skew among female eggs in a sample of 17 polygynous colonies taken from a field population of the ant *L. acervorum*. Skew tended to be low, consistent with previous data showing that nearly all queens participate in egg laying (Bourke 1991) and that the maternity of new queens is shared (Bourke et al. 1997). However, despite



Fig. 1 Relative proportions of female eggs produced by queens within 17 polygynous *Leptothorax acervorum* colonies. Alternating *black* and *white* segments of each bar represent the proportion of female eggs attributable to different queens within a given colony. *Numbers above bars* equal the number of female eggs per colony that were successfully attributed to resident queens (total n=550)

wide variation in queen-queen relatedness, we found no471significant association of skew with relatedness. We also472found no significant association of skew with productivity473(as measured by worker number) or per capita productivity.474



Fig. 2 Reproductive skew, as estimated by the *B* index among female eggs, in 17 polygynous *L. acervorum* colonies. For each colony, *upper horizontal bar* ('—') denotes the maximum value of *B* (i.e., value if one queen monopolizes all reproduction), given the observed number of queens in the colony; *upper* '×' denotes the upper 95% confidence limit of *B*, based on 10,000 randomizations; *filled circle* denotes observed *B*; *lower* '×' denotes lower 95% confidence limit of *B*, based on 10,000 randomizations; *filled circle* denotes the minimum value of *B* (i.e., value if all queens share reproduction equally), given the observed number of queens in the colony. Following Bonferroni correction, skew was significantly greater than expected by chance in five colonies (SD99.54, SD99.55, SD99.94, SD00.126 and SD00.129) and marginally greater than expected by chance in a sixth colony (SD00.143)



Fig. 3 Variation in reproductive skew, as estimated by the *B* index among female eggs, in 17 polygynous *L. acervorum* colonies as a function of queen–queen relatedness within colonies (*upper figure*), queen number (*middle figure*) and number of old (adult) workers (representing a measure of productivity; *lower figure*)

These findings were contrary to the predictions of the 475476 concession model of reproductive skew (Table 1). Furthermore, contrary to the prediction of the tug-of-war model 477(Table 1), we found no significant association of relatedness 478479and productivity (as measured by worker number). The 480 absence of a significant association between relatedness and queen number was consistent with our previous findings 481from an overlapping data set (Hammond et al. 2001). 482 483 Overall, our results failed to match any single current skew model predicting an association of skew with the variables484that we investigated (Table 1). In this, our results are485consistent with the majority of similar, within-population486studies of the expected correlates of skew in other social487Hymenoptera, especially ants (see 'Introduction').488

Our principal measure of reproductive skew was the 489degree to which coexisting queens shared the parentage of 490female (diploid) eggs. We selected this measure because of 491the high turnover among L. acervorum queens in the study 492population (Bourke et al. 1997; present study), which 493meant that offspring sampled as adults would no longer 494have been assignable to resident queens. This measure of 495skew assumed that egg-to-adult survival of female eggs 496does not vary with parentage, that queens do not differ in 497the chances of their female eggs developing into adult 498queens or workers and that skew among female progeny 499matches skew among male progeny. The first of these 500 assumptions is plausible because, although differential 501mortality stemming from nepotism has been found in the 502polygynous ant Formica fusca (Hannonen and Sundström 5032003b), L. acervorum queens, although known to eat eggs, 504do not discriminate eggs by their maternal origin (Bourke 5051994). Likewise, as regards the second assumption, 506although coexisting queens have been shown to differ in 507their relative contributions to worker and queen progeny in 508some polygynous ant species (Ross 1988; Pamilo and 509Seppä 1994), in the present study, we found that L. 510acervorum queens contributed similar shares to worker 511and queen progeny (see also Rüppell et al. 2002). This 512finding is consistent with queen-worker caste fate being 513environmentally determined in Leptothorax (Wesson 1940). 514It also suggests that the workers' biasing of caste fate that 515we have previously described in L. acervorum (Hammond 516et al. 2002) is exercised randomly with respect to female 517parentage. Contrary to our third assumption, we found that 518coexisting L. acervorum queens exhibited significant 519variation in their relative contributions to female and male 520progeny (cf. Fournier and Keller 2001). In general, skew 521among male progeny was higher than among female 522progeny (B=0.56 and 0.15 among males and new workers, 523respectively, and B_{adi}=0.67 and 0.28 among males and new 524workers, respectively; data from five colonies in Table 3), 525from which it follows that skew among sexual progeny as a 526whole would be higher than skew estimated among females 527only. However, this does not necessarily affect our main 528conclusions regarding the lack of association between skew 529and its predicted correlates across colonies. This is because 530it seems unlikely that skew in males would vary as a 531function of variables with which we found skew among 532females to be uncorrelated. 533

Previous evidence suggests that leptothoracine ants 534 exhibit a positive relationship of skew with relatedness at 535 the between-population and between-species level, as the 536

537concession model of skew evolution predicts (see 538'Introduction'). However, within-population studies reveal either no relationship (present study) or a negative 539relationship (Rüppell et al. 2002). Applied within popula-540541tions, skew models assume that coexisting breeders are 542capable of assessing within-group relatedness and adjusting 543their share of reproduction accordingly. At first sight, two pieces of evidence suggest that L. acervorum queens in 544545polygynous colonies could be capable of assessing queen-546queen relatedness. The first is the negative relationship of skew and relatedness in L. rugatulus (Rüppell et al. 2002). 547The second is the existence of worker-controlled sex ratios 548549associated with variation in relative colony-level relatedness asymmetry (relative relatedness to the sexes) in L. 550acervorum and other ant species (Chan and Bourke 1994; 551Sundström 1994; Evans 1995; Sundström et al. 1996), a 552553precondition for which is workers' assessment of relatedness asymmetry. However, in L. rugatulus (but not L. 554acervorum), queens are dimorphic, with small-bodied 555queens (microgynes) producing relatively more sexuals 556than large-bodied queens (macrogynes) (Rüppell et al. 5572002). Furthermore, microgynes tend to be less related 558559than macrogynes (Rüppell et al. 2001). Therefore, unlike L. acervorum queens, L. rugatulus queens may have a 560physical cue (frequency of nestmate microgynes) that 561562covaries with relatedness and, at least partly, predicts nestmates' share of reproduction. As regards workers' 563assessment of relatedness asymmetry, it is likely that such 564565assessment, which occurs on the basis of chemical cues (Boomsma et al. 2003), is an easier chemosensory task than 566567queens' assessment of queen-queen relatedness since it almost certainly requires discriminations on a coarser scale. 568Therefore, it remains possible that L. acervorum queens in 569570polygynous colonies are unable to assess within-colony 571relatedness and that this is why they fail to adjust their levels of skew as a function of relatedness varying within 572573populations.

574Not only processes in the concession models operating at the population level, other factors may also contribute to 575the maintenance of low skew in the study population of 576577 L. acervorum (and other polygynous ants sharing its biology). One is indiscriminate infanticide in the form of 578indiscriminate egg cannibalism (Bourke 1991, 1994). 579580Coupled with low costs of offspring (egg) production, this is predicted to promote low skew by a model of Johnstone 581582and Cant (1999a). Another is split sex ratios (Chan and Bourke 1994; Chan et al. 1999; Hammond et al. 2002). 583These could interact with skew evolution to reward the 584maintenance of low skew in polygynous colonies, given 585586that queens achieving reproductive monopoly within polygynous colonies should lose fitness through their 587 588workers rearing less-valuable daughters from the sexual brood (Bourke 2001; Nonacs 2002). Future work in L. 589

596

605

acervorum and other species should therefore concentrate 590 on (a) further testing of which assumptions of the differing 591 skew models are applicable, (b) greater integration of the 592 differing skew models into a single comprehensive framework (e.g., Johnstone 2000) and (c) the experimental 594 testing of the models' predictions (e.g., Langer et al. 2004). 595

Acknowledgements We thank Peter Nonacs, Seirian Sumner and an 597 anonymous referee for helpful comments and advice. The Forestry 598Commission kindly granted permission to collect samples. This work 599was supported by a grant (GR3/11792) from the UK Natural 600 Environment Research Council to AFGB and MWB. Rob Hammond 601 602 was supported by Swiss National Science Foundation grants awarded 603 to Laurent Keller while this paper was written. The work in this paper complies with current UK law. 604

References

Boomsma JJ, Nielsen J, Sundström L, Oldham NJ, Tentschert J, 606 Petersen HC, Morgan ED (2003) Informational constraints on 607 optimal sex allocation in ants. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 608 100:8799-8804 609 Bourke AFG (1991) Queen behaviour, reproduction and egg canni-610 balism in multiple-queen colonies of the ant Leptothorax 611 acervorum. Anim Behav 42:295-310 612 Bourke AFG (1994) Indiscriminate egg cannibalism and reproductive 613 skew in a multiple-queen ant. Proc R Soc Lond B 255:55-59 614 Bourke AFG (2001) Reproductive skew and split sex ratios in social 615Hymenoptera. Evolution 55:2131-2136 616 Bourke AFG, Heinze J (1994) The ecology of communal breeding: 617the case of multiple-queen leptothoracine ants. Philos Trans R 618 619 Soc Lond B 345:359–372 Bourke AFG, Green HAA, Bruford MW (1997) Parentage, reproduc-620 tive skew and queen turnover in a multiple-queen ant analysed 621 with microsatellites. Proc R Soc Lond B 264:277-283 622 Buschinger A (1973) The role of daily temperature rhythms in brood 623 development of ants of the tribe Leptothoracini (Hymenoptera; 624 Formicidae). In: Wieser W (ed) Effects of temperature on ectother-625mic organisms. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York, pp 229-232 626 Buschinger A (1974) Monogynie und Polygynie in Insektensozietäten. 627 In: Schmidt GH (ed) Sozialpolymorphismus bei Insekten. 628 Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft, Stuttgart, pp 862-896 629 Cant MA (1998) A model for the evolution of reproductive skew 630 without reproductive suppression. Anim Behav 55:163-169 631 Cant MA (2006) A tale of two theories: parent-offspring conflict and 632 reproductive skew. Anim Behav 71:255-263 633 Cant MA, Johnstone RA (1999) Costly young and reproductive skew 634in animal societies. Behav Ecol 10:178-184 635 Cant MA, Johnstone RA (2000) Power struggles, dominance testing, 636 and reproductive skew. Am Nat 155:406-417 637 Chan GL, Bourke AFG (1994) Split sex ratios in a multiple-queen ant 638 population. Proc R Soc Lond B 258:261-266 639 Chan GL, Hingle A, Bourke AFG (1999) Sex allocation in a 640 facultatively polygynous ant: between-population and between-641colony variation. Behav Ecol 10:409-421 642 Clutton-Brock TH (1998) Reproductive skew, concessions and limited 643 control. Trends Ecol Evol 13:288-292 644Douwes P, Sivusaari L, Niklasson M, Stille B (1987) Relatedness 645 among queens in polygynous nests of the ant Leptothorax 646 acervorum. Genetica 75:23-29 647 Emlen ST (1982a) The evolution of helping. I. An ecological 648 constraints model. Am Nat 119:29-39 649

behavioral	Johnstone RA, Cant MA (1999a) Reproductive skew and indiscrim- inate infanticide. Anim Behav 57:243–249	
brates In	Inductional Induction Inductive Stew and the	
olutionary	threat of eviction: a new perspective. Proc R Soc Lond B 266:275–279	
ng simple	Johnstone RA, Woodroffe R, Cant MA, Wright J (1999) Reproductive skew in multimember groups Am Nat 153:315–331	
of female	Keller L, Reeve HK (1994) Partitioning of reproduction in animal	
noensis, as	societies. Trends Ecol Evol 9:98–102	
Acad Sci	Kokko H (2003) Are reproductive skew models evolutionarily stable? Proc R Soc Lond B 270:265–270	
ctive strat-	Kokko H, Johnstone RA (1999) Social queuing in animal societies: a	
8:190–199	dynamic model of reproductive skew. Proc R Soc Lond B	
productive	266:571–578	
nenoptera, ral Spain	tion in a social bee Nature 428.844 847	
iai Spaill.	Langer P. Hogendoorn K. Schwarz MP. Keller I. (2006) Reproductive	
Social and	skew in the Australian allodapine bee Exoneura robusta. Anim	
ns: tests of	Behav 71:193–201	
	Liebert AE, Starks PT (2006) Taming of the skew: transactional	
quency of	models fail to predict reproductive partitioning in the paper wasp	
crosatellite	Polistes dominulus. Anim Behav 71:913–923	
on amona	Magrath RD, Heinsohn RG (2000) Reproductive skew in birds:	
im Behav	Nonacs P (2000) Measuring and using skew in the study of social	
uni Denav	behavior and evolution. Am Nat 156:577–589	
ve skew in	Nonacs P (2002) Sex ratios and skew models: the special case of	
Mol Ecol	evolution of cooperation in polistine wasps. Am Nat 160:103-118	
_	Nonacs P (2003) Measuring the reliability of skew indices: is there	
ide repeat	one best index? Anim Behav 65:615–627	
nosior and	Nonacs P, Reeve HK, Starks PT (2004) Optimal reproductive-skew	
enschaften	models fail to predict aggression in wasps. Proc R Soc Lond B	
viour I II	2/1.011-01/ Nonacs P. Liebert A.F. Starks PT (2006) Transactional skew and assured	
viou 1, 11.	fitness return models fail to predict patterns of cooperation in	
frequency	wasps. Am Nat 167:467–480	
ax acervo-	Pamilo P, Seppä P (1994) Reproductive competition and conflicts	
	in colonies of the ant Formica sanguinea. Anim Behav 48:	
t workers	1201–1206	
elopment.	Pedersen JS, Boomsma JJ (1999) Effect of habitat saturation on the	
narontago	number and turnover of queens in the polygynous ant, Myrmica sulcinodic, I Evol Biol 12:002, 017	
paremage	Oueller DC Goodnight KF (1989) Estimating relatedness using	
Yacon unt.	genetic markers. Evolution 43:258–275	
ng among	Ragsdale JE (1999) Reproductive skew theory extended: the effect of	
875	resource inheritance on social organization. Evol Ecol Res	
m among	1:859-874	
	Reeve HK (1991) Polistes. In: Ross KG, Matthews RW (eds) The	
edness in	social biology of wasps. Comstock Publishing Associates, Ithaca,	
nies of the	pp $yy-14\delta$ Reeve HK (2000) Δ transactional theory of within group conflict Δm	
nes of the	Nat 155:365–382	
	Reeve HK, Emlen ST (2000) Reproductive skew and group size: an	
ographical	N-person staying incentive model. Behav Ecol 11:640–647	
the ant,	Reeve HK, Keller L (2001) Tests of reproductive-skew models in	
	social insects. Annu Rev Entomol 46:347-385	
b) Colony	Reeve HK, Ratnieks FLW (1993) Queen-queen conflicts in polygynous	
cervorum.	societies: mutual tolerance and reproductive skew. In: Keller L (ed)	
ata anazza	Queen number and sociality in insects. Oxford University Press,	
ate queens	UXIOIU, pp 43-83 Reeve HK Emlen ST Keller I (1998) Reproductive sharing in animal	
ensenanten	societies: reproductive incentives or incomplete control by	
inctionally	dominant breeders? Behav Ecol 9:267–278	
	Reeve HK, Starks PT, Peters JM, Nonacs P (2000) Genetic support for	
eview and	the evolutionary theory of reproductive transactions in social	
	wasps. Proc R Soc Lond B 267:75-79	

650	Emlen ST (1982b) The evolution of helping. II. The role of behaviora
651	conflict. Am Nat 119:40-53
652	Emlen ST (1997) Predicting family dynamics in social vertebrates. Ir
653	Krebs JR, Davies NB (eds) Behavioural ecology: an evolutionar
654	approach. Blackwell, Oxford, pp 228-253
655	Evans JD (1993) Parentage analyses in ant colonies using simpl
656	sequence repeat loci. Mol Ecol 2:393-397
657	Evans JD (1995) Relatedness threshold for the production of femal
658	sexuals in colonies of a polygynous ant, Myrmica tahoensis, a
659	revealed by microsatellite DNA analysis. Proc Natl Acad So
660	USA 92:6514–6517
661	Fanelli D, Boomsma JJ, Turillazzi S (2005) Multiple reproductive strat
662	egies in a tropical hover wasp. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 58:190-19
663	Felke M, Buschinger A (1999) Social organization, reproductiv

- behavior and ecology of Leptothorax acervorum (Hymenoptera,
 Formicidae) from the Sierra de Albarracin in central Spain.
 Insectes Soc 46:84–91
- Field J, Solís CR, Queller DC, Strassmann JE (1998) Social and
 genetic structure of paper wasp cofoundress associations: tests of
 reproductive skew models. Am Nat 151:545–563
- Foitzik S, Haberl M, Gadau J, Heinze J (1997) Mating frequency of
 Leptothorax nylanderi ant queens determined by microsatellite
 analysis. Insectes Soc 44:219–227
- Fournier D, Keller L (2001) Partitioning of reproduction among
 queens in the Argentine ant, Linepithema humile. Anim Behav
 62:1039–1045
- Fournier D, Aron S, Keller L (2004) Significant reproductive skew in
 the facultatively polygynous ant Pheidole pallidula. Mol Ecol
 13:203-210
- Hamaguchi K, Itô Y, Takenaka O (1993) GT dinucleotide repeat
 polymorphisms in a polygynous ant, Leptothorax spinosior and
 their use for measurement of relatedness. Naturwissenschaften
 80:179–181
- Hamilton WD (1964) The genetical evolution of social behaviour I, II.
 J Theor Biol 7:1–52
- Hammond RL, Bourke AFG, Bruford MW (2001) Mating frequency
 and mating system of the polygynous ant, Leptothorax acervo rum. Mol Ecol 10:2719–2728
- Hammond RL, Bruford MW, Bourke AFG (2002) Ant workers
 selfishly bias sex ratios by manipulating female development.
 Proc R Soc Lond B 269:173–178
- Hammond RL, Bruford MW, Bourke AFG (2003) Male parentage
 does not vary with colony kin structure in a multiple-queen ant.
 J Evol Biol 16:446–455
- Hannonen M, Sundström L (2003a) Reproductive sharing among
 queens in the ant Formica fusca. Behav Ecol 14:870–875
- Hannonen M, Sundström L (2003b) Worker nepotism amongpolygynous ants. Nature 421:910
- Heinze J (1995) Reproductive skew and genetic relatedness in
 Leptothorax ants. Proc R Soc Lond B 261:375–379
- Heinze J, Lipski N (1990) Fighting and usurpation in colonies of the
 palaearctic ant Leptothorax gredleri. Naturwissenschaften
 77:493–495
- Heinze J, Lipski N, Hölldobler B, Bourke AFG (1995a) Geographical
 variation in the social and genetic structure of the ant,
 Leptothorax acervorum. Zoology 98:127–135
- Heinze J, Lipski N, Schlehmeyer K, Hölldobler B (1995b) Colony
 structure and reproduction in the ant, Leptothorax acervorum.
 Behav Ecol 6:359–367
- Heinze J, Oberstadt B (2003) Costs and benefits of subordinate queens
 in colonies of the ant, Leptothorax gredleri. Naturwissenschaften
 90:513-516
- Heinze J, Smith TA (1990) Dominance and fertility in a functionally
 monogynous ant. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 27:1–10
- 714Johnstone RA (2000) Models of reproductive skew: a review and715synthesis. Ethology 106:5–26

- Rice WR (1989) Analyzing tables of statistical tests. Evolution43:223-225
- Ross KG (1988) Differential reproduction in multiple-queen colonies
 of the fire ant Solenopsis invicta (Hymenoptera: Formicidae).
 Behav Ecol Sociobiol 23:341–355
- Rüppell O, Heinze J, Hölldobler B (2001) Alternative reproductive
 tactics in the queen-size-dimorphic ant Leptothorax rugatulus
 (Emery) and their consequences for genetic population structure.
 Behav Ecol Sociobiol 50:189–197
- Rüppell O, Heinze J, Hölldobler B (2002) Intracolonial patterns of
 reproduction in the queen-size dimorphic ant Leptothorax
 rugatulus. Behav Ecol 13:239–247
- Seppä P, Queller DC, Strassmann JE (2002) Reproduction in
 foundress associations of the social wasp, Polistes carolina:
 conventions, competition, and skew. Behav Ecol 13:531–542
- Sumner S, Casiraghi M, Foster W, Field J (2002) High reproductive
 skew in tropical hover wasps. Proc R Soc Lond B 269:179–186

- Sundström L (1994) Sex ratio bias, relatedness asymmetry and queen mating frequency in ants. Nature 367:266–268 800
- Sundström L, Chapuisat M, Keller L (1996) Conditional manipulation
 801

 of sex ratios by ant workers: a test of kin selection theory.
 802

 Science 274:993–995
 803
- Vehrencamp SL (1979) The roles of individual, kin, and group 804
 selection in the evolution of sociality. In: Marler P, 805
 Vandenbergh JG (eds) Handbook of behavioral neurobiology. 806
 vol. 3. Social behavior and communication. Plenum, New York, 807
 pp 351–394
- Vehrencamp SL (1983) Optimal degree of skew in cooperative 809 societies. Am Zool 23:327–335 810
- Wesson LG (1940) An experimental study on caste determination in 811 ants. Psyche 47:105–111 812
- Zink AG, Reeve HK (2005) Predicting the temporal dynamics of reproductive skew and group membership in communal breeders. Behav Ecol 16:880–888

hover wasps. Proc R Soc Lond B 269:179–186



AUTHOR QUERY FORM

Dear Author,

During the preparation of your manuscript for typesetting, some questions have arisen. These are listed below. Please check your typeset proof carefully and mark any corrections in the margin of the proof or compile them as a separate list.

Queries and/or remarks

Location in Article	Query / remark
	No query.

Thank you for your assistance