GENETIC VARIATION AND SOCIALITY IN A PRIMATE SPECIES

Marie J. E. Charpentier^{1,2,*}, Franck Prugnolle³, Olivier Gimenez^{2,4} and Anja Widdig^{5,6,*}

¹ Department of Biology, Duke University, North Carolina, USA

² Centre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive, CNRS, France

³ Génétique et Evolution des Maladies Infectieuses, IRD-CNRS, France

⁴ Centre for Research into Ecological and Environmental Modelling, University of St Andrews, Scotland

⁵ Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Department of Primatology, Leipzig, Germany

⁶ Caribbean Primate Research Center, Puerto Rico, USA

*These two authors contributed equally to this work.

Running head: Genetic and behavior in macaques

Correspondence to:

Dr Marie Charpentier

Duke University

Science Drive, Biological Bldg 020

24 PO 90338
25 Durham, NC 27708, USA
26 Phone: (+1) 919 660 7291
27 Fax: (+1) 919 660 7293
28 Email: mariecharp@yahoo.fr
29

ABSTRACT

The relationship between an individual's genotype and its phenotype is a central issue in biology, but one that is largely unexplored for the important phenotype of complex social behavior. Here we examine the relationship between heterozygosity and social behavior among unrelated adult female rhesus macaques living on the island of Cayo Santiago (Puerto Rico). We show that female macaques with lower mean neutral heterozygosity were discriminated against by their unrelated conspecifics: less heterozygous females received aggressive behavior at higher rates and received affiliation at lower rates than more heterozygous females. We demonstrate that these results are likely due to local genomic effects associated with particular microsatellite loci. Our study suggests that genetic characteristics can impact the way an individual experiences its social environment and that female macaques that are homozygous at two microsatellite loci are potentially socially isolated and avoided by unrelated conspecifics.

Words: 143

Keywords: correlations heterozygosity/fitness; local effect; social behavior; *Macaca mulatta*

Social behavior has been shown to impact fitness in a range of animal species. For example, cooperative behaviors, such as coalitions or helping behaviors in cooperative breeding systems, enhance reproductive success of red howler monkeys (*Alouatta seniculus*; Pope 2000), of subordinate wild turkeys (*Meleagris gallopavo*; Krakauer 2005), or of helper long-tailed tits (*Aegithalos caudatus*; Hatchwell et al. 2004). Grooming behavior presents both social (Dunbar 1988) and hygienic functions by potentially decreasing parasite loads (Saunders and Hausfater 1985) in addition to reducing heart rate in receivers (Boccia et al. 1989; Aureli et al. 1999). Furthermore, grooming has also been demonstrated to reduce stress levels, through decrease in glucocorticoid levels in receivers (Gust et al. 1993) and more surprisingly, initiators (Shutt et al. 2007). The strength of female social bonds (higher sociality index) has been shown to enhance offspring survival in wild savanna baboons (Silk et al. 2003). This non-exhaustive list of examples illustrates how social behaviors may impact fitness correlates for individuals that display them and, hence, illustrates indirectly the adaptive value of sociality in animal species.

A series of recent studies underscores the diversity of approaches that can be taken to broaden our understanding of genetic sources of behavioral variation in animal populations (Plomin et al. 2001). A prominent example involves the effects of neurotransmitters (e.g., serotonin, dopamine and norepinephrine) on reproductive output, aggression, impulsivity, the timing of migration, and some measures of sociality in nonhuman primates (Mehlman et al. 1995; Higley et al. 1996; Fairbanks et al. 1999; Fairbanks 2001; Gerald et al. 2002). Recently, an orthologous gene of the human serotonin transporter gene (SLC6A4) present in rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*) has been shown to influence the timing of migration and reproductive rates in males (Trefilov et al. 2000;

Krawczak et al. 2005), giving clear observational evidence of the compelling relationship between genotypes and social behaviors.

Heterozygosity, one aspect of genotype, has been associated with a range of fitness-related phenotypes in a variety of organisms (see for review Crnokrak and Roff 1999; Keller and Waller 2002). These phenotypes have included survival (Coulson et al. 1998), reproduction (Amos et al. 2001; Charpentier et al. 2005), disease resistance (Coltman et al. 1999), disease susceptibility (Acevedo-Whitehouse 2003), as well as male's secondary sexual traits (Müller and Ward 1995; Aparicio et al. 2001). Even though studies on the effect of genetic heterozygosity on a range of fitness-related traits are numerous, its influence on social behavior has been given little consideration. However, there are evidences that both aggressive behaviors and competitive abilities are influenced by levels of inbreeding in mice (Barnard and Fitzsimons 1989; Eklund 1996; Meagher et al. 2000) and drosophila (Latter and Robertson 1962; Latter and Sved 1994).

The current study was motivated by the observation that heterozygosity alone can influence social behavior, as recently demonstrated in fishes, where highly heterozygous salmons (*Salmo salar*) are able to initiate more costly aggressive behaviors than more homozygous ones, increasing their competitive abilities (Tiira et al. 2003). The rationale underlying relationships between heterozygosity and behavior can be summarized into two hypotheses. First, homozygous individuals could be physically weaker or in poorer condition, either because of inbreeding depression or because homozygosity at key loci can reduce fitness. The best example to illustrate the latter is the heterozygote advantage at genes of the major histocompatibility complex (MHC; reviewed in Apanius et al. 1997). Heterozygous individuals at MHC genes (in vertebrates) have been shown to better resist

95 parasites (Apanius et al. 1997). Consequently, high allelic diversity at MHC genes has been
96 maintained by balancing selection in most vertebrate populations (Klein 1986; Hughes and
97 Nei 1988; Loisel et al. 2006). Furthermore, both Trefilov et al. (2000) and Krawczak et al.
98 (2005) found some evidence of heterozygote advantages at the orthologous gene of the
99 human serotonin transporter gene (SLC6A4) in rhesus macaques in the form of
100 intermediate age at dispersal in heterozygous males and higher reproductive success in
101 heterozygous males who are in their prime (respectively). We speculate that these
102 homozygous individuals could in turn be less involved in the social life within their group,
103 because they just cannot display as many costly behaviors, such as aggressiveness, as fitter
104 individuals.

105 Second, if homozygous individuals are physically weaker, they could constitute less
106 attractive social partners, because their conspecifics will not enjoy fitness advantages to
107 interact with them. Indeed, if homozygous individuals are less able to display defensive
108 behaviors and/or are less prone to form coalitions, they could just represent less attractive
109 social partners. In the same way, more homozygous individuals could also be more
110 susceptible to pathogens, as observed in sea lions (Acevedo-Whitehouse 2003), and
111 parasitized individuals could act as effective reservoirs of infectious agents and could
112 therefore pose a risk to their congeners, which in turns could socially avoid them (e.g.
113 Kiesecker et al. 1999).

114 Our goal was to examine the relationship between multi-locus heterozygosity and
115 multiple complex social behaviors between non-kin in a highly social primate. For the
116 purpose of our study, we studied the well-known rhesus macaque population living on the
117 island of Cayo Santiago (Puerto Rico). We hypothesized that more homozygous individuals

would exhibit social deficits, either because they are less able to display costly behaviors or because they constitute less attractive social partners.

METHODS

Behavioral observations

All individuals present in the island of Cayo Santiago, a 15.2 ha island off the coast of Puerto Rico, are direct descendants of 400 animals captured in India in 1938 (Rawlins and Kessler 1986). This study focused on 51 of 91 rhesus macaques females in group R, aged from one to nine years old at the beginning of the study. Females >9 years old (N=40) were excluded from data collection because we lacked paternity information for them which was the focus of the original study (Widdig et al. 2001; 2002). The fact that we did not consider older females could have potentially influenced our findings if the effects of heterozygosity differ with age, beginning at ages > 9 years. While we cannot rule out this hypothesis, combined behavior and genetic data are not yet available for females older than 9 years. We, however, think that the relationship we found between heterozygosity and behavior (see results) should be interpreted in the light of this age restriction.

A total of 958 hours of focal data (Altmann 1974) were collected on these females between May and December 1997, using 20 min focal samples. Analyses were limited to non-physical aggression (i.e., threats and other gestures that did not entail physical contact between opponents, as data on physical aggression were too limited) and three types of affiliative activity (i.e., grooming, approaches, and occurrence of proximity – 5m radius – between two individuals) that occurred during a focal observation (Widdig et al. 2001; 2002). All behaviors were analyzed as bouts, i.e., the occurrence of behaviors rather than

time-periods (see Table 1 for details on the studied behaviors). We indicated whether the focal female initiated or received each behavior (except in the case of proximity where no such differentiation could be made). We further restricted our analyses to non-kin dyads ($N = 1848$) because considering related dyads was problematic. Indeed, the free-ranging and provisioned nature of our study population implies that more kin live in the same social group compared to the wild. We therefore decided to restrict our analyses to non-kin dyads to avoid potential biases due to the setting of the studied population. The 51 studied females belonged to three different matriline and had between 18 and 79 unrelated females in the group (mean $\pm$ s.e.m.: 36.24 ± 2.93).

Genetic analysis

All 51 focal females involved in this study were genotyped at 13 microsatellite loci (Nürnberg et al. 1998; Widdig et al. 2001). Mean heterozygosity per female was calculated as the number of heterozygous loci divided by 13 (mean $\pm$ s.e.m.: 0.73 ± 0.02 , range: 0.38-0.92; and see Table 2). Pairs of females were considered unrelated ($r \sim 0.00$) when they were (a) born into different matriline (with matrilineal relationships traced back to 1956), and (b) paternally unrelated (i.e., they were neither paternal half-siblings nor descendants of paternal half-siblings). Paternal kinship was assessed by genotyping all group members, including all potential sires (Nürnberg et al. 1998; Widdig et al. 2001), but paternity was only known for a maximum of three generations.

Genomewide inbreeding or local effects?

Heterozygosity will affect phenotypes either because it reflects genome wide inbreeding, or because one or more microsatellite loci are physically linked to functional loci. If heterozygosity reflects genome wide inbreeding, then more homozygous individuals should be uniformly homozygous across all tested markers (Balloux et al. 2004). We randomly generated two data subsets from the single data set of genotypes on the entire population of macaques genotyped at 13 loci ($N = 566$ individuals). Each data subset contained six or seven randomly chosen microsatellite loci from the full set of 13 analyzed loci. We examined the correlation between individual heterozygosity measures in the two data subsets, and then repeated the procedure (generating two data subsets and examining the correlation) 100 times using SPLUS 2000. A significantly positive value for the mean of the 100 'heterozygosity-heterozygosity correlations would indicate that heterozygous individuals tend to be uniformly heterozygous across all loci. Therefore, the higher the correlation, the more precisely heterozygosity reflects inbreeding in the population (Pemberton 2004).

In a second step, we investigated the influence of locus-specific heterozygosity (considered as a binary variable with 1 when a given locus was heterozygous, and 0 if homozygous) upon each of the social behaviours that were pointed out by the analyses (see below).

Statistical analyses

Poisson regressions were used to model the relationship between each of the behavioral response variables (aggression and affiliation) and several predictor variables defined below, so that seven distinct analyses were performed. While the behaviors of

different individuals were assumed to be independent, the behaviors of each individual female were most likely correlated across her relationships, so we incorporated the identity of a given focal female as a repeated variable. The total duration of the focal sampling for each female was also included as an offset in the regressions. Because some behaviors were rarely observed during observations, resulting in excess zeros and overdispersion, we used zero-inflated Poisson (ZIP) regressions with random effects (Hall 2000) to improve statistical inference (see Supplementary Information). Following Martin et al. (2005), we conveniently used Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling (Gilks et al. 1996) in a Bayesian framework (see Supplementary Information).

In addition to heterozygosity, we now describe the other predictor variables that were used in the analyses of social behaviors. Previous studies have shown that the difference in age between females affects social behaviors (Widdig et al. 2001; Smith et al. 2003; Silk et al. 2006), and so we considered whether the social partner was the focal's peer (born in the same birth cohort) or non-peer (born in a different birth cohort), as defined by Widdig et al. (2002). Because the 51 focal females varied greatly in age, we also considered the age of the focal females. Finally, we took into account their social rank as a co-variable: we collected focal and all occurrence data on aggression in order to construct a dominance hierarchy of the adult females. We classified females as high-, mid-, and low-ranking females. Females that had not yet entered the adult dominance hierarchy (i.e., they were less than two years old) were ranked directly below their mother, the rank that they would most likely assume as adults. However, we also re-did the analysis excluding the 13 females aged less than two years old. Results did not change. Predictor variables were examined for collinearity, using Spearman rank correlations. The effects of the three co-

variables (peers/non-peers; age and social rank) on social behavior are widely discussed elsewhere (Pope 2000; Widdig et al. 2002) and the only aim of considering them in these analyses was to use them as a control to avoid confounding effects. The results obtained on these co-variables are therefore neither presented, nor discussed here.

To test the influence of heterozygosity on social behavior, we calculated the posterior distribution that this effect was positive (or negative, respectively) as the fraction of the number of MCMC iterations in which the corresponding regression parameter was positive (or negative, respectively). As a threshold, we have considered that Bayesian significance was achieved for posterior probabilities $\geq 90\%$ (Draper 2000; Link and Barker 2005), which corresponds to fairly good betting odds – about 10 to 1 – in favor of an influence of heterozygosity. In contrast with the frequentist approach using P-values, the Bayesian approach allows us to identify effects of biological importance as well as statistical significant by explicitly calculating the strength of evidence of such effects while coping with effect size, that is, the magnitude and precision of the effect (Anderson et al. 2001).

In a second step, we investigated the influence of locus-specific heterozygosity (considered as a binary variable with 1 when a given locus was heterozygous, and 0 if homozygous) upon each of the two social behaviours that were pointed out by the previous analyses (i.e., aggression and grooming received). For each of them, we considered the same model structure as above, except that the covariate heterozygosity was replaced by the 13 binary variables corresponding to the 13 loci. Rather than performing separate simple linear regressions (that might have led to flawed inference), we considered the 13 explanatory

variables in a multiple regression framework to account for possible co-variations between them. Those loci having a significant effect were determined using an extension of the MCMC algorithm used above – the so-called Reversible Jump MCMC (Green 1995) – that allowed us to perform model selection in a high-dimensional set of possible candidates (see Supplementary information).

RESULTS

Heterozygosity and social behaviors

We found that focal individuals with lower mean heterozygosity received higher rates of aggression from non-kin than more heterozygous females (Table 3 and Fig.1a), after controlling for female age and dominance rank and for the age difference between females, as well as for individual effects and other potential sources of statistical bias (see experimental procedures). However, we found no effect of heterozygosity on initiated aggression (Table 3 and Fig.1a). We also found that heterozygosity in focal females was positively correlated with the rate at which they received grooming from non-kin, such that more homozygous individuals received this type of affiliation at lower rates (Table 3 and Fig. 1b). This difference was not due to a decreased spatial association with conspecifics. Indeed, more homozygous females spent as much time in proximity to non-kin as more heterozygous females, and they initiated affiliative behaviors at similar rates (Table 3 and Fig. 1b). However, homozygous females were discriminated against by unrelated conspecifics; specifically, female macaques directed grooming behaviors towards more homozygous females at lower rates than they did towards more heterozygous females. Homozygous female macaques therefore appear to be actively socially avoided, in that they

both received less affiliation and also received more aggression from non-kin; i.e., they appear to constitute less attractive social partners.

Genomewide or local effect?

Mean heterozygosity calculated for the two randomly chosen groups of loci in our analysis were not significantly correlated (mean $\pm$ sem: $r_s = -0.023 \pm 0.003$; $P = 0.408 \pm 0.029$), indicating that more homozygous individuals were not necessarily uniformly homozygous across all loci. This suggested that the effects of heterozygosity that we detected on social behavior were probably due to local effects at one or few loci rather than a genome-wide effect of inbreeding.

To investigate which microsatellite loci particularly influenced the relationship between heterozygosity and behaviors, we re-analyzed our behavioral data using the 13 heterozygosities as co-variates. We found that heterozygosity at two out of 13 loci was particularly associated with variance in social behaviors (Table 4): locus D20S206 negatively influenced received aggression and locus D6S474 positively influenced received grooming. Hence, the local-effect hypothesis gained more support as a cause for association between neutral markers and fitness traits in our data than the genome-wide-effect hypothesis.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we found that genetic characteristics contribute to the social environment of an individual in complex social species such as primates, and particularly

that some females – those that tend to be more homozygous at particular loci – seem to be socially isolated and avoided by their unrelated conspecifics: they received less affiliation, in the form of grooming, and more aggressive behaviors from unrelated group members. The coarse-grained nature of the genetic analysis was complemented by the fine-grained nature of the behavioral data, and this combination produced an important result; the genetic characteristics of an individual influenced the manner in which its conspecifics behaved towards it. In matrilineal societies, such as most Old World primates, social relationships may confer fitness benefits e.g., through their impact on infant survival (Silk et al. 2003), through their impact on success in agonistic interactions (Sterck et al. 1997), and through the benefits of parasite removal through mutual grooming (Saunders and Hausfater 1985; see also Shutt et al. 2007). Social isolation, in contrast, may increase the risk of disease or disability through an increase of stress (House et al 1988). This behavioral discrimination by conspecifics may indicate social selection against both less socially and less physically capable individuals. While correlations between heterozygosity and fitness parameters – i.e., reproduction and survival – are common in the literature (Crnokrak and Roff 1999; Keller and Waller 2002), less is known about the influence of genetic characteristics on social behaviors. In this study we have shown that heterozygosity at particular microsatellite loci may contribute to the quality of social bonds between unrelated individuals and that homozygous individuals could constitute less attractive social partners for their unrelated conspecifics.

Genome-wide inbreeding vs. local effects

Correlations between heterozygosity and various fitness estimates, including some measurements of social behaviors, are usually interpreted to reflect either deleterious consequences of genome-wide inbreeding (because more inbred individuals are also more homozygous), or to reflect the fact that being heterozygous at particular loci, in and of itself, confers advantages (see for example: Lieutenant-Gosselin and Bernatchez 2006). There is currently much debate over whether the numerous examples of heterozygosity-fitness correlations found in several plant and animal species result from a genome-wide inbreeding or are due to one or more markers being linked to functional loci. Indeed, heterozygosity, even when measured over many markers, appears to be only weakly correlated with inbreeding coefficients (Balloux et al. 2004; Pemberton 2004; Slate et al. 2004), with the exception of populations showing high variance in individual's inbreeding (Slate et al. 2004).

Our analysis employed coarse-grained genetic characteristics and was therefore relatively uninformative about the genetic mechanisms underlying the relationship. Our results however strongly suggest that the effects found were not attributable to genome-wide inbreeding, but instead point to chromosomal regions of interest for potential candidate gene studies (Bean et al. 2004; Hansson et al. 2004). In this study, it seems likely that two of the microsatellite loci (D6S474 and D20S206) lie close enough to a balanced polymorphism for linkage to generate an association between heterozygosity and variation in behavior. Interestingly, these two loci were previously shown to be associated with certain phenotypes in humans. Locus D6S474 was recurrently shown to be associated with alcohol dependence (Camp and Bansal 1999; Sun et al. 1999), while locus D20S206 flanks a region that seems involved in human myeloid disorders (Wang et al. 1998).

Our study highlights the importance of potential local genetic effects in heterozygosity / fitness correlates relationships, as already suggested by a growing number of studies (Bean et al. 2004; Hansson et al. 2004; Markert et al. 2004; Spielman et al. 2004; Lieutenant-Gosselin and Bernatchez 2006; Tiira et al. 2006). One question remains open though: why homozygosity *per se* at any given locus would confer disadvantages, and above all why these disadvantages would take the form of conspecific discrimination. Answering this question will require the refinement of our knowledge of the genetic basis of the observed behaviors. In this respect, the recent completion of a draft sequence of the rhesus macaque genome (Rhesus Macaque Genome Sequencing and Analysis Consortium, 2007) as well as the very recent identification of about 23, 000 SNPs (Single Nucleotide Polymorphisms) distributed all over the genome (Malhi et al. 2007) may help doing so.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to the CPRC for permission to conduct this study. Furthermore, we are grateful to Fred Bercovitch, Matt Kessler, John Berard, Joerg Schmidtke, Peter Nürnberg and Michael Krawczak for their efforts to start continuous paternity analyses on Cayo Santiago as early as 1992. Andrea Trefilov, Heike Roessler and Ingrid Barth partly conducted the paternity analysis. We thank Linda Vigilant, Tim Coulson, Bill Amos and Courtney Fitzpatrick for their helpful comments on an earlier version of the manuscript. Finally, we are most grateful to Susan Alberts who gave us numerous advices and helpful comments during both the analyses and the writing of this manuscript. This publication was made possible by Grant Number CM-5-P40RR003640-13 awarded to the CPRC from the National Center for Research Resources (NCRR), a component of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of NCRR or NIH. Further support was provided by the UPR Medical Sciences Campus, the German Science Foundation with an Emmy Noether grant to Anja Widdig (WI 1801/1-2) and Marie-Curie Outgoing and Intra-European Fellowships to both Marie Charpentier and Olivier Gimenez respectively.

REFERENCES

- Acevedo-Whitehouse K, Gulland F, Grieg D, Amos W (2003) Disease susceptibility in California sea lions *Nature* 422: 6227.
- Altmann J (1974) Observational study of behavior: sampling methods *Behaviour* 49: 227-267.
- Amos W, Worthington Wilmer J, Fullard K, Burg TM, Croxall JP, Bloch D, Coulson T (2001) The influence of parental relatedness on reproductive success *Proc Roy Soc Lond B* 268: 2021-2027.
- Anderson DR, Link WA, Johnson DH, Burnham K P (2001) Suggestions for presenting the results of data analyses *J Wildlife Manage* 65: 373-378.
- Apanius V, Penn D, Slev PR, Ruff LR, Potts WK (1997) The nature of selection on the major histocompatibility complex. *CRC Cr Rev Immunol* 17: 179-224.
- Aparicio JM, Cordero PJ, Veiga JP (2001) A test of the hypothesis of mate choice based on heterozygosity in the spotless starling. *Anim Behav* 62: 1001-1006.
- Aureli F, Preston SD, de Waal FBM (1999) Heart rate responses to social interactions in free-moving rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*): a pilot study *J Comp Psychol* 113: 59–65.
- Balloux F, Amos W, Coulson T (2004) Does heterozygosity estimate inbreeding in real populations? *Mol Ecol* 13: 3021-3031.
- Barnard CJ, Fitzsimons J (1989) Kin recognition and mate choice in mice: fitness consequences of mating with kin. *Anim Behav* 38: 35–40.

372 Bean K, Amos W, Pomeroy PP, Twiss SD, Coulson TN, Boyd IL (2004) Patterns of
 373 parental relatedness and pup survival in the grey seal (*Halichoerus grypus*). Mol Ecol 13:
 374 2365-2370.

375 Boccia ML, Reite M, Laudenslager M (1989) On the physiology of grooming in a pigtail
 376 macaque. Physiol Behav 45: 667–670.

377 Camp NJ, Bansal A (1999) A low density genome-wide search for loci involved in alcohol
 378 dependence using the transmission/disequilibrium test, sib-TDT, and two combined tests.
 379 Genet Epidemiol 17 (Suppl 1): 85-90.

380 Charpentier M, Setchell JM, Prugnolle F, Knapp LA, Wickings EJ, Peignot P, Hossaert-
 381 McKey M (2005) Genetic diversity and reproductive success and in mandrills
 382 (*Mandrillus sphinx*). P Natl Acad Sci USA 102: 16723-16728.

383 Coltman D, Pilkington J, Smith J, Pemberton J (1999) Parasite-mediated selection against
 384 inbred Soay sheep in a free-living, island population. Evolution 53: 1259-1267.

385 Coulson TN, Pemberton JM, Albon SD, Beaumont M, Marshall TC, Slate J, Guinness FE,
 386 Clutton-Brock TH (1998) Microsatellites reveal heterosis in red deer. Proc Roy Soc
 387 Lond B 267: 489-495.

388 Crnokrak P, Roff DA (1999) Inbreeding depression in the wild. Heredity 83: 260-270.

389 Draper D (2000) Bayesian Hierarchical Modelling. Springer-Verlag, New York.

390 Dunbar RIM (1988) Primate social systems. Cornell University Press, New York.

391 Eklund A (1996) The effects of inbreeding on aggression in wild male house mice (*Mus*
 392 *domesticus*). Behaviour 133: 883–901.

393 Fairbanks LA (2001) Individual differences in response to a stranger: social impulsivity as
 394 a dimension of temperament in vervet monkeys (*Chlorocebus aethiops sabeus*). J Comp
 395 Psychol 115: 22-28.

396 Fairbanks LA, Fontenot MB, Phillips-Conroy JE, Jolly CJ, Kaplan JR, Mann JJ (1999) CSF
 397 monoamines, age, and impulsivity in wild grivet monkeys (*Cercopithecus aethiops*
 398 *aethiops*). Brain Behav Evol 53: 305-312.

399 Gerald MS, Higley S, Luissier ID, Westergaard GC, Suomi S, JHigley JD (2002) Variation
 400 in reproductive outcomes for captive male rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*) differing
 401 in CSF 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid concentrations. Brain Behav Evol 60: 117-124.

402 Gilks W, Richardson S, Spiegelhalter D (1996) Markov Chain Monte Carlo in Practice.
 403 Chapman & Hall, London.

404 Green PJ (1995) Reversible Jump MCMC computation and Bayesian model determination.
 405 Biometrika 82: 711-732.

406 Gust DA, Gordon TP, Hambright MK, Wilson ME (1993) Relationship between social
 407 factors and pituitary: adrenocortical activity in female rhesus monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*)
 408 Horm Behav 27: 318–331.

409 Hall DB (2000) Zero-inflated Poisson and Binomial regression with random effects: a case
 410 study. Biometrics 56: 1030-1039.

411 Hansson B, Westergahl H, Hasselquist D, Åkesson M, Bensch S (2004) Does linkage
 412 disequilibrium generate heterozygosity fitness correlations in great reed warblers.
 413 Evolution 58: 870-879.

414 Hatchwell BJ, Russell AF, MacColl ADC, Ross DJ, Fowlie MK, McGowan A (2004)
 415 Helpers increase long-term but not short-term productivity in cooperatively breeding
 416 long-tailed tits. *Behav Ecol* 15: 1-10.
 417 Higley JD, Mehlman PT, Poland RE, Taub DM, Vickers J, Suomi SJ, Linnoila M (1996)
 418 CSF testosterone and 5-HIAA correlate with different types of aggressive behaviors. *Biol*
 419 *Psychiat* 40: 1067-1082.
 420 House JS, Landis KR, Umberson D (1988) Social relationships and health. *Science* 241:
 421 540-545.
 422 Hughes A, Nei M (1988) Pattern of nucleotide substitution at major histocompatibility
 423 complex loci reveals overdominant selection. *Nature* 335: 167-170.
 424 Keller LF, Waller, DM (2002) Inbreeding effects in wild populations. *Trends Ecol Evol* 17:
 425 230-241.
 426 Kiesecker JM, Skelly DK, Beard KH, Preisser E (1999) Behavioral reduction of infection
 427 risks. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 96: 9165-9168.
 428 Klein J (1986) Natural history of the major histocompatibility complex. Wiley, New York.
 429 Krakauer AH (2005) Kin selection and cooperative courtship in wild turkeys. *Nature* 434:
 430 69-72.
 431 Krawczak M, Trefilov A, Berard J, Bercovitch F, Kessler M, Sauermann U, Croucher P,
 432 Nürnberg P, Widdig A, Schmidtke J (2005) Male reproductive timing in rhesus
 433 macaques is influenced by the 5HTTLPR promoter polymorphism of the serotonin
 434 transporter gene. *Biol Reprod* 72: 1109-1113.
 435 Latter BDH, Robertson A (1962) The effects of inbreeding and artificial selection on
 436 reproductive fitness. *Genet Res* 3: 110-138.

437 Latter BDH, Sved JA (1994) A re-evaluation of data from competitive tests shows high
 438 levels of heterosis in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* 137: 509–511.
 439 Lieutenant-Gosselin M, Bernatchez L (2006) Local heterozygosity-fitness correlations with
 440 global positive effects on fitness in threespine stickleback. *Evolution* 60: 1658–1668.
 441 Link WA, Barker RJ (2005) Modeling association among demographic parameters in
 442 analysis of open population capture-recapture data. *Biometrics* 61: 46-54.
 443 Loisel DA, Rockman MV, Wray GA, Altmann J, Alberts SC (2006) Ancient polymorphism
 444 and functional variation in the primate MHC-DQA1 5' cis-regulatory region. *P Natl*
 445 *Acad Sci USA* 103: 16331–16336.
 446 Lunn DJ, Whittaker JC, Best NA (2006) A Bayesian toolkit for genetic association studies.
 447 *Genet Epidemiol* 30: 231-247.
 448 Malhi RS, Sickler B, Lin D, Satkoski J, Tito RY, George D, Kanthaswamy S, Smith DG
 449 (2007) MamuSNP: A resource for rhesus macaque (*Macaca mulatta*) genomics. *PLoS*
 450 *ONE* 2: 438.
 451 Markert JA, Grant PR, Grant BR, Keller LF, Coombs JL, Petren K (2004) Neutral locus
 452 heterozygosity, inbreeding, and survival in Darwin's ground finches (*Geospiza fortis* and
 453 *G. scandens*). *Heredity* 92: 306–315.
 454 Martin TG, Wintle BA, Rhodes JR, Kuhnert PM, Field SA, Low-Choy SJ, Tyre AJ,
 455 Possingham HP (2005) Zero tolerance ecology: improving ecological inference by
 456 modelling the source of zero observations. *Ecol Lett* 8: 1235-1246.
 457 Meagher S, Penn DJ, Potts WK (2000) Male–male competition magnifies inbreeding
 458 depression in wild house mice. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 97: 3324–3329.

459 Mehlman P, Higley JD, Faucher I, Lilly AA, Taub DM, Vickers J, Suomi SJ, Linnoila M
 460 (1995) Correlation of CSF 5-HIAA concentration with sociality and the timing of
 461 emigration in free-ranging primates. *Am J Psychiatry* 152: 907-913.

462 Müller G, Ward PI (1995) Parasitism and heterozygosity influence the secondary sexual
 463 characters of the european minnow, *Phoxinus-phoxinus* (L) (Cyprinidae). *Ethology* 100:
 464 309-319.

465 Nürnberg P, Sauermann U, Kayser M, Lanfer C, Manz E, Widdig A, Berard J, Bercovitch
 466 FB, Kessler M, Schmidtke J, Krawczak M (1998) Paternity assessment in rhesus
 467 macaques (*Macaca mulatta*): multilocus DNA fingerprinting and PCR marker typing.
 468 *Am J Primatol* 44: 1-18.

469 Pemberton J (2004) Measuring inbreeding depression in the wild: the old ways are the best.
 470 *Trends Ecol Evol* 19: 613-615.

471 Plomin R, DeFries JC, McClearn GE, McGuffin P (2001) *Behavioral Genetics*, 4th edition.
 472 Worth Publishers, New York.

473 Pope TR (2000) Reproductive success increases with degree of kinship in cooperative
 474 coalitions of female red howler monkeys (*Alouatta seniculus*). *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 48:
 475 253-267.

476 Rawlins RG, Kessler MJ (1986) *The Cayo Santiago macaques: history, behavior and*
 477 *biology*. State Univ New York Press, New York.

478 Rhesus Macaque Genome Sequencing and Analysis Consortium (2007) Evolutionary and
 479 biomedical insights from the rhesus macaque genome. *Science* 316: 222–234.

480 Saunders CD, Hausfater G (1985) Influence of tick density on baboon grooming behaviour.
 481 *Am J Primatol* 8: 362.

482 Shutt K, MacLarnon A, Heistermann M, Semple S (2007) Grooming in Barbary macaques:
 483 better to give than to receive? Biol Lett 3: 231-233.

484 Silk JB, Alberts SC, Altmann J (2003) Social bonds of female baboons enhance infant
 485 survival. Science 302: 1231-1234.

486 Silk JB, Altmann J, Alberts SC (2006) Social relationships among adult female baboons
 487 (*papio cynocephalus*) I. Variation in the strength of social bonds. Behav Ecol Sociobiol
 488 61: 183–195.

489 Slate J, Kruuk LEB, Marshall TC, Pemberton JM, Clutton-Brock TH (2000) Inbreeding
 490 depression influences lifetime breeding success in a wild population of red deer (*Cervus*
 491 *elaphus*). P Roy Soc Lond B 267: 1657-1662.

492 Smith K, Alberts SC, Altmann J (2003) Wild female baboons bias their social behaviour
 493 towards paternal half-sisters. P Roy Soc Lond B 270: 503-510.

494 Spielman D, Brook BW, Briscoe DA, Frankham R (2004) Does inbreeding and loss of
 495 genetic diversity decrease disease resistance? Conserv Genet 5: 439–448.

496 Sterck EHM, Watts DP, van Schaick CP (1997) The evolution of female social
 497 relationships in nonhuman primates. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 41: 291-309.

498 Sun F, Cheng R, Flanders WD, Yang Q, Khoury MJ (1999) Whole genome association
 499 studies for genes affecting alcohol dependence. Genet Epidemiol Suppl 1: 337-342.

500 Tiira K, Laurila A, Peuhkuri N, Piironen J, Ranta E, Primmer CR (2003) Aggressiveness is
 501 associated with genetic diversity in landlocked salmon (*Salmo salar*). Mol Ecol 12:
 502 2399-2407.

503 Tiira KA, Laurila A, Enberg K, Piironen J, Aikio S, Ranta E, Primmer CR (2006) Do
 504 dominants have higher heterozygosity? Social status and genetic variation in brown trout,
 505 *Salmo trutta*. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 59: 657–665.

506 Trefilov A, Berard J, Krawczak M, Schmidtke J (2000) Natal dispersal in rhesus macaques
 507 is related to serotonin transporter gene promoter variation. Behav Genet 30: 295-301.

508 Wang PW, Iannantuoni K, Davis EM, Espinosa III R, Stoffel M, Le Beau MM (1998)
 509 Refinement of the commonly deleted segment in myeloid leukemias with a del(20q).
 510 Gene Chromosome Canc 21: 75-81.

511 Widdig A, Nürnberg P, Krawczak M, Streich W, JBercovitch FB (2002) Affiliation and
 512 aggression among adult female rhesus macaques: a genetic analysis of paternal cohorts.
 513 Behaviour 139: 371-391.

514 Widdig A, Nürnberg P, Krawczak M, Streich WJ, Bercovitch FB (2001) Paternal
 515 relatedness and age-proximity regulate social relationships among adult female rhesus
 516 macaques. P Natl Acad Sci USA 98: 13769-13773.

FIGURE LEGEND

Fig. 1

Posterior probability density functions (PDF) of the influence of mean individual heterozygosity upon each social behavior. The X axes represent the range of possible regression coefficients for the effect of heterozygosity on each behavior, generated by The Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) process and smoothed with kernel density estimates. Shaded areas correspond to the posterior probabilities that the heterozygosity regression parameters are positive or negative, whichever is appropriate – referred to as Bayesian significance in Table 3.

Table 1 Information on the seven studied behaviors across all 51 studied females. Values represent the mean, s.e.m. and the range of the recorded numbers of bouts per hour, initiated and received by the focal females interacting with their non-kin.

Social behavior	Mean	s.e.m.	Range
Aggression initiated	0.006	0.000	0-0.184
Aggression received	0.005	0.001	0-0.414
Initiated grooming	0.007	0.001	0-0.879
Received grooming	0.006	0.001	0-0.776
Initiated approach	0.117	0.004	0-3.931
Received approach	0.135	0.004	0-1.653
Proximity	0.007	0.009	0-4.086

533 **Table 2** Mean heterozygosity per locus and s.e.m.

534

Locus	Mean heterozygosity	s.e.m.
D2S367	0.706	0.064
D8S601	0.745	0.062
D20S206	0.784	0.058
D6S493	0.667	0.067
D6S474	0.725	0.063
D20S476	0.627	0.068
D12S66	0.745	0.062
D12S67	0.922	0.038
D14S255	0.627	0.068
D5S820	0.667	0.067
D5S1470	0.804	0.056
D6S266	0.804	0.056
D8S271	0.706	0.064

535

536

537 **Table 3** Effect of mean individual heterozygosity on social behaviors of females (N=51).
538 Data were modeled using Poisson regressions accounting for repeated measurements,
539 overdispersion and excess zeros. Note that other variables were used to control for
540 confounding effects. The posterior median is reported for the regression parameter estimate
541 corresponding to heterozygosity with its associated standard deviation (SD). Bayesian
542 significance was achieved for posterior probabilities $\geq 90\%$, where posterior probabilities
543 are calculated as the fraction of the number of times that the heterozygosity regression
544 parameter is positive or negative, whichever is appropriate.

Social behaviors	Posterior median values of the regression parameter	SD	Bayesian significance	Direction
Aggressive behaviors				
Aggression initiated	0.037	0.234	0.564	No effect
Aggression received	-0.183	0.117	0.937	More homozygous females received aggression at higher rates
Affiliative behaviors				
Initiated grooming	-0.126	0.135	0.836	No effect
Received	0.455	0.180	0.999	More homozygous females

grooming				received grooming at
				lower rates
Initiated	0.035	0.057	0.716	No effect
approach				
Received	0.052	0.053	0.841	No effect
approach				
Proximity	0.010	0.065	0.559	No effect

545

546

Table 4 Associations between heterozygosity (Y/N) and social behaviors, in 51 females, at the 13 loci. For each of the two social behaviors (in column), cells in bold correspond to the loci selected by the RJMCMC algorithm. Posterior means of the regression parameters are provided along with their associated standard deviations (SD). Note that these are model-averaged estimates and so the associated SDs incorporate both parameter and model uncertainty. *The best model contains this single co-variate.

Locus	Received aggression	Received grooming
	Estimate (SD)	Estimate (SD)
D2S367	-2.90e-7 (2.39e-4)	0.010 (0.083)
D8S601	-5.15e-7 (1.49e-4)	0.027 (0.216)
D20S206	-0.138 (0.154)*	-0.045 (0.206)
D6S493	-3.03e-6 (1.59e-4)	0.023 (0.149)
D6S474	-4.09e-6 (2.66e-4)	1.069 (0.646)*
D20S476	-1.14e-6 (1.10e-4)	-0.017 (0.108)
D12S66	-6.19e-5 (0.001)	0.006 (0.083)
D12S67	-4.69e-4 (0.006)	-0.366 (0.801)
D14S255	8.35e-6 (6.56e-4)	-0.005 (0.099)
D5S820	9.63e-8 (1.61e-4)	0.007 (0.071)
D5S1470	-9.71e-8 (1.76e-4)	0.017 (0.121)
D6S266	-3.25e-5 (8.06e-4)	0.121 (0.334)
D8S271	2.27e-6 (2.72e-4)	-0.006 (0.065)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Statistical analyses

The translation of the verbal description of the model used (see Methods) into mathematical terms is presented here. Let Y_{ij} be the number of behavioral responses of focal individual i in focal sample j . We considered that Y_{ij} arises from a mixture of a point mass at zero and a Poisson distribution with mean μ_{ij} , and we modeled the influence of the predictor variables X_{ij} on the logarithm scale as:

$$\log(\mu_{ij}) = \text{offset}_i + \underline{X}_{ij}^T \underline{\beta} + \eta_i + \varepsilon_{ij},$$

Offset is the log-transformed total duration of the sampling for a focal individual i . $\underline{\beta} = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4)$ is the vector of regression coefficients to be estimated. η_i is an individual random effect assumed to be normally distributed with mean 0 and standard deviation σ_η ; this deals with repeated measurements; ε_{ij} is an individual by focal sample random effect assumed to be normally distributed with mean 0 and standard deviation σ_ε to account for extra-Poisson variation. Note that the use of the individual random effect η_i imposes an exchangeable correlation structure similar to the one used in the SAS procedure GENMOD with the REPEATED statement. To estimate the model parameters, a frequentist approach would require maximizing the ZIP model likelihood, which is obtained by integrating the distribution of Y_{ij} over the random effects η and ε , therefore involving a high dimensional integral. To circumvent this difficulty, we made use of Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling (Gilks et al. 1996) in a Bayesian framework. Specifically, we chose vague normal prior distributions for the regression parameters with mean 0 and large variances (i.e., 10,000) and inverse gamma priors for the variance of the two random effects

with parameters equal to 1 and 0.001. Note that if the data are informative enough, the likelihood dominates the noninformative priors, and the posterior summaries using MCMC samples are close to the results of a frequentist analysis. We used software WinBUGS v.1.4 (Imperial College and the Medical Research Council, London) to implement our approach. We generated two chains of length 150,000, discarding the first 50,000 as burn-in. Convergence was assessed using the Gelman and Rubin statistic which compares the within to the between variability of chains started at different and dispersed initial values (Gilks et al. 1996).

To determine those loci having a significant effect, we had to perform model selection among a set of 8192 (2^{13}) possible candidates, which would have been untractable using classical model selection criteria such as the well known AIC (Burnham and Anderson 1998). We therefore opted for an extension of the MCMC algorithm used above and employed Reversible Jump MCMC (RJMCMC) to simultaneously explore the parameter and model space within a single Markov Chain (Green 1995). The main idea underlying this algorithm is to allow transitions between models, or ‘jumps’, in order to assess the presence or absence of a covariate. The priors for parameters were the same as above. In addition, we specified an equal prior probability on all possible models, which corresponds to an independent prior probability of 0.5 for each covariate. A locus was significantly correlated with a social behavior if it was present in the model best supported by the data. Posterior means and standard deviations for the regression parameters were calculated. Again, we used software WinBUGS v.1.4 (Imperial College and the Medical Research Council, London) to implement our approach, in combination with the Jump interface which performs the RJMCMC (Lunn et al. 2006; Gimenez et al. in press).

REFERENCES FOR SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

- 598
599
600 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (1998) Model Selection and Inference. Springer-Verlag, New
601 York).
- 602 Gimenez O, Bonner S, King R, Parker RA, Brooks SP, Jamieson LE, Grosbois V, Morgan
603 BJT, Thomas L (in press) WinBUGS for population ecologists: Bayesian modeling using
604 Markov Chain Monte Carlo methods. Environ Ecol Stat.