

This is the pre-peer-reviewed version of the following article:

Sutter A, Travers LM, Oku K, Delaney, K, Store, S, Price TAR, Wedell N. Flexible polyandry in female flies is an adaptive response to infertile males. *Behavioral Ecology advance online access*.

It has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arz140>

## **Flexible polyandry in female flies is an adaptive response to infertile males**

Andreas Sutter<sup>1,2,†</sup>, Laura M Travers<sup>1,2</sup>, Keiko Oku<sup>1</sup>, Kynan Delaney<sup>1</sup>, Stefan Store<sup>1</sup>, Tom A. R. Price<sup>3</sup>, & Nina Wedell<sup>1</sup>

1. Centre for Ecology & Conservation, College of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter, Cornwall Campus, TR10 9FE, Penryn, UK.
2. School of Biological Sciences, Norwich Research Park, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK
3. Institute of Integrative Biology, University of Liverpool, Crown Street, Liverpool, L69 7ZB, UK

† [a.sutter@exeter.ac.uk](mailto:a.sutter@exeter.ac.uk)

### **Abbreviated title**

Male infertility increases polyandry

### **Abstract**

Infertility is common in nature despite its obvious cost to individual fitness. Rising global temperatures are predicted to decrease fertility, and male sterility is frequently used in attempts to regulate pest or disease vector populations. When males are infertile, females may mate with multiple males to ensure fertilisation, and changes in female mating

behaviour in turn could intensify selection on male fertility. Fertility assurance is a potentially wide-spread explanation for polyandry, but whether and how it actually contributes to the evolution of polyandry is not clear. Moreover, whether a drop in male fertility would lead to a genetic increase in polyandry depends on whether females respond genetically or through behavioural plasticity to male infertility. Here, we experimentally manipulate male fertility through heat-exposure in *Drosophila pseudoobscura*, and test female discrimination against infertile males before and after mating. Using isogenic lines, we compare the roles of behaviourally plastic versus genetically fixed polyandry. We find that heat-exposed males are less active and attractive, and that females are more likely to remate after mating with these males. Remating rate increases with reduced reproductive output, indicating that females use current sperm storage threshold to make dynamic remating decisions. After remating with fertile males, females restore normal fecundity levels. These results suggest that male infertility could explain the evolution of adaptively flexible polyandry, but is not predicted to cause an increase in genetic polyandry.

**Keywords:** sexual selection, male sterility, multiple mating, phenotypic plasticity, temperature, sterile insect technique

### **Lay summary**

Females mate with more males when their first mate's fertility is low. We experimentally investigated how female flies respond to male infertility through multiple mating. Males whose fertility was compromised by heat had reduced mating success, and their mates were more likely to remate at the next opportunity. Females used behavioural flexibility

to restore their reproductive fitness, rather than relying on genetically fixed mating strategies.

## **Introduction**

Mating failure, defined as adult females remaining unmated (Rhainds, 2010) or as the failure to convert matings into reproductive success (Greenway *et al.*, 2015), is pervasive in nature (Garcia-Gonzalez, 2004; Rhainds, 2010). In insects, as many as two-thirds of all matings do not result in any offspring production, and the median for mating failure across 30 species is 22% (Garcia-Gonzalez, 2004). Fertilisation failure can also be considerable in birds (Adkins-Regan, 2015; Schmoll *et al.*, 2016) and reptiles (Olsson & Shine, 1997), though estimates from wild populations remain rare. Male infertility may often be responsible for mating failure. Male fertility is often impaired at high temperatures (David *et al.*, 2005; Setchell, 2006; Hurley *et al.*, 2018; Sales *et al.*, 2018; but see Janowitz & Fischer, 2011), and increased occurrence of heat waves due to climate change (Meehl, 2004) may cause higher sterility rates (Reinhardt *et al.*, 2015; Walsh *et al.*, 2019). Further, segregation distorters favourably target male gametes (Taylor & Ingvarsson, 2003; Price & Wedell, 2008), and mito-nuclear incompatibilities can devastate sperm function (Dowling *et al.*, 2015), making genomic conflict another potentially common source for male fertility reduction. Finally, mass-sterilisation of males is a common strategy for human pest control (Knipling, 1955; Dyck *et al.*, 2005).

Given the wide variety of factors that can create complete or partial infertility in males, how should females respond? Females show adaptations that help minimise the incidence of failure to copulate and become inseminated (Rhainds, 2010). But if some males are infertile, simply being mated will not guarantee a female successful reproduction. In

contrast, actively choosing fertile males over infertile ones could allow females to assure reproductive output. The phenotype-linked fertility hypothesis posits that male signals and fertility are positively correlated, allowing females to simply choose attractive males to avoid reduced fertility (Sheldon, 1994). While some studies have found positive correlations between male attractiveness indicators and semen quality parameters (Malo *et al.*, 2005; Forstmeier *et al.*, 2017), a recent meta-analysis found no general support for a link between male secondary sexual signals and tentative indices of ejaculate quality (Mautz *et al.*, 2013). Even when intrinsic male fertility correlates with male attractiveness, more attractive males may become sperm depleted because of their increased mating success, making intrinsically more fertile males temporarily less fertile (Preston *et al.*, 2001), and thus undermining the fertility benefit of female choice for attractive males. The paucity of evidence for an association between male external phenotype and fertility may explain why discrimination against sub-fertile or infertile males is rare. For example, despite mating failure being attributable to individual seed bug males (Greenway & Shuker, 2015), females do not choose fertile males (Greenway *et al.*, 2017).

When females do not discriminate between fertile and sterile males before mating, females may safeguard against mating failure simply by mating with multiple males, thus making multiple mating (polyandry) an alternative to precopulatory choice (e.g. Sakaluk & Cade, 1980; Gibson & Jewell, 1982; Sheldon, 1994; Arnqvist & Nilsson, 2000; Mossinson & Yuval, 2003; Forbes, 2014). Importantly, polyandrous females can benefit even without being able to detect fertile males, as long as infertile males' sperm are outcompeted by fertile males' sperm, or females remate more after mating with sterile males (Lorch & Chao, 2003; Barclay, 2005; Champion de Crespigny *et al.*, 2008; Hasson

& Stone, 2009). Hence, increased fertility assurance for females might be a major reason why polyandry is so common. Across animal taxa, 89% of all natural populations investigated showed evidence for multiple paternity (Taylor *et al.*, 2014). The theory underlying the evolution of polyandry for fertility assurance is well developed (Hasson & Stone, 2009), and correlative studies support the notion that females remate more after receiving small or infertile ejaculates (Wetton & Parkin, 1991; Delisle & Hardy, 1997; Torres-Vila *et al.*, 1997; Krokene *et al.*, 1998; Uller & Olsson, 2005). Support through experimentally impaired male fertility, often in the context of the sterile insect technique (SIT), comes from many (Miyatake *et al.*, 1999; Kraaijeveld & Chapman, 2004; Gavriel *et al.*, 2009; Friesen *et al.*, 2014; Landeta-Escamilla *et al.*, 2016) but not all studies (Harmer *et al.*, 2006; Abraham *et al.*, 2013; Haq *et al.*, 2013; Krüger *et al.*, 2019).

One common limitation is that researchers have typically measured the mean response of target females (Calkins & Parker, 2005 and references above). While this assesses the present potential for population control through the release of sterile males, it largely ignores the possibility of a dynamic female response that evolves over multiple generations. Indeed, demonstrations for the importance of considering genetic variation in female mating behaviours comes from field studies of releases of sterile males into natural populations that observed the evolution of precopulatory behavioural discrimination against sterile males (Hibino & Iwahashi, 1991; Mcinnis *et al.*, 1996). Similarly, an evolutionary increase in polyandry under constant levels of male infertility requires genetic variation to underlie the response in female mating behaviour. Selection could favour either genes controlling a behaviourally plastic increase in female remating after mating with infertile males, or genes underlying generally polyandrous behaviour without behavioural plasticity. Only the latter response would lead to a general increase

in polyandry in the population, whereas the former should only increase polyandry as long as male sterility persists. To our knowledge only one empirical study has explicitly addressed the evolution of female remating behaviour in response to sterilised males, and did not find evidence neither for increased behavioural plasticity nor increased genetically fixed polyandry after 12 generations of experimental evolution in Tephritid fruit flies (Kuriwada *et al.*, 2014). However, the authors concluded that insufficient genetic variation in the starting population may have limited the potential for an evolutionary response (Kuriwada *et al.*, 2014).

Here, we investigated whether females of the fly *Drosophila pseudoobscura* mate multiply to ensure successful fertilisation. Experimentally manipulating the fertility of a female's first mate through heat-exposure, we measured female reproductive output in the first four days following the mating, and assessed whether females are more likely to remate after an infertile/sub-fertile mating. Importantly, using isolines that genetically differ in polyandry enabled us to examine the relative roles of behavioural plasticity and genetic predisposition in shaping the remating response, and hence the evolutionary potential for polyandry to evolve in response to male infertility.

## **Material and Methods**

### Fly stocks

We used *D. pseudoobscura* that were collected from two populations in the Western USA (Lewistown, Montana, 47°03'N, 109°28'W; Show Low, Arizona, 34°16'N, 110°00'W) in 2008 and 2012. We maintained all flies under a 14:10 light: dark cycle at 23°C, with standard *Drosophila* food vials (75 mm in height by 25 mm in width) containing commercial Jazz-Mix™ *Drosophila* food (Fisher Scientific) for feeding and oviposition.

The experiments described here were performed between March and May 2018 across two experimental blocks that were shifted by three days.

We sourced females from isofemale isogenic lines that had been established using wild-caught females as described in detail elsewhere (Taylor *et al.*, 2016; first author *et al.*, *in review*). Briefly, offspring of wild-caught females were full-sib inbred for 15 or more generations, after which flies within an isoline are virtually genetically identical, and after which these isolines were maintained under less-restrictive breeding conditions. Before the experiment, isolines were subjected to one generation of common garden breeding. We set up five vials per isoline with five virgin females and five males each, which gave females opportunity for mate choice. After 24 hours, before *D. pseudoobscura* females remate (Snook & So, 2000), males were removed and females were transferred to a new vial to oviposit. Female groups were then transferred to new food every 24 hours for 7 consecutive days.

Males were derived from the same populations as the isofemale lines, but were maintained across several standard *Drosophila* vials as small outbred laboratory populations with overlapping generations and fluctuating population sizes. Flies collected in 2008 were kept separately from flies collected in 2012, such that we maintained four laboratory populations, two from both localities. Before the start of the experiment, we mass-bred these small populations into large 3.5L population cages. Focal males were collected from standard vials that had been left for oviposition in the population cages for up to 24h.

#### Male heat-exposure treatment

To reduce male fertility, we exposed males to an increased temperature for a few days. Heat-exposure was achieved by submerging standard vials with groups of ten males into a water bath that was maintained at either the elevated temperature of 31°C or at the control temperature of 23°C. About 90% of the vial volume was submerged under water, such that gas exchange through a foam plug at the top of the vial was still possible, but the bottom of the foam plug forced all flies to remain below the level of the water surface. For logistic reasons, water baths were kept on a lab bench and thus exposed to a natural diurnal light cycle. All males used had been collected within 18h of eclosion and separated into single sex groups of up to 20 males. We heat-exposed two separate cohorts of males for each experimental block. The first cohort of males had been kept in standard conditions for 1–2 days, before they were exposed to 31°C for 72h, and finally separated into individual vials and left at 23°C on the evening before the day of their mating trial (i.e. around 15h before the mating trial). The second cohort of males was subjected to heat-exposure immediately after collection on the day of eclosion for about 62h until two hours before their mating trial. Thus, the first cohort of males was older (5–6d versus 3d), exposed to heat for longer (72h versus 62h), and given more time to recover from heat exposure than the second cohort (15h versus 2h). To obtain a measure of how physiologically stressful our heat-exposure was to males, we measured male survival during heat-exposure. To do this we counted the number of alive and dead males when separating them into their individual vials at the end of their heat-exposure treatment. Further, we checked whether mortality during heat-exposure led to a bias in male size, i.e. favouring smaller or larger males in the heat-exposure versus the control treatment, because a male size bias could in turn have affected female (re)mating patterns. As a



proxy for male size we measured the length of the third longitudinal vein (Taylor *et al.*, 2008) of one wing using *Fiji* (Schindelin *et al.*, 2012).

### Mating assays

To avoid fertilisation failure, females might discriminate against sterile males before or after mating by refusing to mate with sterile males or by increasing remating after having mated with sterile males, respectively. Alternatively, males may provide females with cues about their fertility during mating, and females may use these to make future remating decisions. We used a mating assay routinely performed in our laboratory (Price *et al.*, 2011; Herrera *et al.*, 2014; Taylor *et al.*, 2016) to address whether heat-exposed males were less likely or slower to mate, indicating reduced male vigour or attractiveness. We also determined whether heat-exposed males copulated for a shorter duration, possibly indicating reduced ejaculate transfer, and whether these behaviours predicted female remating behaviour, potentially informing about proximate mechanisms underlying polyandry. We used females from each of ten isolines and males from the two populations, the temperature treatments and male cohorts in a fully-factorial design.

We aspirated sexually mature, virgin females that were five or six days old individually into vials into which a single male had been aspirated the previous day or earlier that morning, depending on its cohort (see above). We took note of the time when the female was introduced, and two observers scan-sampled for initiation and termination of mating to record copulation latency, the duration from female introduction to the first observed stable mount (i.e. the pair being relatively immobile), indicating successful copulation, and copulation duration, the time from that first stable mount until the pair separated. Scan-sampling meant that flies were not continuously observed, but checked for

copulation in short (~2min) intervals. In the second experimental block we additionally recorded *ad libitum* observations of the onset of male courtship to obtain data on latency to initiate courtship and time between courtship initiation and mating. Observers were always blind with regards to male heat-exposure treatment and female isoline identity. We used a combination of randomisation and stratification to determine order in the assay to avoid time-of-day effects on mating parameters. After giving pairs a minimum of two hours to mate, we removed males and froze them for later size measurements. We left females that had mated to oviposit for four days, and discarded females that had not mated.

We gave females a single opportunity to remate four days after their first mating. Again, we aspirated a female into a vial containing a single 5-day old virgin male from the same population as the female's first mate. These males had been kept in incubators at the control temperature of 23°C. Two observers regularly scanned pairs for mating. After a minimum of 90min, we discarded all males. To examine the consequences of enforced monandry on female fitness, we denied a subset (~15%) of females the opportunity to remate by aspirating the male out of the vial immediately before the female was introduced. We left females to oviposit for another four days, after which they were transferred to a third vial for a further four days and finally discarded.

### Fitness consequences

To assess the consequences of male heat-exposure and female remating for female fitness, we quantified female reproductive output over 12 days, which has been shown previously to correlate with lifetime reproductive success under control conditions (Avent *et al.*,

2008). We counted the number of eclosed offspring from these vials 23 days after the first day of oviposition.

To obtain additional data on male fertility and mating capacity, we left a single male in a vial with five virgin females for 24h, after which females were isolated and left to oviposit for four days, following offspring counts after 23 days. For this small experiment, we only used males from one of the populations (Show Low) from the young cohort in the first and the old cohort in the second experimental block, and used a haphazard selection of virgin females from the ten isolines.

### Statistical analyses

To test the physiological impact of heat-exposure on males and its consequences for females we analysed the impact of heat-exposure on multiple aspects of male and female reproductive behaviour and fitness: i) male heat-exposure survival, ii) mating success, copulation latency and duration, as well as iii) female reproductive output and iv) polyandry. We used R version 3.5.1 (R Core Team, 2018) for all statistical analyses and figures, running binomial generalised linear mixed effects models (GLMM) and linear mixed effects models (LMM) implemented in *lme4* version 1.1-14 (Bates *et al.*, 2015), and zero-inflated mixed models in *glmmTMB* (Brooks *et al.*, 2017). Descriptive statistics and sample sizes for the different response variables are summarised in Table 1. Here we give an overview of the fixed and random predictor variables included in the different models (see also Tables 2, 3 & S1–S4).

- i) We first measured male survival to assess how physiologically stressful our heat-exposure treatment was: We ran a binomial GLMM with heat-exposure, male cohort, their interaction and block as fixed effects, and post-eclosion housing vial

and population as random intercepts. To ask whether survival was biased with respect to male size, we ran an LMM on the wing size of surviving males, with heat-exposure, male cohort and their interaction as fixed effects, and male collection batch (16 unique block, population, and collection day combinations) as a random effect.

- ii) We measured male mating success, copulation latency and duration to test for effects of heat-exposure on male reproductive performance: We ran a binomial GLMM with heat-exposure, male cohort, their interaction, block, female age, male size and temporal order within the mating assay as fixed effects, and random intercepts for female post-eclosion housing vial, female isoline and male population.
- iii) We then tested the consequences of mating with a heat-exposed male with or without successive remating with control males for female reproductive output: Because many of the oviposition vials contained no offspring, we used zero-inflated models with a Gaussian distribution for the conditional part implemented in *glmmTMB* (Brooks *et al.*, 2017), and examined residuals with *DHARMA* (Hartig, 2018). Our conditional full model included heat-exposure, female remating, male size, laying vial and two- and three-way interactions as fixed effects. We included random intercepts for female ID, female isoline, male collection batch (see above), and random slopes for individual females to account for repeated measures across a female's three laying vials. (Schielzeth & Forstmeier, 2009). Our zero-inflated full model included heat-exposure, female remating, male cohort, laying vial and two- and three-way interactions as fixed effects.

iv) Finally, we asked what explained variation in polyandry: We ran a binomial GLMM with fixed effects for heat-exposure, reproductive output from the first oviposition vial and male size including two-way interactions with heat-exposure, and female age and temporal order within the mating assay. We included random intercepts for female isoline and male collection batch as random intercepts. Because of our explicit interest in distinguishing between behavioural plasticity and genetic polyandry, we additionally included the interaction between first male temperature treatment and female isoline as an additional random effect (i.e. random slopes for isolines).

Whenever possible, we extracted effect sizes and p values from full models to avoid biasing effect sizes through the removal of non-significant terms (Forstmeier & Schielzeth, 2011). P values from LMMs were obtained from *t*-tests using the Kenward-Roger approximation for denominator degrees of freedom implemented in *lmerTest* (Kuznetsova *et al.*, 2016). For reproductive output, we ran a large albeit not exhaustive selection of combinations of full and reduced conditional and zero-inflation models, and selected the best model based on the lowest AIC value. To facilitate the interpretation of main effects in the presence of interactions and to aid model convergence, we centred covariates to a mean of zero. Age covariates were mean-centred, and temporal order within an assay was centred and scaled to a standard deviation of one. For models on mating behaviour, we additionally centred contrasts between two factors (*older* and *younger* male cohorts, first and second experimental blocks) by coding factor levels as minus 0.5 and 0.5, respectively (Schielzeth, 2010). Approximate 95% confidence intervals (*CI*) for effect sizes were taken as twice the standard error either side of the mean (Crawley, 2007).

## Results

### Heat-exposure reduces male survival and mating success

Heat exposure decreased male survival substantially in the first (older) but only marginally in the second (younger) cohort (Table 1; Fig S3). Survival was lower than 50% in mature heat-exposed males but higher than 97% in the three other treatment-cohort combinations, manifested as a highly significant interaction between treatment and male cohort (GLMM,  $N = 1515$ , effect size  $\beta$  [95%CI] on logit scale =  $-3.8$  [ $-5.9$ ;  $-1.7$ ],  $z = -3.58$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; Table S2). There was no indication that heat-exposure caused size-dependent mortality, as the interaction between temperature and male cohort did not significantly explain variation in body size of surviving males (i.e. wing length; LMM,  $N = 925$ ,  $\beta = -0.01$  [ $-0.03$ ;  $0.02$ ],  $t_{1,907.6} = -0.58$ ,  $p = 0.565$ ; Table S3). Substantial variation in body size was explained by pre-eclosion conditions (unique combinations of populations, male cohorts and experimental blocks; likelihood ratio test LRT,  $\chi^2(14) = 2.6$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) but not by post-eclosion treatment (heat-exposure;  $p > 0.5$ ).

Males that had been heat-exposed were much less likely to mate (binomial GLMM,  $N = 916$ ,  $\beta = -3.1$  [ $-3.6$ ;  $-2.7$ ],  $z = -14.2$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; Table S2). Mating success was 86% in control males but only 30% in heat-exposed males (Fig 1, Table 1). In conjunction with a decrease in mating success, copulation latency of successful males was longer for heat-exposed males (log-transformed latency in minutes; LMM,  $N = 496$ ,  $\beta = 1.1$  [ $0.8$ ;  $1.3$ ],  $t_{1,459.2} = 9.4$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; Fig 1 & S1; Table S1). Copulations with heat-exposed males were shorter than those with control males (LMM,  $N = 487$ ,  $\beta = -0.25$  [ $-0.35$ ;  $-0.15$ ],  $t_{1,451.1} = 9.4$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; Table 1 & S1; Fig S1). Additional data on male courtship collected only in the second experimental block indicated that heat-exposed males were slower and less likely to initiate courtship, and that their courtship quality or intensity

may have been inferior to that of control males (see supplementary Results, Table S1 & Fig S1).

#### Male heat-exposure reduces female reproductive fitness

Females mated to heat-exposed males had lower reproductive fitness than females mated to control males. This was true both for the likelihood of failing to produce any offspring over four days after mating as well as for the number of offspring produced among the subset of females that did produce offspring (Fig 2). In our main dataset, this was evidenced by a significant baseline effect of male heat exposure treatment on the zero-inflation model ( $N = 498$ ,  $\beta = 6.5$ ,  $z = 8.4$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) as well as the conditional model ( $\beta = -28.9$  [ $-44.6$ ;  $-13.2$ ],  $z = -3.9$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; Table 2). In our additional, small dataset, where we housed males with five females for 24h, heat-exposed males successfully reproduced with fewer females (binomial GLM,  $\beta = -2.9$ ,  $z = -6.8$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), and sired marginally fewer offspring per fertile mating (LM,  $\beta = -13.0$  [ $-25.5$ ;  $0.5$ ],  $t_{1,29} = 4.3$ ,  $p = 0.046$ ; Table 1).

#### Polyandry restores female reproductive fitness in the face of male infertility

Polyandry had a beneficial effect on reproductive fitness of females previously mated to heat-exposed males (Table 3), mainly through reducing the incidence of complete reproductive failure (Fig 2 & Table 2). In contrast, polyandry had no substantial effect on fecundity under control conditions (Fig 2), consistent with a recent study (Sutter et al., 2019). Females with higher initial reproductive output were less likely to remate (chosen monandry; see below), but appeared to run out of sperm over the next 4–8 days (Fig 2). The temporal decline in reproductive fitness of facultatively monandrous females and the reproductive increase in polyandrous females within the male heat-exposure treatment

contrasted with the consistent temporal patterns within the control treatment. This explained the three-way interaction between heat-exposure treatment, remating phenotype and oviposition vial.

### Phenotypically plastic polyandry

Four days after their first mating, females that had mated with a heat-exposed male were twice as likely to remate (84%) as were females that had mated with control males (42%; Table 1). The relationship with reproductive output after the first mating suggests this difference in mating behaviour is causally related to reduced fertility and fecundity. Females were more likely to remate if they had produced fewer offspring after the first mating (binomial GLMM,  $N = 427$ ,  $\beta = -0.4$  [-0.7;-0.1],  $z = -2.5$ ,  $p = 0.012$ ; Table 3). However, when matched for fecundity, females mated to heat-exposed males still had a higher remating likelihood ( $\beta = 1.9$  [1.1;2.7],  $z = 4.7$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; Table 3). Polyandry tended to decrease after mating with larger males and to increase with female age (Table 3).

The increase in polyandry after mating with heat-exposed males was consistent in females from all ten isolines, indicated by the interaction between female isoline and heat-exposure of the first mate not explaining a significant amount of variation in polyandry (Fig 3; LRT,  $\chi^2(2) = 0.85$   $p = 0.654$ ). In contrast, significant variation between isolines confirmed genetic variation in polyandry (LRT,  $\chi^2(1) = 10.4$   $p = 0.001$ ). Together, these results indicate behavioural plasticity in polyandry, and genetic variation in polyandry, but no genetic variation in behavioural plasticity.

## **Discussion**



Here we show that females representing distinct genotypes consistently use polyandry as a behaviourally flexible strategy to mitigate the potential fitness loss arising from male sterility, using cues from stored ejaculates. Increased male infertility is unlikely to lead to an evolutionary increase in polyandry, but the flexible female response we describe here could intensify selection on male fertility, and aid population resilience.

#### Adaptively flexible polyandry

After mating with heat-exposed males with severely compromised fertility, female remating doubled from 42% to 84%. Safeguarding against male infertility is a potential adaptive explanation for the ubiquity of female multiple mating, and a number of studies have reported increased polyandry after mating with experimentally sterilised males (e.g. medfly: Miyatake *et al.*, 1999; Kraaijeveld & Chapman, 2004; Gavriel *et al.*, 2009; red garter snake: Friesen *et al.*, 2014; *Anastrepha serpentina*: Landeta-Escamilla *et al.*, 2016), further supported by correlational data (Sakaluk & Cade, 1980; Wetton & Parkin, 1991; Uller & Olsson, 2005; Reding, 2015; but see Morrow *et al.*, 2002). Other experiments however found no effect of male sterility on female remating behaviour (Queensland fruit fly: Harmer *et al.*, 2006; *Anastrepha fraterculus*: Abraham *et al.*, 2013; melon fly: Haq *et al.*, 2013; *Drosophila sukukii*: Krüger *et al.*, 2018). A potential explanation for this discrepancy is that the latter studies used artificial techniques such as genetic manipulation and irradiation to induce male sterility, and these males may lack the cues present in naturally sterile males, with which female remating behaviour has coevolved.

Heat-induced male infertility is likely to be relevant in nature (Sales *et al.*, 2018; Walsh *et al.*, 2019), and should create a strong incentive for female multiple mating. Here, more than half of the females that mated with heat-exposed males produced no offspring

following mating, indicating high rates of male sterility, compared to a mere five percent in the control group. Among these females with failed early reproduction, remating rates were as high as the proportion of virgin females that mated with control males, meaning the effect of heat-exposure on polyandry could have been driven by pseudopolyandry rather than true polyandry (Fisher *et al.*, 2013). However, when focusing on the subsets of females that had non-zero early reproductive output, the difference in polyandry between females mated to heat-exposed versus control males was again almost two-fold (76% versus 39%; data not shown). More formally, in our analysis on polyandry where we included early reproductive output as a predictor variable, male heat-exposure showed a very strong effect on polyandry (Table 3, see also Fig S2).

Females may have used information obtained during the first mating to make remating decisions. Heat-exposure decreased survival only in the older males, but had pronounced sub-lethal effects on sexual behaviour in both male cohorts. Heat-exposed males were slower to initiate courtship, took longer to be accepted by females and copulated for a shorter duration, possibly because heat-exposure had negative effects on male condition, thus providing females with additional pre- and peri-copulatory cues about male fertility. However, remating likelihood was not related to copulation latency or duration of a female's first mating (results not shown), making it more likely that females used cues from stored ejaculates. Our experimental design did not distinguish between whether changes in sperm or seminal fluids were responsible for the increase in polyandry. Either mechanism is plausible, but the effects are likely to be species-specific. For example, sperm-less males can induce a refractory period in female Queensland fruit flies and Medflies (Harmer *et al.*, 2006; Gabrieli *et al.*, 2016), but both seminal fluids and sperm are required for inhibiting remating in *Anastrepha fraterculus* and *A. ludens* (Abraham *et*

*al.*, 2016), and *Drosophila melanogaster* flies (Liu & Kubli, 2003). Independent of the precise mechanism, our results suggest that polyandry is not simply a response to the absence of fertile sperm but that females take current semen storage into account when making remating decisions (Manning, 1967; Crudgington *et al.*, 2005).

Polyandry increases with latitude across *D. pseudoobscura* populations in North America, consistent with the proximate effect of lower temperature increasing polyandry (Taylor *et al.*, 2016). However, variation in polyandry between populations is genetic and not simply explained by these proximate effects (Taylor *et al.*, 2016). Similarly, the genetic cline is opposite to that expected if polyandry had evolved in response to higher rates of heat-induced male sterility. However, variation in male fertility could more generally have favoured the evolution of behavioural plasticity in polyandry. Using females from distinct genetic backgrounds that differ in polyandry (Taylor *et al.*, 2016; first author *et al.*, *in review*), we found that females consistently elevated polyandry after mating with sub-fertile males, indicating behavioural plasticity that was independent of genetic variation in polyandry. Including reproductive output as a covariate meant our tests were controlled for variation in reproductive output among isolines (see above). However, our power to detect a potential subtle genotype-by-treatment interaction for polyandry was limited by the low mating success of heat-exposed males (Fig 3 & Table S5). While we cannot comprehensively rule out that there may be genetic variation in behavioural plasticity of polyandry, selection may more generally favour females that make reproductive decisions dynamically and flexibly (Gowaty, 2013; Ah-King & Gowaty, 2016). In the context of male infertility, females appear to update their remating decisions according to their current state (Gowaty & Hubbell, 2009), and to lower their mate acceptance threshold when sperm storage is low.

### Consequences for populations

Plastically elevated polyandry levels have important implications for population viability (Holman & Kokko, 2013), particularly for populations under threat due to rising male infertility, and for targets of the sterile insect technique (SIT). First, climate change means that many organisms are likely to face increased male fertility problems (Walsh et al., 2019). If females increase remating after mating with infertile males, heat-induced male infertility may have little impact on population productivity as long as there are enough fertile males. Little is known about the heritability of temperature sensitivity of male fertility (Walsh et al., 2019). But, if variation in male fertility is heritable and continuous, more intense postcopulatory sexual selection due to increased polyandry (Morimoto *et al.*, 2019) will increase reproductive skew towards fully fertile males, which may accelerate adaptation to increasing temperatures and delay population extinction (Parrett & Knell, 2018). Second, plastically elevated polyandry thwarts population control attempts through SIT (Kraaijeveld & Chapman, 2004; Barclay, 2005). Thus, understanding short-term plasticity in polyandry as well as the amount of genetic variation underlying this plasticity is important for predicting the potential of SIT. For example, even if the average female shows no increased remating after mating with sterile males, populations may still harbour genetic variation in female remating behaviour. This would lead to an increase in polyandry in response to SIT across generations, hence hampering SIT effectiveness.

### Conclusions

Mating failure is common, and represents a potential explanation for the ubiquity of female multiple mating. Male fertility is often compromised by natural processes and human intervention. Here, we have shown that females flexibly adjusted their remating

rate according to their demands for fertile sperm, consistent with behavioural plasticity that was independent of genetic variation in polyandry. Polyandry allowed females to buffer against fitness costs associated with mating with heat-exposed males with low fertility, which may hamper the impact of release of sterile males for population control, but may increase selection on male fertility and assist adaptation to increasing global temperatures.

### **Funding**

This work was supported by a Swiss National Science Foundation fellowship awarded to AS (grant number P300PA\_177906) a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Fellowship to KO (grant number 746169 – IMMUNFUNC).

### **Acknowledgements**

We thank Ali Skeats and Michelle Taylor for establishing the isolines, Steven Parratt and Katherine Roberts for advice on heat-exposure protocols, and Zeynep Karahan for help with wing measurements.

### **Data Accessibility Statement**

Analyses reported in this article can be reproduced using the data provided by Sutter *et al.* (2019; Data to be added to Dryad upon acceptance).

### **References**

- Abraham, S., Lara-Pérez, L.A., Rodríguez, C., Contreras-Navarro, Y., Nuñez-Beverido, N., Ovruski, S., *et al.* 2016. The male ejaculate as inhibitor of female remating in two tephritid flies. *J. Insect Physiol.* **88**: 40–47.
- Abraham, S., Liendo, M.C., Devescovi, F., Peralta, P.A., Yusef, V., Ruiz, J., *et al.* 2013.

- Remating behavior in *Anastrepha fraterculus* (Diptera: Tephritidae) females is affected by male juvenile hormone analog treatment but not by male sterilization. *Bull. Entomol. Res.* **103**: 310–317.
- Adkins-Regan, E. 2015. Hit or miss: Fertilization outcomes of natural inseminations by Japanese quail. *PLoS One* **10**: 1–20.
- Ah-King, M. & Gowaty, P.A. 2016. A conceptual review of mate choice: stochastic demography, within-sex phenotypic plasticity, and individual flexibility. *Ecol. Evol.* **6**: 4607–4642.
- Arnqvist, G. & Nilsson, T. 2000. The evolution of polyandry: multiple mating and female fitness in insects. *Anim. Behav.* **60**: 145–164.
- Avent, T.D., Price, T.A.R. & Wedell, N. 2008. Age-based female preference in the fruit fly *Drosophila pseudoobscura*. *Anim. Behav.* **75**: 1413–1421.
- Barclay, H. 2005. Mathematical Models for the Use of Sterile Insects. In: *Sterile Insect Technique: Principles and Practice in Area-Wide Integrated Pest Management* (V. Dyck et al., eds), pp. 147–174. Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.
- Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *J. Stat. Softw.* **67**: 1–48.
- Brooks, M.E., Kristensen, K., van Benthem, , Koen J. Magnusson, A., Berg, C.W., Nielsen, A., Skaug, H.J., et al. 2017. glmmTMB Balances Speed and Flexibility Among Packages for Zero-inflated Generalized Linear Mixed Modeling. *R J.* **9**: 378–400.
- Calkins, C. & Parker, A. 2005. Sterile Insect Quality. In: *Sterile Insect Technique: Principles and Practice in Area-Wide Integrated Pest Management* (V. A. Dyck et al., eds), pp. 269–296. Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

- Champion de Crespigny, F.E., Hurst, L.D. & Wedell, N. 2008. Do *Wolbachia*-associated incompatibilities promote polyandry? *Evolution* **62**: 107–122.
- Crawley, M.J. 2007. *The R Book*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
- Crudginton, H.S., Beckerman, A.P., Brüstle, L., Green, K. & Snook, R.R. 2005. Experimental removal and elevation of sexual selection: does sexual selection generate manipulative males and resistant females? *Am. Nat.* **165**: S72–S87.
- David, J.R., Araripe, L.O., Chakir, M., Legout, H., Lemos, B., Pétavy, G., *et al.* 2005. Male sterility at extreme temperatures: A significant but neglected phenomenon for understanding *Drosophila* climatic adaptations. *J. Evol. Biol.* **18**: 838–846.
- Delisle, J. & Hardy, M. 1997. Male nutrition influences the reproductive success of both sexes of the spruce budworm *Choristoneura fumiferana* (Lepidoptera: Tortricidae). *Funct. Ecol.* **11**: 451–463.
- Dowling, D.K., Tompkins, D.M. & Gemmill, N.J. 2015. The Trojan Female Technique for pest control: A candidate mitochondrial mutation confers low male fertility across diverse nuclear backgrounds in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evol. Appl.* **8**: 871–880.
- Dyck, V.A., Hendrichs, J. & Robinson, A.S. 2005. *Sterile Insect Technique: Principles and Practice in Area-Wide Integrated Pest Management* (V. A. Dyck et al., eds). Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.
- Fisher, D.N., Doff, R.J. & Price, T.A.R. 2013. True polyandry and pseudopolyandry: why does a monandrous fly remate? *BMC Evol. Biol.* **13**: 157.
- Forbes, S. 2014. Partial fertility and polyandry: a benefit of multiple mating hiding in plain sight? *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **68**: 1329–1334.
- Forstmeier, W., Ihle, M., Opatová, P., Martin, K., Knief, U., Albrechtová, J., *et al.*

2017. Testing the phenotype-linked fertility hypothesis in the presence and absence of inbreeding. *J. Evol. Biol.* **30**: 968–976.
- Forstmeier, W. & Schielzeth, H. 2011. Cryptic multiple hypotheses testing in linear models: Overestimated effect sizes and the winner's curse. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **65**: 47–55.
- Friesen, C.R., Uhrig, E.J. & Mason, R.T. 2014. Females remate more frequently when mated with sperm-deficient males. *J. Exp. Zool. Part A Ecol. Genet. Physiol.* **321**: 603–609.
- Gabrieli, P., Scolari, F., Di Cosimo, A., Savini, G., Fumagalli, M., Gomulski, L.M., *et al.* 2016. Sperm-less males modulate female behaviour in *Ceratitis capitata* (Diptera: Tephritidae). *Insect Biochem. Mol. Biol.* **79**: 13–26.
- Garcia-Gonzalez, F. 2004. Infertile matings and sperm competition: the effect of 'nonsperm representation' on intraspecific variation in sperm precedence patterns. *Am. Nat.* **164**: 457–472.
- Gavriel, S., Gazit, Y. & Yuval, B. 2009. Remating by female Mediterranean fruit flies (*Ceratitis capitata*, Diptera: Tephritidae): Temporal patterns and modulation by male condition. *J. Insect Physiol.* **55**: 637–642.
- Gibson, R.M. & Jewell, P.A. 1982. Semen quality, female choice and multiple mating in domestic sheep: A test of Trivers' Sexual Competence Hypothesis. *Behaviour* **80**: 9–31.
- Gowaty, P.A. 2013. Adaptively flexible polyandry. *Anim. Behav.* **86**: 877–884.
- Gowaty, P.A. & Hubbell, S.P. 2009. Reproductive decisions under ecological constraints: it's about time. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **106 Suppl**: 10017–10024.



- Greenway, E., Dougherty, L.R. & Shuker, D.M. 2015. Mating failure. *Curr. Biol.* **25**: R534–R536.
- Greenway, E. & Shuker, D. 2015. The repeatability of mating failure in a polyandrous bug. *J. Evol. Biol.* **28**: 1578–1582.
- Greenway, E.V., Balfour, V.L. & Shuker, D.M. 2017. Can females choose to avoid mating failure in the seed bug *Lygaeus simulans*? *Anim. Behav.* **129**: 61–69.
- Haq, I.U., Vreysen, M.J.B., Abd-Alla, A. & Hendrichs, J. 2013. Ability of Genetic Sexing Strain male melon flies (Diptera: Tephritidae) to suppress wild female remating: Implications for SIT. *Florida Entomol.* **96**: 839–849.
- Harmer, A.M.T., Radhakrishnan, P. & Taylor, P.W. 2006. Remating inhibition in female Queensland fruit flies: Effects and correlates of sperm storage. *J. Insect Physiol.* **52**: 179–186.
- Hartig, F. 2018. DHARMA: Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchical (Multi-Level / Mixed) Regression Models. R package version 0.2.0. , doi: 10.1111/j.1753-0407.2009.00036.x.
- Hasson, O. & Stone, L. 2009. Male infertility, female fertility and extrapair copulations. *Biol. Rev.* **84**: 225–244.
- Herrera, P., Taylor, M.L., Skeats, A., Price, T.A.R. & Wedell, N. 2014. Can patterns of chromosome inversions in *Drosophila pseudoobscura* predict polyandry across a geographical cline? *Ecol. Evol.* **4**: 3072–3081.
- Hibino, Y. & Iwahashi, O. 1991. Appearance of wild females unreceptive to sterilized males on Okinawa Is. in the eradication program of the Melon fly, *Dacus cucurbitae* Coquillett (Diptera: Tephritidae). *Appl. Entomol. Zool.* **26**: 265–270.
- Holman, L. & Kokko, H. 2013. The consequences of polyandry for population viability,

- extinction risk and conservation. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **368**: 20120053.
- Hurley, L.L., McDiarmid, C.S., Friesen, C.R., Griffith, S.C. & Rowe, M. 2018. Experimental heatwaves negatively impact sperm quality in the zebra finch. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **285**.
- Janowitz, S.A. & Fischer, K. 2011. Opposing effects of heat stress on male versus female reproductive success in *Bicyclus anynana* butterflies. *J. Therm. Biol.* **36**: 283–287.
- Knipling, E.F. 1955. Possibilities of insect control or eradication through the use of sexually sterile males. *J. Econ. Entomol.* **48**: 459–462.
- Kraaijeveld, K. & Chapman, T. 2004. Effects of male sterility on female remating in the Mediterranean fruitfly, *Ceratitis capitata*. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **271**: S209–S211.
- Krokene, C., Rigstad, K., Dale, M. & Lifjeld, J.T. 1998. The function of extrapair paternity in blue tits and great tits: good genes or fertility insurance? *Behav. Ecol.* **9**: 649–656.
- Krüger, A.P., Schlesener, D.C.H., Martins, L.N., Wollmann, J., Deprá, M. & Garcia, F.R.M. 2019. Radiation effects on *Drosophila suzukii* (Diptera: Drosophilidae) reproductive behaviour. *J. Appl. Entomol.* **143**: 88–94.
- Kuriwada, T., Kumano, N., Shiromoto, K., Haraguchi, D., Matsuyama, T. & Kohama, T. 2014. Female preference did not evolve under laboratory conditions in the solanaceous fruit fly *Bactrocera latifrons*. *Int. J. Pest Manag.* **60**: 160–165.
- Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P.B. & Christensen, R.H.B. 2016. lmerTest: 2.0-33., Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models. R package version 2.0-33.
- Landeta-Escamilla, A., Hernández, E., Arredondo, J., Díaz-Fleischer, F. & Pérez-

- Staples, D. 2016. Male irradiation affects female remating behavior in *Anastrepha serpentina* (Diptera: Tephritidae). *J. Insect Physiol.* **85**: 17–22.
- Liu, H. & Kubli, E. 2003. Sex-peptide is the molecular basis of the sperm effect in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **100**: 9929–9933.
- Lorch, P.D. & Chao, L. 2003. Selection for multiple mating in females due to mates that reduce female fitness. *Behav. Ecol.* **14**: 679–686.
- Malo, A.F., Roldan, E.R., Garde, J., Soler, A.J. & Gomendio, M. 2005. Antlers honestly advertise sperm production and quality. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **272**: 149–57.
- Manning, A. 1967. The control of sexual receptivity in female *Drosophila*. *Anim. Behav.* **15**: 239–250.
- Mautz, B.S., Møller, A.P. & Jennions, M.D. 2013. Do male secondary sexual characters signal ejaculate quality? A meta-analysis. *Biol. Rev.* **88**: 669–682.
- Mcinnis, D.O., Lance, D.R. & Jackson, C.G. 1996. Behavioral resistance to the sterile insect technique by Mediterranean fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae) in Hawaii. *Ann. Entomol. Soc. Am.* **89**: 739–744.
- Meehl, G.A. 2004. More Intense, More Frequent, and Longer Lasting Heat Waves in the 21st Century. *Science.* **305**: 994–997.
- Miyatake, T., Chapman, T. & Partridge, L. 1999. Mating-induced inhibition of remating in female mediterranean fruit flies *Ceratitis capitata*. *J. Insect Physiol.* **45**: 1021–1028.
- Morimoto, J., McDonald, G.C., Smith, E., Smith, D.T., Perry, J.C., Chapman, T., *et al.* 2019. Sex peptide receptor-regulated polyandry modulates the balance of pre- and post-copulatory sexual selection in *Drosophila*. *Nat. Commun.* **10**: 283.
- Morrow, E.H., Arnqvist, G. & Pitcher, T.E. 2002. The evolution of infertility: Does

- hatching rate in birds coevolve with female polyandry? *J. Evol. Biol.* **15**: 702–709.
- Mossinson, S. & Yuval, B. 2003. Regulation of sexual receptivity of female Mediterranean fruit flies: Old hypotheses revisited and a new synthesis proposed. *J. Insect Physiol.* **49**: 561–567.
- Olsson, M. & Shine, R. 1997. Advantages of multiple matings to females: a test of the infertility hypothesis using lizards. *Evolution* **51**: 1684–1688.
- Parrett, J.M. & Knell, R.J. 2018. The effect of sexual selection on adaptation and extinction under increasing temperatures. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **285**: 20180303.
- Preston, B.T., Stevenson, I.R., Pemberton, J.M. & Wilson, K. 2001. Dominant rams lose out by sperm depletion. *Nature* **409**: 681–682.
- Price, T.A.R., Lewis, Z., Smith, D.T., Hurst, G.D.D. & Wedell, N. 2011. Remating in the laboratory reflects rates of polyandry in the wild. *Anim. Behav.* **82**: 1381–1386.
- Price, T.A.R. & Wedell, N. 2008. Selfish genetic elements and sexual selection: their impact on male fertility. *Genetica* **132**: 295–307.
- R Core Team. 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- Reding, L. 2015. Increased hatching success as a direct benefit of polyandry in birds. *Evolution* **69**: 264–270.
- Reinhardt, K., Dobler, R. & Abbott, J. 2015. An ecology of sperm: Sperm diversification by natural selection. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **46**: 435–459.
- Rhainds, M. 2010. Female mating failures in insects. *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* **136**: 211–226.
- Sakaluk, S.K. & Cade, W.H. 1980. Female mating frequency and progeny production in

- singly and doubly mated house and field crickets. *Can. J. Zool.* **58**: 404–411.
- Sales, K., Vasudeva, R., Dickinson, M.E., Godwin, J.L., Lumley, A.J., Michalczyk, Ł., *et al.* 2018. Experimental heatwaves compromise sperm function and cause transgenerational damage in a model insect. *Nat. Commun.* **9**: 4771.
- Schielzeth, H. 2010. Simple means to improve the interpretability of regression coefficients. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **1**: 103–113.
- Schielzeth, H. & Forstmeier, W. 2009. Conclusions beyond support: overconfident estimates in mixed models. *Behav. Ecol.* **20**: 416–420.
- Schindelin, J., Arganda-Carreras, Ignacio Frise, E., Kaynig, V., Longair, M., Pietzsch, T., Preibisch, S., *et al.* 2012. Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image analysis. *Nat. Methods* **9**: 676–682.
- Schmoll, T., Kleven, O. & Reynolds, J. 2016. Functional infertility in a wild passerine bird. *Ibis (Lond. 1859)*. **158**: 670–673.
- Setchell, B.P. 2006. The effects of heat on the testes of mammals. *Anim. Reprod.* **3**: 81–91.
- Sheldon, B.C. 1994. Male phenotype, fertility, and the pursuit of extra-pair copulations by female birds. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **257**: 25–30.
- Snook, R.R. & So, Y.K. 2000. Associations between female remating behavior, oogenesis and oviposition in *Drosophila melanogaster* and *Drosophila pseudoobscura*. *J. Insect Physiol.* **46**: 1489–1496.
- Taylor, D.R. & Ingvarsson, P.K. 2003. Common features of segregation distortion in plants and animals. *Genetica* **117**: 27–35.
- Taylor, M.L., Price, T.A.R., Skeats, A. & Wedell, N. 2016. Temperature can shape a cline in polyandry, but only genetic variation can sustain it over time. *Behav. Ecol.*

27: 462–469.

Taylor, M.L., Price, T.A.R. & Wedell, N. 2014. Polyandry in nature: a global analysis.

*Trends Ecol. Evol.* **29**: 376–383.

Taylor, M.L., Wedell, N. & Hosken, D.J. 2008. Sexual selection and female fitness in

*Drosophila simulans*. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **62**: 721–728.

Torres-Vila, L.M., Stockel, J. & Rodríguez-Molina, M.C. 1997. Physiological factors

regulating polyandry in *Lobesia botrana* (Lepidoptera: Tortricidae). *Physiol.*

*Entomol.* **22**: 387–393.

Uller, T. & Olsson, M. 2005. Multiple copulations in natural populations of lizards:

evidence for the fertility assurance hypothesis. *Behaviour* **142**: 45–56.

Walsh, B.S., Parratt, S.R., Hoffmann, A.A., Atkinson, D., Snook, R.R., Bretman, A., *et*

*al.* 2019. The Impact of Climate Change on Fertility. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **34**: 249–

259.

Wetton, J.H. & Parkin, D.T. 1991. An association between fertility and cuckoldry in the

house sparrow, *Passer domesticus*. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **245**: 227–233.

## Figure legends

**Figure 1:** Male mating success and latency. Heat-exposed males (red) had a longer copulation latency and reduced mating success compared to control males (blue; see main text and Table S1). Thin lines represent approximate 95% confidence intervals from a cox proportional hazard model on right-censored mating latency with other fixed effects centred. Note the log-scale of the x axis.

**Figure 2:** Male heat-exposure reduces female reproductive output, but polyandry can restore fitness. Framed circles and error bars depict mean and approximate 95% confidence intervals. Faint circles represent raw data, with circle area proportional to the number of observations. Under enforced monandry, females mated to heat-exposed males had consistently low reproductive fitness (left panel). Females often chose not to remate when initial reproductive output was substantial after mating with heat-exposed males, but soon after showed reduced reproductive output (central panel). Remating with fertile males fully restored subsequent reproductive fitness in females that had mated with heat-exposed males (right panel).

**Figure 3:** Females increase polyandry after mating with heat-exposed males through behavioural plasticity. Isolines were assigned a colour gradient according to polyandry at the control temperature. Polyandry was consistently higher after mating with heat-exposed males (right) versus control males (left; Table 3). The area of circles is proportional to the sample size. Raw values and sample sizes are given in Table S5. Note the smaller sample sizes for females first mated to heat-exposed males due to low mating success of heat-exposed males, limiting the power to detect genetic variation in behavioural plasticity.

**Table 1:** Summary statistics and sample sizes.

Temperature	Control (23°C)		Heat-exposure (31°C)		Heat effect	Full model	Illustration
	Old	Young	Old	Young			
<i>main experiment</i>							
Male mortality (N)	2% (285)	0.8% (260)	52% (460)	2% (510)	(↑)	Table S2	Fig S3
Mating success (N)	91% (163)	84% (230)	24% (148)	33% (381)	↓	Table S1	Fig 1
Copulation latency [min] (N)	3.4±3.2 (147)	8.2±17.5 (192)	16.5±25.8 (36)	18.5±23.6 (124)	↑	Table S1	Fig 1 & S1
Copulation duration [sec] (N)	6.6±2.3 (148)	5.9±1.8 (194)	4.9±2.0 (36)	5.7±5.1 (123)	↓	Table S1	Fig S1
4d fecundity (N)	42.3±19.8 (147)	43.2±19.0 (192)	33.3±25.0 (35)	9.8±18.6 (125)	↓	Table 2	Fig 2
Polyandry (N)	44% (147)	40% (136)	77% (35)	85% (109)	↑	Table 3	Fig 3
<i>additional males</i>							
Male fertility (N)	4.8±0.7 (9)	3.1±1.2 (8)	2.0±1.3 (11)	0.5±0.7 (11)	↓		
4d fecundity (N)	229±65 (9)	131±63 (8)	78±38 (9)	41±26 (5)	↓		

Given are mean, standard deviation and sample sizes for survival, mating behaviours and reproductive output. The effect of male heat-exposure is indicated by arrows. For detailed results see the full models as indicated in the last column.



**Table 2:** Model summary for female reproductive output.

<i>Fixed/Random effects</i>	<b>Conditional model</b>				<b>Zero-inflation model</b>					
	<b>Coef</b>	<b>SE (Coef)</b>	<b>z</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>Var</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Coef</b>	<b>SE (Coef)</b>	<b>z</b>	<b>p</b>
Intercept [control; forced monandry; Vial A (d1–5)]	42.777	2.775	15.41	<b>&lt;0.001</b>			–5.624	0.942	–5.97	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Heat-exposure	–28.826	7.456	–3.87	<b>&lt;0.001</b>			6.509	0.778	8.37	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Chosen monandry (Mono)	3.169	2.544	1.25	0.213			–0.648	1.020	–0.64	0.525
Chosen polyandry (Poly)	0.894	2.705	0.33	0.741			3.876	0.904	4.29	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
First mate's size (centred & scaled)	–1.106	0.565	–1.96	<b>0.050</b>						
Vial B (d5–9)	–16.407	3.038	–5.40	<b>&lt;0.001</b>			2.395	0.934	2.57	<b>0.010</b>
Vial C (d9–13)	–6.657	3.186	–2.09	<b>0.037</b>			3.512	0.918	3.83	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Male cohort (old)							–0.705	0.226	–3.12	<b>0.002</b>
Heat:Mono	30.004	8.566	3.50	<b>&lt;0.001</b>			–0.632	0.725	–0.87	0.383
Heat:Poly	17.664	7.976	2.22	<b>0.027</b>			–4.237	0.696	–6.09	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Heat:Vial B	28.646	11.099	2.58	<b>0.010</b>			–2.425	0.636	–3.81	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Heat:Vial C	0.711	12.416	0.06	0.954			–3.140	0.558	–5.63	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Mono:Vial B	–5.725	3.514	–1.63	0.103			0.772	0.949	0.81	0.416
Mono:Vial C	–11.299	3.683	–3.07	<b>0.002</b>			0.897	0.977	0.92	0.358
Poly:Vial B	–4.031	3.725	–1.08	0.279			–3.312	0.854	–3.88	<b>&lt;0.001</b>

Table 2 (continued)

Fixed/Random effects	Conditional model				Zero-inflation model					
	Coef	SE (Coef)	z	p	Var	SD	Coef	SE (Coef)	z	p
Poly:Vial C	-6.831	3.914	-1.75	0.081			-3.287	0.850	-3.87	<0.001
Heat:Mono:Vial B	-32.379	12.860	-2.52	<b>0.012</b>						
Heat:Mono:Vial C	-21.605	14.467	-1.49	0.135						
Heat:Poly:Vial B	-15.155	11.634	-1.30	0.193						
Heat:Poly:Vial C	12.732	12.929	0.99	0.325						
<i>Individual female</i>					7.70	2.77				
<i>Female:Vial (random slopes)</i>					<0.01	0.02				
<i>Female isoline (10 levels)</i>					26.17	5.12				
<i>Male collection batch (16 levels)</i>					3.59	1.90				
<i>Residual</i>					245.20	15.66				


The conditional model describes the Gaussian component of female reproductive output (498 females) while the zero-inflation model accounts for the likelihood of reproductive failure. The model with the lowest AIC value was chosen as the best model. See Table S4 for an overview of models and associated AIC values.

**Table 3:** Full model summary for polyandry.

binomial GLMM (N = 427)						
<b>Fixed/Random effects</b>	<b>Coef</b>	<b>SE (Coef)</b>	<b>z</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>Var</b>	<b>SD</b>
Intercept (control; young cohort)	-0.163	0.246	-0.66	0.508		
Heat-exposure	1.910	0.408	4.68	<b>&lt;0.001</b>		
4d reproductive output (centred & scaled)	-0.411	0.164	-2.51	<b>0.012</b>		
First mate's size (centred & scaled)	-0.220	0.136	-1.62	0.105		
Female age (centred)	0.513	0.271	1.89	0.059		
Order in assay (centred & scaled)	0.097	0.145	0.67	0.504		
Heat:Reproductive_output	-0.337	0.295	-1.14	0.253		
Heat:First_mate_size	-0.650	0.348	-1.87	0.062		
<i>Male collection batch (16 levels)</i>					<0.001	<0.001
<i>Female isoline (10 levels)</i>					0.38	0.62
<i>Heat:Female_isoline (random slopes)</i>					0.21	0.46


Four-day reproductive output corresponds to the number of offspring eclosed from the vial in which a female was housed between her first mating and the remating opportunity. Random slopes for female isolines were included to test for genetic variation in behavioural plasticity (G x E; see Fig 3).

**Figure 1:**




Pre-peer-review

Figure 2:



Pre-peer-

Figure 3:



Pre-1

ript

# Electronic supplementary material

## Adaptively flexible polyandry by female flies when males are infertile

Andreas Sutter<sup>1,2,†</sup>, Laura M Travers<sup>1,2</sup>, Keiko Oku<sup>1</sup>, Kynan Delaney<sup>1</sup>, Stefan Store<sup>1</sup>, Tom A. R. Price<sup>3</sup>, & Nina Wedell<sup>1</sup>

1. Centre for Ecology & Conservation, College of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter, Cornwall Campus, TR10 9FE, Penryn, UK.
2. School of Biological Sciences, Norwich Research Park, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK
3. Institute of Integrative Biology, University of Liverpool, Crown Street, Liverpool, L69 7ZB, UK

† [a.sutter@exeter.ac.uk](mailto:a.sutter@exeter.ac.uk)

### Index

- [Supplementary results](#)
- [Supplementary tables](#)
  - Table S1; Table S2; Table S3; Table S4; Table S5
- [Supplementary figures](#)
  - Figure S1; Figure S2; Figure S3

### Supplementary results

To investigate whether reduced mating success for heat-exposed males was caused by female discrimination against heat-exposed males or reduced courtship by heat-exposed males, we recorded and analysed data on courtship latency in the second experimental block. Courtship latency was longer for heat-exposed males. This was true both for eventually successful and unsuccessful males (Table 2; Fig S1). Additionally, of the males that did not mate, heat-exposed males were more likely not to have been observed courting (71% versus 50% for control males). And in the subset of males that were observed to both court and mate, latency from courtship initiation to mating tended to be longer for heat-exposed males (3.6 versus 1.5min), though the effect was not statistically significant, probably because of the small sample size ( $N = 52$ ). In combination, these results suggest that heat-exposed males were slower and less likely to initiate courtship, and that their courtship quality or intensity may have been inferior to that of control males.

## Supplementary tables

**Table S1:** Model summaries for mating behaviours. Note that courtship behaviour was only measured in the second experimental block.

Fixed/Random effects	Mating success (binomial GLMM; N = 916)						Copulation latency (log LMM; N = 496)						Copulation duration (log LMM; N = 487)					
	Coef	SE (Coef)	z	p	Var	SD	Coef	SE (Coef)	t	p	Var	SD	Coef	SE (Coef)	t	p	Var	SD
Intercept (control; young cohort)	2.078	0.223	9.31	<0.001	-	-	5.248	0.104	50.70	<0.001	-	-	5.866	0.060	97.71	<0.001	-	-
Heat-exposure	-3.116	0.219	-14.21	<0.001	-	-	1.056	0.113	9.37	<0.001	-	-	-0.252	0.051	-4.99	<0.001	-	-
Cohort (older; centred)	0.357	0.340	1.05	0.294	-	-	-0.446	0.113	-3.94	<0.001	-	-	0.109	0.051	2.14	<b>0.033</b>	-	-
Heat:Cohort	-0.980	0.406	-2.41	<b>0.016</b>	-	-	0.233	0.221	1.05	0.293	-	-	-0.168	0.099	-1.69	0.092	-	-
Block (centred)	-0.548	0.185	-2.96	<b>0.003</b>	-	-	0.101	0.099	1.03	0.308	-	-	0.110	0.044	2.49	<b>0.014</b>	-	-
Female age (centred)	-0.040	0.218	-0.18	0.855	-	-	-0.182	0.121	-1.51	0.134	-	-	-0.082	0.054	-1.51	0.134	-	-
Male size (centred & scaled)	0.324	0.097	3.36	<b>0.001</b>	-	-	-0.035	0.053	-0.65	0.514	-	-	-0.036	0.024	-1.51	0.132	-	-
Order in assay (centred & scaled)	-0.346	0.092	-3.75	<0.001	-	-	0.055	0.048	1.15	0.255	-	-	0.007	0.021	0.34	0.735	-	-
Mating (yes vs no)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female housing vial ( $\leq 93$ levels)	-	-	-	-	0.059	0.244	-	-	-	-	<0.001	<0.001	-	-	-	-	<0.001	<0.001
Female isoline (10 levels)	-	-	-	-	0.061	0.247	-	-	-	-	0.009	0.096	-	-	-	-	<0.001	<0.001
Male population (4 levels)	-	-	-	-	0.052	0.227	-	-	-	-	0.027	0.164	-	-	-	-	0.012	0.109
Residual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.987	0.994	-	-	-	-	0.197	0.444

Fixed/Random effects	Courtship latency (log LMM; N = 127)						Courtship duration (log LMM; N = 52)					
	Coef	SE (Coef)	t	p	Var	SD	Coef	SE (Coef)	t	p	Var	SD
Intercept (control; young cohort)	5.924	0.266	22.29	<0.001	-	-	4.531	0.341	13.29	<0.001	-	-
Heat-exposure	1.191	0.289	4.11	<0.001	-	-	0.764	0.562	1.36	0.180	-	-
Cohort (older; centred)	-0.521	0.376	-1.38	0.169	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Heat:Cohort	1.079	0.521	2.07	<b>0.041</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Block (centred)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female age (centred)	-0.107	0.315	-0.34	0.743	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male size (centred & scaled)	-0.098	0.143	-0.69	0.496	-	-	-0.219	0.290	-0.76	0.454	-	-
Order in assay (centred & scaled)	0.313	0.124	2.53	<b>0.013</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mating (yes vs no)	-0.933	0.276	-3.38	<b>0.001</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female housing vial ( $\leq 93$ levels)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female isoline (10 levels)	-	-	-	-	0.016	0.128	-	-	-	-	-	-
Male population (4 levels)	-	-	-	-	<0.001	<0.001	-	-	-	-	<0.001	<0.001



*Residual*

- - - - 1.438 1.199 - - - - 3.767 1.941

---

Pre-peer-review-manuscript

**Table S2:** Full model summary for male survival under heat-exposure and control temperature. Vials containing groups of up to ten males were submerged in water baths at 23°C or 31°C for two-and-a-half (young cohort; see main text) or three days (old cohort). Experimental block was centred as described in the main text. Effects associated with a p value smaller than 0.05 are highlighted in bold.

binomial GLMM (N = 1645)						
<b>Fixed/Random effects</b>	<b>Coef</b>	<b>SE (Coef)</b>	<b>z</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>Var</b>	<b>SD</b>
Intercept (control; young cohort)	5.570	0.813	6.85	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	-	-
Heat-exposure	-1.053	0.869	-1.21	0.226	-	-
Cohort (old)	-0.833	0.941	-0.89	0.376	-	-
Heat:Cohort	-3.770	1.053	-3.58	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	-	-
Block (centred)	0.929	0.349	2.67	<b>0.008</b>	-	-
<i>Housing vial (155 levels)</i>	-	-	-	-	1.51	1.23
<i>Population (4 levels)</i>	-	-	-	-	<0.001	<0.001

**Table S3:** Full model summary for male size (length of wing L3 [mm]). Only males surviving the heat-exposure/control were measured. Virgin collection batch corresponds to unique combinations of virgin collection day and population cage.

LMM (N = 925)							
<b>Fixed/Random effects</b>	<b>Coef</b>	<b>SE (Coef)</b>	<b>ddf</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>	<b>Var</b>	<b>SD</b>
Intercept (control; young cohort)	1.435	0.020	15.2	73.182	<0.001	-	-
Heat-exposure	-0.004	0.010	907.0	-0.569	0.569	-	-
Cohort (old)	0.021	0.028	15.8	0.783	0.445	-	-
Heat:Cohort	-0.008	0.013	907.6	-0.576	0.565	-	-
<i>Virgin collection batch (16 levels)</i>	-	-	-	-	-	0.003	0.053
<i>Residual</i>	-	-	-	-	-	0.008	0.091

**Table S4:** Overview of models for reproductive output. Models were run using glmmTMB and were sorted along ascending AIC values. All conditional models included random intercepts for female ID, female isolate, male collection batch (unique combinations of population, age cohort and block), and random slopes for individual females across the three laying vials (see main text).


	Conditional model										Zero-inflation model								df	AIC	ΔAIC
	Intercept	Heat-exposure	Mating (FM, Mono, Poly)	First mate's size	Vial (A-C)	Heat:Mating	Heat:Vial	Mating:Vial	Heat:Size	Heat:Mating:Vial	Intercept	Heat-exposure	Mating (FM, Mono, Poly)	Vial (A-C)	Male cohort	Heat:Mating	Heat:Vial	Mating:Vial			
Model 1	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	39	11648.5	0.0
Model 2	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	40	11650.1	1.6
Model 3	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	38	11650.3	1.9
Model 4	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	42	11654.6	6.1
Model 5	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	41	11662.5	14.0
Model 6	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	34	11664.5	16.0
Model 7	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	32	11668.0	19.5
Model 8	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	38	11668.7	20.2
Model 9	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	32	11671.9	23.4
Model 10	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	36	11672.3	23.8
Model 11	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	30	11674.6	26.1
Model 12	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	36	11676.2	27.7
Model 13	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	30	11677.0	28.6
Model 14	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	28	11678.7	30.2
Model 15	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	34	11679.3	30.9
Model 16	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	34	11681.5	33.0
Model 17	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	32	11683.4	34.9
Model 18	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	28	11686.6	38.1
Model 19	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	24	11689.0	40.5
Model 20	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	23	11690.5	42.0
Model 21	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	32	11691.7	43.2
Model 22	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	26	11692.8	44.3
Model 23	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	25	11693.9	45.4
Model 24	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	30	11697.9	49.4
Model 25	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	29	11705.9	57.4
Model 26	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	30	11769.4	120.9
Model 27	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	29	11792.6	144.1
Model 28	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	19	11805.1	156.6
Model 29	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	19	11808.8	160.3
Model 30	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	26	11839.8	191.3
Model 31	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	17	11848.1	199.7
Model 32	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	15	11861.8	213.3
Model 33	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	15	11879.2	230.7
Model 34	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	33	11879.7	231.2
Model 35	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	13	11891.8	243.3
Model 36	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	22	11915.6	267.1
Model 37	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	24	11918.9	270.4
Model 38	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	23	11923.8	275.3
Model 39	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	21	11923.8	275.3
Model 40	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	21	11923.8	275.3
Model 41	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	27	11946.7	298.2
Model 42	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	27	11967.7	319.2
Model 43	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	25	11971.9	323.4
Model 44	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	23	12006.9	358.4
Model 45	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	16	12010.8	362.3
Model 46	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	14	12020.6	372.1
Model 47	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	14	12036.6	388.1
Model 48	x																		7	not converged	

**Table S5:** Summary statistics for isofemale isolines. Percentages and sample sizes for mating and remating, and early fecundity of females paired with a control (23°C) or a heat-exposed (31°C) male. Note the smaller sample sizes for polyandry and fecundity due to low mating success of heat-exposed males.


Population	Isoline	Mating				Polyandry				4d Fecundity			
		23C	N	31C	N	23C	N	31C	N	23C	N	31C	N
Show Low	SLOB3	90%	41	42%	55	55%	31	94%	18	41.6±21.8	37	9.2±18.4	22
Show Low	2SLOC4	85%	41	47%	55	14%	28	91%	23	43.5±21.2	35	5.8±11.7	26
Show Low	SLOC48	90%	40	32%	56	52%	31	65%	17	49.1±20.2	35	27.1±27.2	18
Show Low	2SLOD29	85%	40	38%	55	15%	27	68%	19	48.3±17.9	34	16.2±27.2	21
Show Low	2SLOD33	85%	40	13%	56	57%	28	100%	7	46.5±18.9	34	0±0	7
Show Low	2SLOD6	83%	40	25%	55	41%	27	92%	13	47.5±16.8	33	16±20.9	14
Lewistown	LEW17	83%	40	37%	54	27%	30	71%	17	32.5±15.1	33	18.6±22.8	20
Lewistown	LEW23	88%	41	20%	55	57%	30	78%	9	42.2±16.1	36	15.6±21.2	11
Lewistown	LEW3	93%	40	18%	56	50%	30	100%	10	37.8±17.7	37	15.5±22.9	10
Lewistown	LEW64	83%	40	30%	56	46%	26	94%	16	37.3±20.9	33	20.1±24.9	17

### Supplementary figures

**Figure S1:** Male heat-exposure affects multiple aspects of sexual behaviour. Courtship latencies (note the log-scale) of males that did not mate are shown as open circles. Bars illustrate approximate 95% confidence intervals, taken as twice the standard error calculated on the log-scale. Heat-exposed males (red) were less likely to court and mate, took longer to initiate courtship and to procure a mating, and mated for a shorter duration than control males (blue; see Tables 1 & S2).



**Figure S2:** Lower reproductive output after the first mating is associated with increased polyandry. Ticks represent individual females, initially mated to heat-exposed (red) or control males (blue). Individual females are represented by ticks. Circles illustrate average polyandry for females within ranges of similar reproductive output (shaded horizontal bars), with surface area proportional to sample size. Irrespective of reproductive output, polyandry was higher after mating with heat-exposed males (main effect of male heat-exposure). The interaction between reproductive output and male heat-exposure was not significant (see Table 3) but is retained here for illustrative purposes.



**Figure S3:** Heat-exposure decreased survival only in the older male cohort. Vials containing groups of up to 10 males were transferred into water baths set to 23°C (blue) or 31°C (red) one to two days (older cohort) or immediately (younger cohort) after eclosion. In contrast to survival (Table S2), mating performance was similar for younger and older males after heat-exposure (see Tables 1 & S1). Solid Bars illustrate approximate 95% confidence intervals and point surface area is proportional to the number of vials tested.

