**Evolutionary biology**

# An experimental test of the role of male mating history on paternal effects in the livebearer fish *Gambusia holbrooki*

Upama Aich, Michael D. Jennions and Rebecca J. Fox

Division of Ecology and Evolution, Research School of Biology, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory 2600, Australia

UA, 0000-0003-2576-0922; MDJ, 0000-0001-9221-2788; RJF, 0000-0003-3442-4189

Studies often show that paternal age affects offspring fitness. However, such effects could be due either to age, or to a male's previous mating effort (which is necessarily confounded with age). We experimentally tested whether differences in the mating history of old males affect offspring performance in the mosquitofish *Gambusia holbrooki*. Upon maturation, males were housed for a duration of the natural field-breeding season (23 weeks) either with mating access to females (lifetime-mating), or with visual but no physical access to females (no-mating). We then paired these males with a female to test whether male mating history had a significant effect on their mate's breeding success or offspring performance. The daughters, but not the sons, of 'no-mating' treatment males matured significantly sooner, and at a significantly smaller size, than those of 'lifetime-mating' treatment males. There was, however, no effect of male mating history on their daughters' initial fecundity, or on proxy measures of their sons' reproductive success. These results, when combined with earlier studies showing effects of male mating history on sperm quality, growth and immunity, suggest that variation in paternal effects currently attributed to male age could partly arise because older males have usually mated more often than younger males.

## 1. Introduction

Numerous studies on human and other animals have investigated whether a father's age is associated with offspring performance [1–4]. Special attention has been paid to cases where a relationship cannot be attributable to a reduction in male parental care. In most cases, there is a reported decline in offspring performance with paternal age [1–3]. For example, offspring sired by older males more often have health disorders in humans [5,6], reduced early embryo survival in cabbage beetles [7], slower growth and reduced longevity in mice [8,9], lower fecundity in bulb mites [10] and higher mortality in ungulates [11]. These declines are attributed to offspring inheriting mutations accumulated in the germline of older males [5,12,13], to epigenetic changes, or to substances transferred in ejaculates that alter gene expression in offspring [9,14,15]. Fewer studies have, however, also reported that male age has positive effects on offspring (e.g. mating with older males increases egg hatching success in insects [16,17], and juvenile survival in fruitflies [18,19]). But to what extent does male age, rather than a factor that tends to covary with age, explain the general trend for a negative correlation between male age and offspring fitness?

A key factor that might determine how paternal age affects offspring success is a male's past mating activity [2]. In general, older males are likely to have mated more often than younger males [20,21]. The resources invested to acquire mates, produce sperm and so on, impose energetic and maintenance costs (i.e.

**Figure 1.** Experimental protocol to determine how male mating history affects offspring performance in eastern mosquitofish (*G. holbrooki*). Females are represented by fish with a black gravid spot, and males by fish with an extended anal fin (the gonopodium).

reproductive effort costs) that might lower a male's ability to repair germline DNA [15,22,23, but see 24]. This could lead to age-dependent paternal effects. To determine whether male mating histories actually have causal effects on offspring performance it is necessary to conduct experiments. We need to manipulate male mating history and then test for an effect on offspring performance. To date, few such experiments have been conducted. In most studies, age and mating history are conflated (e.g. observational studies of birds). Here, we therefore focus on testing for a direct effect of male mating history while controlling for male age.

In the eastern mosquitofish (*Gambusia holbrooki*), we controlled for any effect of paternal age by only using old males as sires. We calculated the effect of experimental manipulation of these males' mating history on their subsequent fertility and on components of offspring fitness. Recently-matured males were housed for 23 weeks either with access to females with whom they could mate (lifetime mating treatment), or with only visual access to females (no mating treatment). We then paired old males with a female to test for any effect of male mating history on their mate's fecundity (brood size) and their offspring's reproductive performance (sons' mating potential and daughters' initial fecundity).

## 2. Material and methods

### (a) Origin and maintenance of animals

Juvenile male *G. holbrooki* (n = 144) were collected from the wild. Upon reaching sexual maturity (at approx. 6–8 weeks of age), males were randomly allocated to one of two mating treatments for a period of 23–25 weeks. Half the males were individually housed in 7 l aquaria with a female with whom they could mate freely (lifetime mating treatment). The other half were individually housed in 7 l aquaria with a female behind a mesh

barrier: they had access to visual and olfactory cues from females, but could not mate (no mating treatment; figure 1, also see [21]). For both treatments, females were rotated between tanks weekly to maintain male sexual interest.

### (b) Study design

When males were 24 weeks old they were removed from their individual treatment tank. We then created groups of three males of the same treatment type: 23 lifetime mating and 25 no mating treatment trios. Each trio of males was then introduced into a 7 l aquarium, along with a virgin female. These females were the laboratory-born offspring of wild-caught mothers, reared in the laboratory and held in single-sex groups (40 fish/ 90 l aquaria) from maturity to ensure virginity. We used three rather than one male per female to ensure natural levels of polyandry [25].

### (c) Female reproductive output and offspring growth

After 20 days, the 48 females were transferred to individual 1 l tanks (gestation is longer than 21 days) containing a plastic mesh refuge to protect offspring from matricide. They were checked twice daily and we recorded the date of birth and number of offspring. In total, 19 of 23 females housed with lifetime mating treatment males and 22 of 25 housed with no mating treatment males gave birth. Up to 10 fry per brood were photographed to measure their standard length at birth (n = 251). Offspring from 30 broods (n = 14 lifetime mating; 16 no mating treatment) were then reared individually and re-photographed at 21 days of age (n = 199) to calculate their early growth rate [25]. Not all broods were retained owing to logistic constraints.

### (d) Offspring reproductive performance

To test if paternal mating history, controlling for paternal age, affects offspring reproductive performance, we reared sons and daughters to maturity in their individual 1 l tanks (see electronic

**Table 1.** Parameter estimates and test statistics for the effect of male mating treatment on female reproductive output and offspring traits in eastern mosquitofish (*G. holbrooki*). Mating treatment values are for 'no mating' treatment. Offspring sex values are for sons. Full model outputs are provided in the electronic supplementary material, tables S1 and S2. Italic type indicates significance at the 0.05 level.

| | | | | test statistic | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| trait | predictor | estimate | s.e. | | value | *p* |
| **female fecundity** | | | | | | |
| bred (yes/no) | mating treatment | −0.111 | 0.832 | $\chi^2$ | 0.018 | 0.894 |
| gestation period | mating treatment | −0.010 | 0.059 | $\chi^2$ | 0.029 | 0.864 |
| brood size | mating treatment | 0.156 | 0.192 | $\chi^2$ | 0.656 | 0.418 |
| **offspring traits** | | | | | | |
| size at birth | mating treatment | −0.107 | 0.121 | *F* | 0.784 | 0.382 |
| | sex | 0.118 | 0.088 | *F* | 1.781 | 0.184 |
| | mating treatment × sex | −0.134 | 0.114 | *F* | 1.361 | 0.245 |
| survival to 21 days | mating treatment | 0.179 | 1.167 | $\chi^2$ | 0.023 | 0.878 |
| early growth | mating treatment | 0.001 | 0.024 | *F* | 0.002 | 0.968 |
| | sex | −0.026 | 0.013 | *F* | 4.231 | *0.041* |
| | mating treatment × sex | 0.029 | 0.016 | *F* | 3.073 | 0.082 |
| size at maturity | mating treatment | −1.238 | 0.627 | *F* | 3.881 | 0.057 |
| | sex | −1.744 | 0.470 | *F* | 13.57 | *0.0003* |
| | mating treatment × sex | 1.720 | 0.607 | *F* | 7.921 | *0.005* |
| time to maturity | mating treatment | −0.130 | 0.048 | $\chi^2$ | 7.466 | *0.006* |
| | sex | −0.020 | 0.027 | $\chi^2$ | 0.577 | 0.447 |
| | mating treatment × sex | 0.118 | 0.035 | $\chi^2$ | 11.41 | *0.0007* |
| **daughter traits** | | | | | | |
| egg number | mating treatment | 0.950 | 1.155 | *F* | 0.823 | 0.422 |
| egg size | mating treatment | −0.023 | 0.049 | *F* | 0.212 | 0.650 |
| adult growth rate | mating treatment | 0.005 | 0.010 | *F* | 0.238 | 0.630 |
| **son traits** | | | | | | |
| sperm velocity | mating treatment | −3.161 | 3.797 | *F* | 0.656 | 0.431 |
| sperm count | mating treatment | 25.97 | 146.97 | *F* | 0.030 | 0.866 |
| gonopodium size | mating treatment | −0.004 | 0.008 | *F* | 0.288 | 0.599 |
| mating behaviour | mating treatment | −0.523 | 0.291 | *F* | 3.061 | 0.099 |

supplementary material for details). Each individual was photographed at maturity to measure its standard length and, for males, also their relative gonopodium length (a predictor of male insemination success [26]). At a standardized age of five weeks post-maturity, we measured traits likely to be linked to reproductive success. In the case of daughters ($n = 103$), we counted the number of eggs available for fertilization (i.e. their initial fecundity). We also photographed eggs under a dissecting microscope alongside a reference scale, and measured the diameter of five randomly chosen eggs using ImageJ. The mating potential of sons was estimated in two behavioural assays made five weeks after maturation ($n = 81$). First, we measured attractiveness in two-choice association trials where test females chose between the focal male and a stock male [27]. Second, we measured male mating behaviour (e.g. time near female, number of copulation attempts) when the male freely interacted with the test female for 10 min (see electronic supplementary material). After the mating behaviour measures were recorded, sons were returned to their individual tanks for 7 days to allow sperm

replenishment [27]. Finally, we recorded sperm number and sperm swimming velocity as proxies for the sons' potential to achieve fertilization success under sperm competition (female *G. holbrooki* mate multiply) [21,28]. We make a standard assumption based on results in many species that males with more sperm and faster swimming sperm are more likely to gain paternity when there is sperm competition.

All data were collected blind to male mating treatment. All fish were eventually euthanized in MS222 to comply with Australian legislation prohibiting the release of pest species.

### (e) Statistical analyses

The effect of a male's mating treatment on female reproductive success was evaluated using three response variables: (1) whether or not a female gave birth (yes/no); (2) gestation period and (3) brood size. The effect of male mating treatment on offspring was evaluated using: (4) size at birth; (5) early growth rate; (6) early survival and (7) size at maturity; and for daughters only:

(8) adult growth; (9) fecundity and (10) egg size; and for sons only: (11) 'mating behaviours'; (12) relative gonopodium length (residuals of log–log regression on standard length); (13) sperm velocity and (14) sperm count. 'Mating behaviours' was the first principle component extracted from information on male attractiveness in two choice trials and three mating behaviours (see electronic supplementary material). We also tested for an effect of male mating treatment on the offspring sex ratio.

We ran generalized linear, generalized linear-mixed and linear-mixed effect models in R v. 3.6.0 [29]. In all models, male mating treatment (lifetime mating' or 'no mating') was a fixed effect, and, where relevant, female body size was a covariate. When analysing post-maturation offspring traits, we included offspring size as a covariate and the interaction between male mating treatment and offspring sex. In all models for offspring traits, we included maternal ID as a random factor because we measured several offspring per brood. The electronic supplementary material contains further details about the methods and analyses.

## 3. Results

Summary statistics and model parameter estimates for the effect of male mating treatment on female fecundity and offspring performance are shown in table 1. There was no effect of male mating treatment on the probability that a female gave birth, her gestation period or brood size; nor was there any effect on offspring size at birth, early survival or early growth rate. Male mating treatment also had no effect on offspring sex ratio ($\chi^2 = 0.133$, df = 1, $p = 0.715$).

There was a clear sex-specific effect of male mating treatment on both time to, and size at, maturation (mating treatment × sex, both $p < 0.01$). The daughters of no mating treatment males matured significantly sooner, and at a smaller size, than those of lifetime mating treatment males. There were no such effects on the size and time to maturation of sons (figure 2a,b).

There was no effect of male mating treatment on daughters' growth, number of eggs or egg diameter; nor were there any effects on sons' sperm count, sperm velocity, relative gonopodium length or mating behaviour (table 1). Details are provided in electronic supplementary material, tables S1 and S2.

## 4. Discussion

Many studies have focused on the effect of male age on reproductive traits, such as sperm count and mating success [2]. Fewer studies look at the effects on offspring fitness [4,29], but almost none of these studies has conclusively shown that male age itself affects offspring performance. This is because age is always confounded with other variables, most notably a male's mating history. We therefore experimentally tested for the effect of lifetime mating activity on the offspring performance of old males of the same age [20,21].

We manipulated the access of male *G. holbrooki* to females over their natural adult lifespan to test whether, for old fathers, total lifetime mating activity affects their offspring. Any effect of mating activity is presumably either due to the transmission of non-genetic information from father to offspring, or because greater mating activity increases the rate of inheritance of germline mutations [14,15,30]. We hypothesized that males that had been prevented from



**Figure 2.** *Gambusia holbrooki*; the effect of mating history of old fathers on offspring reproductive traits: (a) the time (in days) for daughters ($n = 103$, ♀) and sons ($n = 81$, ♂) of fathers experiencing either 'lifetime mating' or 'no mating' to reach sexual maturity; and (b) the body size (standard length in millimetres) of these daughters ($n = 103$, ♀) and sons ($n = 81$, ♂) at sexual maturity. Box plots show median (horizontal line) and interquartile range of data.

mating prior to breeding would produce higher performing offspring than males who had experienced a lifetime of mating activity. In partial support of this prediction, we found a strong effect of fathers' mating history on their daughters' maturation rate. The daughters of males with no previous mating activity matured significantly sooner, albeit at a smaller size (1 mm smaller, which is unlikely to have a large effect on fecundity), than the daughters of males who had experiencing a lifetime of mating (both $p < 0.01$). This suggests that a father's mating history might alter traits potentially linked to the fitness of his daughters. By contrast, we did not find any effect of paternal mating activity on the putative fitness-related traits that we measured in sons. There was no difference in sperm traits, morphology or mating behaviour between the sons of males with a lifetime of mating activity or no prior mating activity. Our results, in conjunction with other studies, suggest that cross-generational paternal effects on traits often linked to fitness (such as body size) can be sex-specific [31,32]. The mechanisms that generate sex-specific paternal effects are largely unknown, but they include differences in the timing and plasticity of events during gamete maturation, and epigenetic changes in gene expression on sex chromosomes unique to males and females [32,33].

Many studies have shown that a male's mating history can affect the fitness of females with whom he mates [33,34]. We did not, however, observe any effect of a male's past mating activity on female breeding success in *G. holbrooki*. One explanation could be that studies investigating

the effect of male mating history on female reproductive output mainly use insects where ejaculates provide nutrients to females [34,35]. By contrast, in *G. holbrooki*, females do not receive any obvious direct nutritional benefits from males. Our finding is consistent with our recent study where female *G. holbrooki* housed with either a large or small male (where larger males have bigger ejaculates [36]) showed no difference in reproductive output [37]. Finally, there might a publication bias against non-significant results obscuring evidence that male mating history does not affect female reproductive output [38].

The current study, when combined with our previous work showing that male mating activity affects sperm traits and proxies of male condition (e.g. immunity) in *G. holbrooki* [21,39], highlights the wider difficulty of directly attributing poor performance by the offspring of older males to the age of their father. Male age and mating activity are naturally confounded. Here, we have not directly investigated the effect of male age. Ideally, future studies should examine the independent main effects of male age and mating activity in males that are young or old (i.e. in a 2 × 2 design). Only then can we determine the relative role of past mating activity and male age on the fitness of a male's progeny.

# References

1. Bonduriansky R, Maklakov A, Zajitschek F, Brooks R. 2008 Sexual selection, sexual conflict and the evolution of ageing and life span. *Funct. Ecol.* **22**, 443–453. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2008.01417.x)

2. Johnson SL, Gemmell NJ. 2012 Are old males still good males and can females tell the difference? Do hidden advantages of mating with old males off-set costs related to fertility, or are we missing something else? *Bioessays* **34**, 609–619. (doi:10.1002/bies.201100157)

3. Roach DA, Carey JR. 2014 Population biology of aging in the wild. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **45**, 421–443. (doi:10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-120213-091730)

4. Johnson SL, Zellhuber-McMillan S, Gillum J, Dunleavy J, Evans JP, Nakagawa S, Gemmell NJ. 2018 Evidence that fertility trades off with early offspring fitness as males age. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **285**, 20172174. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2017.2174)

5. Sartorius GA, Nieschlag E. 2009 Paternal age and reproduction. *Hum. Reprod.* **16**, 65–79. (doi:10.1093/humupd/dmp027)

6. Ramasamy R, Chiba K, Butler P, Lamb DJ. 2015 Male biological clock: a critical analysis of advanced paternal age. *Fertil. Steril.* **103**, 1402–1406. (doi:10.1016/j.fertnstert.2015.03.011)

7. Liu XP, Xu J, He HM, Kuang XJ, Xue FS. 2011 Male age affects female mate preference and reproductive performance in the cabbage beetle, *Colaphellus bowringi*. *J. Insect Behav.* **24**, 83–93. (doi:10.1007/s10905-010-9237-5)

8. Garcia-Palomares S, Navarro S, Pertusa JF, Hermenegildo C, Garcia-Perez MA, Rausell F, Cano A, Tarín JJ. 2009 Delayed fatherhood in mice decreases reproductive fitness and longevity of offspring. *Biol. Reprod.* **80**, 343–349. (doi:10.1095/biolreprod.108.073395)

9. Xie K *et al.* 2018 Epigenetic alterations in longevity regulators, reduced life span, and exacerbated aging-related pathology in old father offspring mice. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **115**, E2348–E2357. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1707337115)

10. Prokop ZM, Stuglik M, Żabińska I, Radwan J. 2007 Male age, mating probability, and progeny fitness in the bulb mite. *Behav. Ecol.* **18**, 597–601. (doi:10.1093/beheco/arm012)

11. Ruiz-López MJ, Espeso G, Evenson DP, Roldan ER, Gomendio M. 2010 Paternal levels of DNA damage in spermatozoa and maternal parity influence offspring mortality in an endangered ungulate. *Proc. R. Soc. B* **277**, 2541–2546. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2010.0333)

12. Pizzari T, Dean R, Pacey A, Moore H, Bonsall MB. 2008 The evolutionary ecology of pre- and post-meiotic sperm senescence. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **23**, 131–140. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2007.12.003)

13. Milekic MH *et al.* 2015 Age-related sperm DNA methylation changes are transmitted to offspring and associated with abnormal behavior and dysregulated gene expression. *Mol. Psychiatry* **20**, 995–1001. (doi:10.1038/mp.2014.84)

14. Bonduriansky R, Day T. 2018 *Extended heredity: a new understanding of inheritance and evolution.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

15. Evans J, Wilson A, Pilastro A, Garcia-Gonzalez F. 2019 Ejaculate-mediated paternal effects: evidence, mechanisms and evolutionary implications. *Reproduction* **157**, R109–R126. (doi:10.1530/REP-18-0524)

16. Pervez A, Omkar, Richmond AS. 2004 The influence of age on reproductive performance of the predatory ladybird beetle, *Propylea dissecta*. *J. Insect Sci.* **4**, 22. (doi:10.1093/jis/4.1.22)

17. Avent TD, Price TAR, Wedell N. 2008 Age-based female preference in the fruit fly *Drosophila pseudoobscura*. *Anim. Behav.* **75**, 1413–1421. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2007.09.015)

18. Krishna MS, Santhosh HT, Hegde SN. 2012 Offspring of older males are superior in *Drosophila bipectinata*. *Zool. Stud.* **51**, 72–84.

19. Priest NK, Mackowiak B, Promislow DEL. 2002 The role of parental age effects on the evolution of aging. *Evol.* **56**, 927–935. (doi:10.1111/j.0014-3820.2002.tb01405.x)

20. Reinhardt K. 2007 Evolutionary consequences of sperm cell aging. *Q. Rev. Biol.* **82**, 375–393. (doi:10.1086/522811)

21. Vega-Trejo R, Fox RJ, Iglesias-Carrasco M, Head ML, Jennions MD. 2019 The effects of male age, sperm age and mating history on ejaculate senescence. *Funct. Ecol.* **33**, 1267–1279. (doi:10.1111/1365-2435.13305)

22. Chen JH, Hales CN, Ozanne SE. 2007 DNA damage, cellular senescence and organismal ageing: causal or correlative? *Nucleic Acids Res.* **35**, 7417–7428. (doi:10.1093/nar/gkm681)

23. Simon L, Lewis SEM. 2011 Sperm DNA damage or progressive motility: which one is the better predictor of fertilization *in vitro*? *Syst. Biol. Reprod. Med.* **57**, 133–138. (doi:10.3109/19396368.2011.553984)

24. Simmons LW, Lovegrove M, Lymbery SJ. 2018 Dietary antioxidants, but not courtship effort, affect oxidative balance in the testes and muscles of crickets. *J. Exp. Biol.* **221**, jeb184770. (doi:10.1242/jeb.184770)

25. Fox RJ, Head ML, Jennions MD. 2019 Disentangling the costs of male harassment and the benefits of polyandry for females. *Behav. Ecol.* **30**, 872–881. (doi:10.1093/beheco/arz024)

26. Head ML, Vega Trejo R, Jacomb F, Jennions MD. 2015. Predictors of male insemination success in the mosquitofish (*Gambusia holbrooki*). *Ecol. Evol.* **5**, 4999–5006. (doi:10.1002/ece3/1775)

27. Vega-Trejo R, O'Dea RE, Jennions MD, Head ML. 2014 The effects of familiarity and mating experience on mate choice in mosquitofish, *Gambusia holbrooki. Behav. Ecol.* **25**, 1205–1211. (doi:10.1093/beheco/aru113)

28. Vega-Trejo R, Jennions MD, Head ML. 2016 Are sexually selected traits affected by a poor environment early in life? *BMC Evol. Biol.* **16**, 263. (doi:10.1186/s12862-016-0838-2)

29. R Core Team. 2019 *R: a language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. See http://www.R-project.org.

30. Caballero-Campo P, Lin W, Simbulan R, Liu X, Feuer S, Donjacour A, Rinaudo PF. 2018 Advanced paternal age affects sperm count and anogenital distance in mouse offspring. *Reprod. Sci.* **25**, 515–522. (doi:10.1177/1933719118759441)

31. Garcia-Gonzalez F, Dowling DK. 2015 Transgenerational effects of sexual interactions and sexual conflict: non-sires boost the fecundity of females in the following generation. *Biol. Lett.* **11**, 20150067. (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2015.0067)

32. Scorza P, Duarte CS, Hipwell AE, Posner J, Ortin A, Canino G, Monk C. 2019 Research review: intergenerational transmission of disadvantage: epigenetics and parents' childhoods as the first exposure. *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry* **60**, 119–132. (doi:10.1111/jcpp.12877)

33. Champagne FA. 2013 Effects of stress across generations: why sex matters. *Biol. Psychiatry* **73**, 2–4. (doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2012.10.004)

34. Torres-Vila LM, Jennions MD. 2005 Male mating history and female fecundity in the Lepidoptera: do male virgins make better partners? *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **57**, 318–326. (doi:10.1007/s00265-004-0857-7)

35. Dubey A, Saxena S, Mishra G. 2018 Mating experience influences mate choice and reproductive output in an aphidophagous ladybird, *Menochilus sexmaculatus. Anim. Biol.* **68**, 247–263. (doi:10.1163/15707563-17000128)

36. O'Dea RE, Jennions MD, Head ML. 2014 Male body size and condition affects sperm number and production rates in mosquitofish, *Gambusia holbrooki. J. Evol. Biol.* **27**, 2739–2744. (doi:10.5061/dryad.sf651)

37. Iglesias-Carrasco M, Fox RJ, Vega-Trejo R, Jennions MD, Head ML. 2019 An experimental test for body size-dependent effects of male harassment and an elevated copulation rate on female lifetime fecundity and offspring performance. *J. Evol. Biol.* **32**, 1262–1273. (doi:10.1111/jeb.13526)

38. Jennions MD, Lortie CJ, Riosenberg MS, Rothstein HR. 2013. Publication and related biases. In *Handbook of meta-analysis in ecology and evolution* (eds J Koricheva, J Gurevitch, K Mengersen), pp. 207–236. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

39. Iglesias-Carrasco M, Fox RJ, Vincent A, Head ML, Jennions MD. 2019 No evidence that male sexual experience increases mating success in a coercive mating system. *Anim. Behav.* **150**, 201–208. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2019.02.012)

40. Aich U, Jennions MD, Fox RJ. 2020 Data from: An experimental test of the role of male mating history on paternal effects in the livebearer fish *Gambusia holbrooki*. Dryad Digital Repository. (doi:10.5061/dryad.h9w0vt4f5)

6