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

Andreas Sutter[1,2,†], Laura M Travers[1,2], Keiko Oku[1], Kynan Delaney[1], Stefan Store[1],

Tom A. R. Price[3], & Nina Wedell[1]

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@uea.ac.uk

Abbreviated title

Male infertility increases polyandry

Data Accessibility Statement

Analyses reported in this article can be reproduced using the data provided by Sutter *et al.*, (2019a).

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. Our results suggest that male infertility could explain the evolution of adaptively flexible polyandry, but is less likely to cause an increase in genetic polyandry.

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, selfish genetic elements such as meiotic drivers favourably target male gametes (Taylor & Ingvarsson, 2003; Price & Wedell, 2008), and mito-nuclear incompatibilities can devastate sperm function (Dowling *et al.*, 2015), meaning intra-genomic conflict is another potentially common source for a reduction in male fertility. 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 failure to copulate and become inseminated (Rhainds, 2010). But copulating and/or receiving an

67 ejaculate alone will not guarantee a female successful reproduction if some males are

68 infertile. In contrast, actively choosing fertile over infertile males could allow females to

69 secure some reproductive output. The phenotype-linked fertility hypothesis posits that

70 male signals and fertility are positively correlated, allowing females to simply choose

71 attractive males to avoid reduced fertility (Sheldon, 1994). While some studies have

72 found positive correlations between male attractiveness indicators and semen quality

73 parameters (Malo *et al.*, 2005; Forstmeier *et al.*, 2017), a recent meta-analysis found no

74 general support for a link between male secondary sexual signals and tentative indices

75 of ejaculate quality (Mautz *et al.*, 2013). Even when intrinsic male fertility correlates

76 with male attractiveness, more attractive males may become sperm depleted because of

77 their increased mating success, making intrinsically more fertile males temporarily less

78 fertile (Preston *et al.*, 2001), and thus undermining the fertility benefit of female choice

79 for attractive males. The paucity of evidence for an association between male external

80 phenotype and fertility may explain why discrimination against sub-fertile or infertile

81 males is rare. For example, despite mating failure being attributable to individual seed

82 bug males (Greenway & Shuker, 2015), females do not choose fertile males (Greenway

83 *et al.*, 2017).

84 When females do not discriminate between fertile and sterile males before mating,

85 females may safeguard against mating failure simply by mating with multiple males,

86 thus making multiple mating (polyandry) an alternative to precopulatory choice (e.g.

87 Sakaluk & Cade, 1980; Gibson & Jewell, 1982; Sheldon, 1994; Arnqvist & Nilsson,

88 2000; Mossinson & Yuval, 2003; Forbes, 2014). Importantly, polyandrous females can

89 benefit even without being able to detect fertile males, as long as infertile males' sperm

90 are outcompeted by fertile males' sperm, or females remate more after mating with

91 sterile males (Lorch & Chao, 2003; Barclay, 2005; Champion de Crespigny *et al.*, 2008;

92 Hasson & Stone, 2009). Hence, increased fertility assurance for females might be a

93 major reason why polyandry is so common. Across animal taxa, 89% of all natural

94 populations investigated showed evidence for multiple paternity (Taylor *et al.*, 2014).

95 The theory underlying the evolution of polyandry for fertility assurance is well

96 developed (Hasson & Stone, 2009), and correlative studies support the notion that

97 females remate more after receiving small or infertile ejaculates (Wetton & Parkin,

98 1991; Delisle & Hardy, 1997; Torres-Vila *et al.*, 1997; Krokene *et al.*, 1998; Uller &

99 Olsson, 2005). Support through experimentally impaired male fertility, often in the

100 context of the sterile insect technique (SIT), comes from many (Miyatake *et al.*, 1999;

101 Kraaijeveld & Chapman, 2004; Gavriel *et al.*, 2009; Friesen *et al.*, 2014; Landeta-

102 Escamilla *et al.*, 2016) but not all studies (Harmer *et al.*, 2006; Abraham *et al.*, 2013;

103 Haq *et al.*, 2013; Krüger *et al.*, 2019).

104 One common limitation is that researchers have typically measured the mean response

105 of target females (Calkins & Parker, 2005 and references above). While this assesses the

106 present potential for population control through the release of sterile males, it largely

107 ignores the possibility of a dynamic female response that evolves over multiple

108 generations. Indeed, field studies of releases of sterile males into natural populations

109 have observed the evolution of precopulatory behavioural discrimination against sterile

110 males (Hibino & Iwahashi, 1991; Mcinnis *et al.*, 1996), which demonstrates the

111 importance of considering genetic variation in female mating behaviours when aiming

112 to predict evolutionary responses. Similarly, male infertility could lead to an

113 evolutionary increase in polyandry. Selection could favour either genes controlling a

114 behaviourally plastic increase in female remating after mating with infertile males, or

genes underlying generally polyandrous behaviour without behavioural plasticity. If male sterility in natural populations is consistently high, these two scenarios have the same outcome. However, if male fertility is compromised only over a temporally limited period (for example, after a heatwave), a genetic response would lead to a persisting increase in polyandry in the population, whereas behavioural plasticity would only increase polyandry during the period of increased male sterility. 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. We also assessed male attractiveness and courtship vigour in an attempt to infer what cues from first mates females may use to make remating decisions. 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^{TM} 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.

To explicitly address the roles of behavioural plasticity and genetic variation in female

remating behaviour, we sourced females from ten isofemale isogenic lines that differ in

polyandry and that had been established using wild-caught females as described in

detail elsewhere (Taylor *et al>*, 2016; Sutter *>et al>*, 2019b). 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.

We used the daughters of these females in experimental mating assays.

Males were derived from the same populations as the isofemale lines, but were

maintained across several standard *Drosophila* vials as small outbred laboratory

161   populations with overlapping generations and fluctuating population sizes. Flies

162   collected in 2008 were kept separately from flies collected in 2012, such that we

163   maintained four laboratory populations, two from both localities. Before the start of the

164   experiment, we mass-bred these small populations into large 3.5L population cages.

165   Focal males were collected from standard vials that had been left for oviposition in the

166   population cages for up to 24h.

167   <u>Male heat-exposure treatment</u>

168   To reduce male fertility, we exposed males to an increased temperature for a few days.

169   Heat-exposure was achieved by submerging standard vials with groups of ten males into

170   a water bath that was maintained at either the elevated temperature of 31°C or at the

171   control temperature of 23°C. About 90% of the vial volume was submerged under

172   water, such that gas exchange through a foam plug at the top of the vial was still

173   possible, but the bottom of the foam plug forced all flies to remain below the level of

174   the water surface. For logistic reasons, water baths were kept on a lab bench and thus

175   exposed to a natural diurnal light cycle. All males used had been collected within 18h of

176   eclosion and separated into single sex groups of up to 20 males. To obtain the large

177   number of virgin males needed for our mating assays we had to pool males collected

178   over several days. Thus, we heat-exposed two separate cohorts of males for each

179   experimental block. The first cohort of males (cohort A) had been kept in standard

180   conditions for 1–2 days, before they were exposed to 31°C for 72h, and finally

181   separated into individual vials and left at 23°C on the evening before the day of their

182   mating trial (i.e. around 15h before the mating trial). Because they were collected only

183   three days prior to the mating assays, the second cohort of males (cohort B) was

184   subjected to heat-exposure immediately after collection on the day of eclosion for about

185   62h until two hours before their mating trial. Thus, male cohort A was older (5–6d

186   versus 3d), exposed to heat for longer (72h versus 62h), and given more time to recover

187   from heat exposure (15h versus 2h) than cohort B. To obtain a measure of how

188   physiologically stressful our heat-exposure was to males, we measured male survival

189   during heat-exposure. To do this we counted the number of alive and dead males when

190   separating them into their individual vials at the end of their heat-exposure treatment.

191   Further, we checked whether mortality during heat-exposure led to a bias in male size,

192   i.e. favouring smaller or larger males in the heat-exposure versus the control treatment,

193   because a male size bias could in turn have affected female (re)mating patterns. As a

194   proxy for male size we measured the length of the third longitudinal vein (Taylor *et al.*,

195   2008) of one wing using *Fiji* (Schindelin *et al.*, 2012).

196   <u>Mating assays</u>

197   To avoid fertilisation failure, females might discriminate against sterile males before or

198   after mating by refusing to mate with sterile males or by increasing remating after

199   having mated with sterile males, respectively. Alternatively, males may provide females

200   with cues about their fertility during mating, and females may use these to make future

201   remating decisions. We used a mating assay routinely performed in our laboratory

202   (Price *et al.*, 2011; Herrera *et al.*, 2014; Taylor *et al.*, 2016) to address whether heat-

203   exposed males were less likely or slower to mate, indicating reduced male vigour or

204   attractiveness. We also determined whether heat-exposed males copulated for a shorter

205   duration, possibly indicating reduced ejaculate transfer (Price et al 2008), and whether

206   these behaviours predicted female remating behaviour, potentially informing about

207   proximate mechanisms underlying polyandry. We used females from each of ten

208   isolines and males from the two populations, the temperature treatments and male

209   cohorts in a fully-factorial design.

210   We aspirated sexually mature, virgin females that were five or six days old individually

211   into vials into which a single male had been aspirated the previous day or earlier that

212   morning, depending on its cohort (see above). We took note of the time when the

213   female was introduced, and two observers scan-sampled for initiation and termination

214   of mating to record copulation latency, the duration from female introduction to the first

215   observed stable mount (i.e. the pair being relatively immobile), indicating successful

216   copulation, and copulation duration, the time from that first stable mount until the pair

217   separated. Scan-sampling meant that flies were not continuously observed, but checked

218   for copulation in short (~2min) intervals. In the second experimental block we

219   additionally recorded *ad libitum* observations of the onset of male courtship to obtain

220   data on latency to initiate courtship and time between courtship initiation and mating.

221   Observers were always blind with regards to male heat-exposure treatment and female

222   isoline identity. We used a combination of randomisation and stratification to determine

223   order in the assay to avoid time-of-day effects on mating parameters. After giving pairs

224   a minimum of two hours to mate, we removed males and froze them for later size

225   measurements. We left females that had mated to oviposit for four days, and discarded

226   females that had not mated.

227   We gave females a single opportunity to remate four days after their first mating. Again,

228   we aspirated a female into a vial containing a single 5-day old virgin male from the

229   same population as the female's first mate. These males had been kept in incubators at

230   the control temperature of 23°C. Two observers regularly scanned pairs for mating.

231   After allowing a minimum of 90min for remating, we discarded all males. To examine

232   the consequences of enforced monandry on female fitness, we denied a subset (~15%)

233   of females the opportunity to remate by aspirating the male out of the vial immediately

234   before the female was introduced. We left females to oviposit for another four days,

235   after which they were transferred to a third vial for a further four days and finally

236   discarded.

237   <u>Fitness consequences</u>

238   To assess the consequences of male heat-exposure and female remating for female

239   fitness, we quantified female reproductive output over 12 days, which has been shown

240   previously to correlate with lifetime reproductive success under control conditions

241   (Avent *et al.*, 2008). We counted the number of eclosed offspring from these vials 23

242   days after the first day of oviposition.

243   To obtain additional data on male fertility and mating capacity, we left a single male in

244   a vial with five virgin females for 24h, after which females were isolated and left to

245   oviposit for four days, following offspring counts after 23 days. For this small

246   experiment, we only used males from one of the populations (Show Low) from cohort B

247   in the first and from cohort A in the second experimental block, and used a haphazard

248   selection of virgin females from the ten isolines.

249   <u>Statistical analyses</u>

250   To test the physiological impact of heat-exposure on males and its consequences for

251   females we analysed the impact of heat-exposure on multiple aspects of male and

252   female reproductive behaviour and fitness: i) male heat-exposure survival, ii) mating

253   success, copulation latency and duration, as well as iii) female reproductive output and

254   iv) polyandry. We used R version 3.5.1 (R Core Team, 2018) for all statistical analyses

255   and figures, running binomial generalised linear mixed effects models (GLMM) and

256   linear mixed effects models (LMM) implemented in *lme4* version 1.1-14 (Bates *et al.*,

257   2015), and zero-inflated mixed models in *glmmTMB* (Brooks *et al.*, 2017). Descriptive

258   statistics and sample sizes for the different response variables are summarised in

259   Table 1. Here we give an overview of the fixed and random predictor variables included

260   in the different models (see also Tables 2, 3 & S1–S4).

261   i)   We first measured male survival to assess how physiologically stressful our heat-

262   exposure treatment was: We ran a binomial GLMM with heat-exposure, male

263   cohort, their interaction and block as fixed effects, and post-eclosion housing vial

264   and population as random intercepts. To ask whether survival was biased with

265   respect to male size, we ran an LMM on the wing size of surviving males, with

266   heat-exposure, male cohort and their interaction as fixed effects, and male

267   collection batch (16 unique block, population, and collection day combinations) as

268   a random effect.

269   ii)   We measured male mating success, copulation latency and duration to test for

270   effects of heat-exposure on male reproductive performance: We ran a binomial

271   GLMM for mating success as well as LMMs on log-transformed copulation

272   latency and duration with heat-exposure, male cohort, their interaction, block,

273   female age, male size and temporal order within the mating assay as fixed effects,

274   and random intercepts for female post-eclosion housing vial, female isoline and

275   male population.

276 iii)   We then tested the consequences of mating with a heat-exposed male with or

277   without successive remating with control males for female reproductive output:

278   Because many of the oviposition vials contained no offspring, we used zero-

279   inflated models with a Gaussian distribution for the conditional part implemented

280   in *glmmTMB* (Brooks *et al.*, 2017), and examined residuals with *DHARMa*

281   (Hartig, 2018). Our conditional full model included heat-exposure, female

282   remating, male size, laying vial and two- and three-way interactions as fixed

283   effects. We included random intercepts for female ID, female isoline, male

284   collection batch (see above), and random slopes for individual females to account

285   for repeated measures across a female's three laying vials. (Schielzeth &

286   Forstmeier, 2009). Our zero-inflated full model included heat-exposure, female

287   remating, male cohort, laying vial and two- and three-way interactions as fixed

288   effects.

289 iv)   Finally, we asked what explained variation in polyandry: We ran a binomial

290   GLMM with fixed effects for heat-exposure, reproductive output from the first

291   oviposition vial and male size including two-way interactions with heat-exposure,

292   and female age and temporal order within the mating assay. We included random

293   intercepts for female isoline and male collection batch as random intercepts.

294   Because of our explicit interest in distinguishing between behavioural plasticity

295   and genetic polyandry, we additionally included the interaction between first male

296   temperature treatment and female isoline as an additional random effect (i.e.

297   random slopes for isolines).

298   Whenever possible, we extracted effect sizes and p values from full models to avoid

299   biasing effect sizes through the removal of non-significant terms (Forstmeier &

300 Schielzeth, 2011). P values for fixed effects from LMMs were obtained from *t*-tests

301 using the Kenward-Roger approximation for denominator degrees of freedom

302 implemented in *lmerTest* (Kuznetsova *et al.*, 2016). For reproductive output, we ran a

303 large albeit not exhaustive selection of combinations of full and reduced conditional and

304 zero-inflation models, and selected the best model based on the lowest AIC value. To

305 facilitate the interpretation of main effects in the presence of interactions and to aid

306 model convergence, we centred covariates to a mean of zero. Age covariates were

307 mean-centred, and temporal order within an assay (pairs that were set-up earlier had

308 more time available for mating/remating) was centred and scaled to a standard deviation

309 of one. For models on mating behaviour, we additionally centred contrasts between two

310 factors (male cohorts A and B, first and second experimental blocks) by coding factor

311 levels as minus 0.5 and 0.5, respectively (Schielzeth, 2010). Approximate 95%

312 confidence intervals (*CI*) for effect sizes were taken as twice the standard error either

313 side of the mean (Crawley, 2007). We tested significance of random effects using

314 likelihood ratio tests between models including and excluding the variable of interest

315 (Bolker *et al.*, 2009). Additionally, we estimated among-isoline variances and the

316 covariance between polyandry after mating with control and heat-exposed males using a

317 Bayesian approach implemented in MCMCglmm (Hadfield, 2010; see the

318 supplementary material).

319 **Results**

320 Heat-exposure reduces male survival and mating success

321 Heat exposure decreased male survival substantially in male cohort A, but only

322 marginally in cohort B (Table 1; Fig S3). Survival was lower than 50% in cohort A

323   heat-exposed males but higher than 97% in the three other treatment-cohort

324   combinations, manifested as a highly significant interaction between treatment and male

325   cohort (GLMM, N = 1515, effect size β *[95%CI]* on logit scale = –3.8 [–5.9;–1.7], z = –

326   3.58, p < 0.001; Table S2). There was no indication that heat-exposure caused size-

327   dependent mortality, as the interaction between temperature and male cohort did not

328   significantly explain variation in body size of surviving males (i.e. wing length; LMM,

329   N = 925, β = –0.01 [–0.03;0.02], $t_{1,907.6}$ = –0.58, p = 0.565; Table S3). Substantial

330   variation in body size was explained by pre-eclosion conditions (unique combinations

331   of populations, male cohorts and experimental blocks; likelihood ratio test LRT,

332   χ^2 *(14)* = 2.6, p < 0.001) but not by post-eclosion treatment (heat-exposure; p > 0.5).

333   Males that had been heat-exposed were much less likely to mate (binomial GLMM,

334   N = 916, β = –3.1 [–3.6;–2.7], z = –14.2, p < 0.001; Table S2). Mating success was 86%

335   in control males but only 30% in heat-exposed males (Fig 1, Table 1). In conjunction

336   with a decrease in mating success, copulation latency of successful males was longer for

337   heat-exposed males (log-transformed latency in minutes; LMM, N = 496, β = 1.1

338   [0.8;1.3], $t_{1,459.2}$ = 9.4, p < 0.001; Fig 1 & S1; Table S1). Copulations with heat-exposed

339   males were shorter than those with control males (LMM, N = 487, β = –0.25 [–0.35;–

340   0.15], $t_{1,451.1}$ = 9.4, p < 0.001; Table 1 & S1; Fig S1). Additional data on male courtship

341   collected only in the second experimental block indicated that heat-exposed males were

342   slower and less likely to initiate courtship, and that their courtship quality or intensity

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

344   Fig S1).

345   <u>Male heat-exposure reduces female reproductive fitness</u>

346   Females mated to heat-exposed males had lower reproductive fitness than females

347   mated to control males. This was true both for the likelihood of failing to produce any

348   offspring over four days after mating as well as for the number of offspring produced

349   among the subset of females that did produce offspring (Fig 2). In our main dataset, this

350   was evidenced by a significant baseline effect of male heat exposure treatment on the

351   zero-inflation model (N = 498, β = 6.5, z = 8.4, p < 0.001) as well as the conditional

352   model (β = –28.9 [–44.6;–13.2], z = –3.9, p < 0.001; Table 2). In our additional, small

353   dataset, where we housed males with five females for 24h, heat-exposed males

354   successfully reproduced with fewer females (binomial GLM, β = –2.9, z = –6.8,

355   p < 0.001), and sired marginally fewer offspring per fertile mating (LM, β = –13.0 [–

356   25.5;0.5], $t_{1,29}$ = 4.3 , p = 0.046; Table 1).

357   <u>Polyandry restores female reproductive fitness in the face of male infertility</u>

358   Polyandry had a beneficial effect on reproductive fitness of females previously mated to

359   heat-exposed males (Table 3), mainly through reducing the incidence of complete

360   reproductive failure (Fig 2 & Table 2). In contrast, polyandry had no substantial effect

361   on fecundity under control conditions (Fig 2), consistent with a recent study (Sutt*er et*

362   *al>*, 2019b). Females with higher initial reproductive output were less likely to remate

363   (chosen monandry; see below), but appeared to run out of sperm over the next 4–8 days

364   (Fig 2). The temporal decline in reproductive fitness of facultatively monandrous

365   females and the reproductive increase in polyandrous females within the male heat-

366   exposure treatment contrasted with the consistent temporal patterns within the control

367   treatment. This explained the three-way interaction between heat-exposure treatment,

368   remating phenotype and oviposition vial.

369   Phenotypically plastic polyandry

370   Four days after their first mating, females that had mated with a heat-exposed male were

371   twice as likely to remate (84%) as were females that had mated with control males

372   (42%; Table 1). The relationship between polyandry and reproductive output after the

373   first mating suggests the difference in mating behaviour is causally related to reduced

374   fertility and fecundity. Females were more likely to remate if they had produced fewer

375   offspring after the first mating (binomial GLMM, $N = 427$, $\beta = -0.4$ [–0.7;–0.1], $z = -$

376   2.5, $p = 0.012$; Table 3). However, when matched for fecundity, females mated to heat-

377   exposed males still had a higher remating likelihood ($\beta = 1.9$ [1.1;2.7], $z = 4.7$,

378    $p < 0.001$; Table 3). Polyandry tended to decrease after mating with larger males and to

379   increase with female age (Table 3).

380   The increase in polyandry after mating with heat-exposed males was consistent in

381   females from all ten isolines, indicated by the interaction between female isoline and

382   heat-exposure of the first mate not explaining a significant amount of variation in

383   polyandry (Fig 3; LRT, $\chi^2(2) = 0.85$ $p = 0.654$). In contrast, significant variation

384   between isolines confirmed genetic variation in polyandry (LRT, $\chi^2(1) = 10.4$

385    $p = 0.001$). However, our additional analyses using MCMCglmm (Hadfield, 2010)

386   showed this genetic variation was substantial in control females but negligible in

387   females mated to heat-exposed males (supplementary Results). Moreover, there was no

388   clear correlation between polyandry of isolines after mating with control versus heat-

389   exposed males. In combination, this meant we were unable to confidently reject that

390   there is genetic variation in behavioural plasticity, nor could we confidently conclude

391   that the response of isolines was quantitatively consistent. Our results indicate

392 behavioural plasticity in polyandry, and genetic variation in polyandry, but show no

393 clear evidence for genetic variation in behavioural plasticity.

394 **Discussion**

395 Here we show that females representing distinct genotypes consistently use polyandry

396 as a behaviourally flexible strategy to mitigate the potential fitness loss arising from

397 male sterility, using cues from stored ejaculates. We found no clear evidence for genetic

398 variation in how females respond to male infertility, but the flexible female response we

399 describe here could intensify selection on male fertility, and aid population resilience.

400 <u>Adaptively flexible polyandry</u>

401 After mating with heat-exposed males with severely compromised fertility, female

402 remating doubled from 42% to 84%. Safeguarding against male infertility is a potential

403 adaptive explanation for the ubiquity of female multiple mating, and a number of

404 studies have reported increased polyandry after mating with experimentally sterilised

405 males (e.g. medfly: Miyatake *et al.*, 1999; Kraaijeveld & Chapman, 2004; Gavriel *et al.*,

406 2009; red garter snake: Friesen *et al.*, 2014; *Anastrepha serpentina*: Landeta-Escamilla

407 *et al.*, 2016), further supported by correlational data (Sakaluk & Cade, 1980; Wetton &

408 Parkin, 1991; Uller & Olsson, 2005; Reding, 2015; but see Morrow *et al.*, 2002). Other

409 experiments however found no effect of male sterility on female remating behaviour

410 (Queensland fruit fly: Harmer *et al.*, 2006; *Anastrepha fraterculus*: Abraham *et al.*,

411 2013; melon fly: Haq *et al.*, 2013; *Drosophila suzukii*: Krüger *et al.*, 2018). A potential

412 explanation for this discrepancy is that the latter studies used artificial techniques such

413 as genetic manipulation and irradiation to induce male sterility, and these males may

414   lack the cues present in naturally sterile males, with which female remating behaviour

415   has coevolved.

416   Heat‑induced male infertility is likely to be relevant in nature (Sales *et al.*, 2018; Walsh

417   *et al.*, 2019), and should create a strong incentive for female multiple mating. Here,

418   more than half of the females that mated with heat-exposed males produced no

419   offspring following mating, indicating high rates of male sterility, compared to a mere

420   five percent in the control group. Among these females with failed early reproduction,

421   remating rates were as high as the proportion of virgin females that mated with control

422   males, meaning the effect of heat-exposure on polyandry could have been driven by

423   pseudopolyandry rather than true polyandry (Fisher *et al.*, 2013). However, when

424   focusing on the subsets of females that had non-zero early reproductive output, the

425   difference in polyandry between females mated to heat-exposed versus control males

426   was again almost two-fold (76% [N = 66] versus 39% [N = 274]). More formally, in our

427   analysis on polyandry where we included early reproductive output as a predictor

428   variable, male heat-exposure showed a very strong effect on polyandry (Table 3, see

429   also Fig S2).

430   Females may have used information obtained during the first mating to make remating

431   decisions. Heat-exposure decreased survival only in male cohort A, but had pronounced

432   sub-lethal effects on sexual behaviour that were similar in both male cohorts. Heat-

433   exposed males were slower to initiate courtship, took longer to be accepted by females

434   and copulated for a shorter duration, possibly because heat-exposure had negative

435   effects on male condition, thus providing females with additional pre- and peri-

436   copulatory cues about male fertility. However, remating likelihood was not related to

437   copulation latency or duration of a female's first mating (Table S6), making it more

438   likely that females used cues from stored ejaculates. Our experimental design did not

439   distinguish between whether changes in sperm or seminal fluids were responsible for

440   the increase in polyandry. Either mechanism is plausible, but the effects are likely to be

441   species-specific. For example, sperm-less males can induce a refractory period in

442   female Queensland fruit flies and Medflies (Harmer *et al.*, 2006; Gabrieli *et al.*, 2016),

443   but both seminal fluids and sperm are required for inhibiting remating in *Anastrepha*

444   *fraterculus* and *A. ludens* (Abraham *et al.*, 2016)*,* and *Drosophila melanogaster* flies

445   (Liu & Kubli, 2003). Independent of the precise mechanism, our results suggest that

446   polyandry is not simply a response to the absence of fertile sperm but that females take

447   current semen storage into account when making remating decisions (Manning, 1967;

448   Crudgington *et al.*, 2005).

449   Behavioural plasticity appeared to be more important than genetic variation in

450   polyandry. Polyandry increases with latitude across *D. pseudoobscura* populations in

451   North America, consistent with the proximate effect of lower temperature increasing

452   polyandry (Taylor *et al.*, 2016). But variation in polyandry between populations is

453   genetic and not simply explained by these proximate effects (Taylor *et al.*, 2016).

454   Similarly, the genetic cline is opposite to that expected if polyandry had evolved in

455   response to higher rates of heat-induced male sterility. More generally, variation in male

456   fertility could have favoured the evolution of behavioural plasticity in polyandry. Using

457   females from distinct genetic backgrounds that differ in polyandry (Tayl*or et al>*, 2016;

458   Sutter*>et al>*, 2019b), we found that females from all backgrounds substantially

459   elevated polyandry levels after mating with sub-fertile males, suggesting behavioural

460   plasticity was largely independent of genetic variation in polyandry. Including

461   reproductive output as a covariate meant our tests were controlled for variation in

462   reproductive output among isolines (see above). Unfortunately, our power to detect a

463   potential subtle genotype-by-treatment interaction for polyandry was limited by the low

464   mating success of heat-exposed males (Fig 3 & Table S5). This means we cannot

465   comprehensively rule out that there may be genetic variation in behavioural plasticity of

466   polyandry. Selection may in general favour females that make reproductive decisions

467   dynamically and flexibly (Gowaty, 2013; Ah-King & Gowaty, 2016). In the context of

468   male infertility, females appear to update their remating decisions according to their

469   current state (Gowaty & Hubbell, 2009), and to indeed dynamically lower their mate

470   acceptance threshold when sperm storage is low.

471   <u>Consequences for populations</u>

472   Plastically elevated polyandry levels have important implications for population

473   viability (Holman & Kokko, 2013), particularly for populations under threat due to

474   rising male infertility, and for targets of the sterile insect technique (SIT). First, climate

475   change means that many organisms are likely to face increased male fertility problems

476   (Walsh et al., 2019). If females increase remating after mating with infertile males, heat-

477   induced male infertility may have little impact on population productivity as long as

478   there are enough fertile males. Little is known about the heritability of temperature

479   sensitivity of male fertility (Walsh et al., 2019). But, if variation in male fertility is

480   heritable and continuous, more intense postcopulatory sexual selection due to increased

481   polyandry (Morimoto *et al.*, 2019) will increase reproductive skew towards fully fertile

482   males, which may accelerate adaptation to increasing temperatures and delay population

483   extinction (Parrett & Knell, 2018). Second, plastically elevated polyandry thwarts

484   population control attempts through SIT (Kraaijeveld & Chapman, 2004; Barclay,

485 2005). Thus, understanding short-term plasticity in polyandry as well as the amount of

486 genetic variation underlying this plasticity is important for predicting the potential of

487 SIT. For example, even if the average female shows no increased remating after mating

488 with sterile males, populations may still harbour genetic variation in female remating

489 behaviour. This would lead to an increase in polyandry in response to SIT across

490 generations, hence hampering SIT effectiveness.

491 Conclusions

492 Mating failure is common, and represents a potential explanation for the ubiquity of

493 female multiple mating. Male fertility is often compromised by natural processes and

494 human intervention. Here, we have shown that females flexibly adjusted their remating

495 rate according to their demands for fertile sperm, consistent with behavioural plasticity

496 that was largely independent of genetic variation in polyandry. Polyandry allowed

497 females to buffer against fitness costs associated with mating with heat-exposed males

498 with low fertility, which may hamper the impact of release of sterile males for

499 population control, but may increase selection on male fertility and assist adaptation to

500 increasing global temperatures.

501 **References**

502 Abraham, S., Lara-Pérez, L.A., Rodríguez, C., Contreras-Navarro, Y., Nuñez-Beverido,

503   N., Ovruski, S., *et al.* 2016. The male ejaculate as inhibitor of female remating in

504   two tephritid flies. *J. Insect Physiol.* **88**: 40–47.

505 Abraham, S., Liendo, M.C., Devescovi, F., Peralta, P.A., Yusef, V., Ruiz, J., *et al.* 2013.

506   Remating behavior in *Anastrepha fraterculus* (Diptera: Tephritidae) females is

507   affected by male juvenile hormone analog treatment but not by male sterilization.

508   *Bull. Entomol. Res.* **103**: 310–317.

509   Adkins-Regan, E. 2015. Hit or miss: Fertilization outcomes of natural inseminations by

510   Japanese quail. *PLoS One* **10**: 1–20.

511   Ah-King, M. & Gowaty, P.A. 2016. A conceptual review of mate choice: stochastic

512   demography, within-sex phenotypic plasticity, and individual flexibility. *Ecol.*

513   *Evol.* **6**: 4607–4642.

514   Arnqvist, G. & Nilsson, T. 2000. The evolution of polyandry: multiple mating and

515   female fitness in insects. *Anim. Behav.* **60**: 145–164.

516   Avent, T.D., Price, T.A.R. & Wedell, N. 2008. Age-based female preference in the fruit

517   fly *Drosophila pseudoobscura*. *Anim. Behav.* **75**: 1413–1421.

518   Barclay, H. 2005. Mathematical Models for the Use of Sterile Insects. In: *Sterile Insect*

519   *Technique: Principles and Practice in Area-Wide Integrated Pest Management* (V.

520   Dyck, J. Hendrichs, & A. Robinson, eds), pp. 147–174. Springer, Dordrecht, The

521   Netherlands.

522   Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects

523   models using lme4. *J. Stat. Softw.* **67**: 1–48.

524   Bolker, B.M., Brooks, M.E., Clark, C.J., Geange, S.W., Poulsen, J.R., Stevens, M.H.H.,

525   *et al.* 2009. Generalized linear mixed models: a practical guide for ecology and

526   evolution. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **24**: 127–135.

527   Brooks, M.E., Kristensen, K., van Benthem, , Koen J. Magnusson, A., Berg, C.W.,

528   Nielsen, A., Skaug, H.J., *et al.* 2017. glmmTMB Balances Speed and Flexibility

529   Among Packages for Zero-inflated Generalized Linear Mixed Modeling. *R J.* **9**:

530   378–400.

531   Calkins, C. & Parker, A. 2005. Sterile Insect Quality. In: *Sterile Insect Technique:*

532   *Principles and Practice in Area-Wide Integrated Pest Management* (V. A. Dyck, J.

533   Hendrichs, & A. Robinson, eds), pp. 269–296. Springer, Dordrecht, The

534   Netherlands.

535   Champion de Crespigny, F.E., Hurst, L.D. & Wedell, N. 2008. Do *Wolbachia-*

536   associated incompatibilities promote polyandry? *Evolution* **62**: 107–122.

537   Crawley, M.J. 2007. *The R Book*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.

538   Crudgington, H.S., Beckerman, A.P., Brüstle, L., Green, K. & Snook, R.R. 2005.

539   Experimental removal and elevation of sexual selection: does sexual selection

540   generate manipulative males and resistant females? *Am. Nat.* **165**: S72–S87.

541   David, J.R., Araripe, L.O., Chakir, M., Legout, H., Lemos, B., Pétavy, G., *et al.* 2005.

542   Male sterility at extreme temperatures: A significant but neglected phenomenon for

543   understanding *Drosophila* climatic adaptations. *J. Evol. Biol.* **18**: 838–846.

544   Delisle, J. & Hardy, M. 1997. Male nutrition influences the reproductive success of both

545   sexes of the spruce budworm *Choristoneura fumiferana* (Lepidoptera: Tortricidae).

546   *Funct. Ecol.* **11**: 451–463.

547   Dowling, D.K., Tompkins, D.M. & Gemmell, N.J. 2015. The Trojan Female Technique

548   for pest control: A candidate mitochondrial mutation confers low male fertility

549   across diverse nuclear backgrounds in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evol. Appl.* **8**:

550   871–880.

551   Dyck, V.A., Hendrichs, J. & Robinson, A.S. 2005. *Sterile Insect Technique: Principles*

552   *and Practice in Area-Wide Integrated Pest Management* (V. A. Dyck, J.

553   Hendrichs, & A. S. Robinson, eds). Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

554   Fisher, D.N., Doff, R.J. & Price, T.A.R. 2013. True polyandry and pseudopolyandry:

555   why does a monandrous fly remate? *BMC Evol. Biol.* **13**: 157.

556 Forbes, S. 2014. Partial fertility and polyandry: a benefit of multiple mating hiding in

557   plain sight? *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **68**: 1329–1334.

558 Forstmeier, W., Ihle, M., Opatová, P., Martin, K., Knief, U., Albrechtová, J., *et al.*

559   2017. Testing the phenotype-linked fertility hypothesis in the presence and absence

560   of inbreeding. *J. Evol. Biol.* **30**: 968–976.

561 Forstmeier, W. & Schielzeth, H. 2011. Cryptic multiple hypotheses testing in linear

562   models: Overestimated effect sizes and the winner's curse. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.*

563   **65**: 47–55.

564 Friesen, C.R., Uhrig, E.J. & Mason, R.T. 2014. Females remate more frequently when

565   mated with sperm-deficient males. *J. Exp. Zool. Part A Ecol. Genet. Physiol.* **321**:

566   603–609.

567 Gabrieli, P., Scolari, F., Di Cosimo, A., Savini, G., Fumagalli, M., Gomulski, L.M., *et*

568   *al.* 2016. Sperm-less males modulate female behaviour in *Ceratitis capitata*

569   (Diptera: Tephritidae). *Insect Biochem. Mol. Biol.* **79**: 13–26.

570 Garcia-Gonzalez, F. 2004. Infertile matings and sperm competition: the effect of

571   ``nonsperm representation'' on intraspecific variation in sperm precedence

572   patterns. *Am. Nat.* **164**: 457–472.

573 Gavriel, S., Gazit, Y. & Yuval, B. 2009. Remating by female Mediterranean fruit flies

574   (*Ceratitis capitata*, Diptera: Tephritidae): Temporal patterns and modulation by

575   male condition. *J. Insect Physiol.* **55**: 637–642.

576 Gibson, R.M. & Jewell, P.A. 1982. Semen quality, female choice and multiple mating

577   in domestic sheep: A test of Trivers' Sexual Competence Hypothesis. *Behaviour*

578   **80**: 9–31.

579 Gowaty, P.A. 2013. Adaptively flexible polyandry. *Anim. Behav.* **86**: 877–884.

580   Gowaty, P.A. & Hubbell, S.P. 2009. Reproductive decisions under ecological

581   constraints: it's about time. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **106 Suppl**: 10017–

582   10024.

583   Greenway, E., Dougherty, L.R. & Shuker, D.M. 2015. Mating failure. *Curr. Biol.* **25**:

584   R534–R536.

585   Greenway, E. & Shuker, D. 2015. The repeatability of mating failure in a polyandrous

586   bug. *J. Evol. Biol.* **28**: 1578–1582.

587   Greenway, E.V., Balfour, V.L. & Shuker, D.M. 2017. Can females choose to avoid

588   mating failure in the seed bug *Lygaeus simulans*? *Anim. Behav.* **129**: 61–69.

589   Hadfield, J.D. 2010. MCMC Methods for Multi-Response Generalized Linear Mixed

590   Models: The MCMCglmm R Package. *J. Stat. Softw.* **33**: 1–22.

591   Haq, I.U., Vreysen, M.J.B., Abd-Alla, A. & Hendrichs, J. 2013. Ability of Genetic

592   Sexing Strain male melon flies (Diptera: Tephritidae) to suppress wild female

593   remating: Implications for SIT. *Florida Entomol.* **96**: 839–849.

594   Harmer, A.M.T., Radhakrishnan, P. & Taylor, P.W. 2006. Remating inhibition in

595   female Queensland fruit flies: Effects and correlates of sperm storage. *J. Insect*

596   *Physiol.* **52**: 179–186.

597   Hartig, F. 2018. DHARMa: Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchical (Multi-Level /

598   Mixed) Regression Models. R package version 0.2.0. , doi: 10.1111/j.1753-

599   0407.2009.00036.x.

600   Hasson, O. & Stone, L. 2009. Male infertility, female fertility and extrapair copulations.

601   *Biol. Rev.* **84**: 225–244.

602   Herrera, P., Taylor, M.L., Skeats, A., Price, T.A.R. & Wedell, N. 2014. Can patterns of

603   chromosome inversions in *Drosophila pseudoobscura* predict polyandry across a

604   geographical cline? *Ecol. Evol.* **4**: 3072–3081.

605   Hibino, Y. & Iwahashi, O. 1991. Appearance of wild females unreceptive to sterilized

606   males on Okinawa Is. in the eradication program of the Melon fly, *Dacus*

607   *cucurbitae* Coquillett (Diptera: Tephritidae). *Appl. Entomol. Zool.* **26**: 265–270.

608   Holman, L. & Kokko, H. 2013. The consequences of polyandry for population viability,

609   extinction risk and conservation. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **368**: 20120053.

610   Hurley, L.L., McDiarmid, C.S., Friesen, C.R., Griffith, S.C. & Rowe, M. 2018.

611   Experimental heatwaves negatively impact sperm quality in the zebra finch. *Proc.*

612   *R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **285**.

613   Janowitz, S.A. & Fischer, K. 2011. Opposing effects of heat stress on male versus

614   female reproductive success in *Bicyclus anynana* butterflies. *J. Therm. Biol.* **36**:

615   283–287.

616   Knipling, E.F. 1955. Possibilities of insect control or eradication through the use of

617   sexually sterile males. *J. Econ. Entomol.* **48**: 459–462.

618   Kraaijeveld, K. & Chapman, T. 2004. Effects of male sterility on female remating in the

619   Mediterranean fruitfly, *Ceratitis capitata*. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **271**: S209–

620   S211.

621   Krokene, C., Rigstad, K., Dale, M. & Lifjeld, J.T. 1998. The function of extrapair

622   paternity in blue tits and great tits: good genes or fertility insurance? *Behav. Ecol.*

623   **9**: 649–656.

624   Krüger, A.P., Schlesener, D.C.H., Martins, L.N., Wollmann, J., Deprá, M. & Garcia,

625   F.R.M. 2019. Radiation effects on *Drosophila suzukii* (Diptera: Drosophilidae)

626   reproductive behaviour. *J. Appl. Entomol.* **143**: 88–94.

627   Kuriwada, T., Kumano, N., Shiromoto, K., Haraguchi, D., Matsuyama, T. & Kohama,

628   T. 2014. Female preference did not evolve under laboratory conditions in the

629   solanaceous fruit fly *Bactrocera latifrons*. *Int. J. Pest Manag.* **60**: 160–165.

630 Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P.B. & Christensen, R.H.B. 2016. lmerTest: 2.0-33., Tests

631   in Linear Mixed Effects Models. R package version 2.0-33.

632 Landeta-Escamilla, A., Hernández, E., Arredondo, J., Díaz-Fleischer, F. & Pérez-

633   Staples, D. 2016. Male irradiation affects female remating behavior in *Anastrepha*

634   *serpentina* (Diptera: Tephritidae). *J. Insect Physiol.* **85**: 17–22.

635 Liu, H. & Kubli, E. 2003. Sex-peptide is the molecular basis of the sperm effect in

636   *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **100**: 9929–9933.

637 Lorch, P.D. & Chao, L. 2003. Selection for multiple mating in females due to mates that

638   reduce female fitness. *Behav. Ecol.* **14**: 679–686.

639 Malo, A.F., Roldan, E.R., Garde, J., Soler, A.J. & Gomendio, M. 2005. Antlers honestly

640   advertise sperm production and quality. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **272**: 149–57.

641 Manning, A. 1967. The control of sexual receptivity in female *Drosophila*. *Anim.*

642   *Behav.* **15**: 239–250.

643 Mautz, B.S., Møller, A.P. & Jennions, M.D. 2013. Do male secondary sexual characters

644   signal ejaculate quality? A meta-analysis. *Biol. Rev.* **88**: 669–682.

645 Mcinnis, D.O., Lance, D.R. & Jackson, C.G. 1996. Behavioral resistence to the sterile

646   insect technique by Mediterranean fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae) in Hawaii. *Ann.*

647   *Entomol. Soc. Am.* **89**: 739–744.

648 Meehl, G.A. 2004. More Intense, More Frequent, and Longer Lasting Heat Waves in

649   the 21st Century. *Science (80-.).* **305**: 994–997.

650 Miyatake, T., Chapman, T. & Partridge, L. 1999. Mating-induced inhibition of remating

651   in female mediterranean fruit flies *Ceratitis capitata*. *J. Insect Physiol.* **45**: 1021–

652   1028.

653   Morimoto, J., McDonald, G.C., Smith, E., Smith, D.T., Perry, J.C., Chapman, T., *et al.*

654   2019. *Sex peptide receptor*-regulated polyandry modulates the balance of pre- and

655   post-copulatory sexual selection in *Drosophila*. *Nat. Commun.* **10**: 283.

656   Morrow, E.H., Arnqvist, G. & Pitcher, T.E. 2002. The evolution of infertility: Does

657   hatching rate in birds coevolve with female polyandry? *J. Evol. Biol.* **15**: 702–709.

658   Mossinson, S. & Yuval, B. 2003. Regulation of sexual receptivity of female

659   Mediterranean fruit flies: Old hypotheses revisited and a new synthesis proposed.

660   *J. Insect Physiol.* **49**: 561–567.

661   Olsson, M. & Shine, R. 1997. Advantages of multiple matings to females: a test of the

662   infertility hypothesis using lizards. *Evolution* **51**: 1684–1688.

663   Parrett, J.M. & Knell, R.J. 2018. The effect of sexual selection on adaptation and

664   extinction under increasing temperatures. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **285**: 20180303.

665   Preston, B.T., Stevenson, I.R., Pemberton, J.M. & Wilson, K. 2001. Dominant rams

666   lose out by sperm depletion. *Nature* **409**: 681–682.

667   Price, T.A.R., Lewis, Z., Smith, D.T., Hurst, G.D.D. & Wedell, N. 2011. Remating in

668   the laboratory reflects rates of polyandry in the wild. *Anim. Behav.* **82**: 1381–1386.

669   Price, T.A.R. & Wedell, N. 2008. Selfish genetic elements and sexual selection: their

670   impact on male fertility. *Genetica* **132**: 295–307.

671   R Core Team. 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R

672   Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL http://www.R-

673   project.org/.

674   Reding, L. 2015. Increased hatching success as a direct benefit of polyandry in birds.

675   *Evolution* **69**: 264–270.

676   Reinhardt, K., Dobler, R. & Abbott, J. 2015. An Ecology of Sperm: Sperm

677   Diversification by Natural Selection. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **46**: 435–459.

678   Rhainds, M. 2010. Female mating failures in insects. *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* **136**: 211–

679   226.

680   Sakaluk, S.K. & Cade, W.H. 1980. Female mating frequency and progeny production in

681   singly and doubly mated house and field crickets. *Can. J. Zool.* **58**: 404–411.

682   Sales, K., Vasudeva, R., Dickinson, M.E., Godwin, J.L., Lumley, A.J., Michalczyk, Ł.,

683   *et al.* 2018. Experimental heatwaves compromise sperm function and cause

684   transgenerational damage in a model insect. *Nat. Commun.* **9**: 4771.

685   Schielzeth, H. 2010. Simple means to improve the interpretability of regression

686   coefficients. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **1**: 103–113.

687   Schielzeth, H. & Forstmeier, W. 2009. Conclusions beyond support: overconfident

688   estimates in mixed models. *Behav. Ecol.* **20**: 416–420.

689   Schindelin, J., Arganda-Carreras, Ignacio Frise, E., Kaynig, V., Longair, M., Pietzsch,

690   T., Preibisch, S., *et al.* 2012. Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image

691   analysis. *Nat. Methods* **9**: 676–682.

692   Schmoll, T., Kleven, O. & Reynolds, J. 2016. Functional infertility in a wild passerine

693   bird. *Ibis (Lond. 1859).* **158**: 670–673.

694   Setchell, B.P. 2006. The effects of heat on the testes of mammals. *Anim. Reprod.* **3**: 81–

695   91.

696   Sheldon, B.C. 1994. Male phenotype, fertility, and the pursuit of extra-pair copulations

697   by female birds. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **257**: 25–30.

698   Snook, R.R. & So, Y.K. 2000. Associations between female remating behavior,

699   oogenesis and oviposition in *Drosophila melanogaster* and *Drosophila*

700   *pseudoobscura*. *J. Insect Physiol.* **46**: 1489–1496.

701 Sutter, A., Travers, L.M., Oku, K., Delaney, K., Store, S., Price, T.A.R., *et al.* 2019a.

702   Data from: Flexible polyandry in female flies is an adaptive response to infertile

703   males. *Dryad Digital Repository* http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.ct8r61v.

704 Sutter, A., Travers, L.M., Weedon, M., Oku, K., Price, T.A.R. & Wedell, N. 2019b. No

705   selection for change in polyandry under experimental evolution. *J. Evol. Biol.*

706   jeb.13476.

707 Taylor, D.R. & Ingvarsson, P.K. 2003. Common features of segregation distortion in

708   plants and animals. *Genetica* **117**: 27–35.

709 Taylor, M.L., Price, T.A.R., Skeats, A. & Wedell, N. 2016. Temperature can shape a

710   cline in polyandry, but only genetic variation can sustain it over time. *Behav. Ecol.*

711   **27**: 462–469.

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

713   *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **29**: 376–383.

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

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

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

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

718   *Entomol.* **22**: 387–393.

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

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

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

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

723   259.

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

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

726

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.

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

Temperature	Control (23°C)		Heat-exposure (31°C)				
Male cohort	A	B	A	B	Heat effect	Full model	Illustration
main experiment							
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
additional males							
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)	↓		

751 Given are mean, standard deviation and sample sizes for survival, mating behaviours and reproductive output. The effect of male heat-

752 exposure is indicated by arrows. For detailed results see the full models as indicated in the last column.

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

Fixed/*Random* effects	Conditional model						Zero-inflation model			
	Coef	**SE (Coef)**	**z**	**p**	**Var**	**SD**	**Coef**	**SE (Coef)**	**z**	**p**
Intercept [control; forced monandry; Vial A (d1–5)]	42.777	2.775	15.41	**<0.001**			–5.624	0.942	–5.97	**<0.001**
Heat-exposure	–28.826	7.456	–3.87	**<0.001**			6.509	0.778	8.37	**<0.001**
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	**<0.001**
First mate's size (centred & scaled)	–1.106	0.565	–1.96	**0.050**						
Vial B (d5–9)	–16.407	3.038	–5.40	**<0.001**			2.395	0.934	2.57	**0.010**
Vial C (d9–13)	–6.657	3.186	–2.09	**0.037**			3.512	0.918	3.83	**<0.001**
Male cohort (A)							–0.705	0.226	–3.12	**0.002**
Heat:Mono	30.004	8.566	3.50	**<0.001**			–0.632	0.725	–0.87	0.383
Heat:Poly	17.664	7.976	2.22	**0.027**			–4.237	0.696	–6.09	**<0.001**
Heat:Vial B	28.646	11.099	2.58	**0.010**			–2.425	0.636	–3.81	**<0.001**
Heat:Vial C	0.711	12.416	0.06	0.954			–3.140	0.558	–5.63	**<0.001**
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	**0.002**			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	**<0.001**

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	**0.012**						
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						
Individual female					7.70	2.77				
Female:Vial (random slopes)					<0.01	0.02				
Female isoline (10 levels)					26.17	5.12				
Male collection batch (16 levels)					3.59	1.90				
Residual					245.20	15.66				

754 The conditional model describes the Gaussian component of female reproductive output (498 females) while the zero-inflation model

755 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

756 overview   of   models   and   associated   AIC   values.

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

| | binomial GLMM (N = 427) | | | | | |
Fixed/*Random* effects	**Coef**	**SE (Coef)**	**z**	**p**	**Var**	**SD**
Intercept (control temperature)	–0.163	0.246	–0.66	0.508		
Heat-exposure	1.910	0.408	4.68	**<0.001**		
4d reproductive output (centred & scaled)	–0.411	0.164	–2.51	**0.012**		
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		
Male collection batch (16 levels)					<0.001	<0.001
Female isoline (10 levels)					0.38	0.62
Heat:Female_isoline (random slopes)					0.21	0.46

758   Four-day reproductive output corresponds to the number of offspring eclosed from the

759   vial in which a female was housed between her first mating and the remating

760   opportunity. Random slopes for female isolines were included to test for genetic

761   variation in behavioural plasticity (G x E; see Fig 3).

Electronic supplementary material

Adaptively flexible polyandry by female flies when males are infertile

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

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@uea.ac.uk

Supplementary results:

Male courtship behaviour

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.

Estimating genetic variation in polyandry and behavioural plasticity

In addition to simply testing for significant effects of female isoline and its interaction with male treatment on polyandry (described in the main text), we used a bivariate model in MCMCglmm to estimate among-isoline variances, and covariance between polyandry of females that had mated with control or with heat-exposed males. For fixed effects (specified in Table 3) and the random effect associated with female isoline, we fitted an unstructured variance-covariance matrix that allows estimation of covariances between parts of the model. We fitted variances but no covariances for the random effect male collection batch. We fixed the residual variance for polyandry (binary outcome) at 10, and rescaled random effect variance estimates as *Var/(1 + c2 * 10)*, where *c2 = ((16 * sqrt(3))/(15 * pi))^2*, following Jarrod Hadfield's MCMCglmm course notes (https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MCMCglmm/vignettes/CourseNotes.pdf). The model was run for 4,050,000 iterations with a thinning interval of 2000 and a burn-in of 50,000 with parameter-inflated priors. This resulted in 2000 samples from the posterior for which autocorrelation between successive samples for parameters was less than 0.1.

Female isoline explained a substantial proportion of variation in polyandry of females after mating with control males (posterior mode [95% credible interval] = 0.12 [0.025, 0.39]), whereas very little variation in polyandry of females mated with heat-exposed males was explained by isoline identity (0.002 [<0.0001, 0.42]). Finally, there was no clear correlation (estimated from (co)variances) between isoline female behaviour after mating with control or heat-exposed males (0.31 [–0.55, 0.88]; note the very large credible interval).

Table S1: Model summaries for mating behaviours

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)	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 (B→A; centred)	0.357	0.340	1.05	0.294	-	-	-0.446	0.113	-3.94	**<0.001**	-	-	0.109	0.051	2.14	**0.033**	-	-
Heat:Cohort	-0.980	0.406	-2.41	**0.016**	-	-	0.233	0.221	1.05	0.293	-	-	-0.168	0.099	-1.69	0.092	-	-
Block (centred)	-0.548	0.185	-2.96	**0.003**	-	-	0.101	0.099	1.03	0.308	-	-	0.110	0.044	2.49	**0.014**	-	-
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	**0.001**	-	-	-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 (≤ 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)	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 (B→A; centred)	-0.521	0.376	-1.38	0.169	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Heat:Cohort	1.079	0.521	2.07	**0.041**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
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	**0.013**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mating (yes vs no)	-0.933	0.276	-3.38	**0.001**		-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female housing vial (≤ 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

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 (cohort B; see main text) or three days (cohort A). 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)					
Fixed/*Random* effects	**Coef**	**SE (Coef)**	**z**	**p**	**Var**	**SD**
Intercept (control; cohort B)	5.570	0.813	6.85	**<0.001**	-	-
Heat-exposure	-1.053	0.869	-1.21	0.226	-	-
Cohort (A)	-0.833	0.941	-0.89	0.376	-	-
Heat:Cohort	-3.770	1.053	-3.58	**<0.001**	-	-
Block (centred)	0.929	0.349	2.67	**0.008**	-	-
Housing vial (155 levels)	-	-	-	-	1.51	1.23
Population (4 levels)	-	-	-	-	<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)						
Fixed/*Random* effects	**Coef**	**SE (Coef)**	**ddf**	***t***	**p**	**Var**	**SD**
Intercept (control; cohort B)	1.435	0.020	15.2	73.182	**<0.001**	-	-
Heat-exposure	-0.004	0.010	907.0	-0.569	0.569	-	-
Cohort (A)	0.021	0.028	15.8	0.783	0.445	-	-
Heat:Cohort	-0.008	0.013	907.6	-0.576	0.565	-	-
Virgin collection batch (16 levels)	-	-	-	-	-	0.003	0.053
Residual	-	-	-	-	-	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 isoline, male collection batch (unique combinations of population, cohort and block), and random slopes for individual females across the three laying vials (see main text).

	Conditional model										Zero-inflation model											
	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	Heat:Mating:Vial	df	AIC	ΔAIC
Model 1	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		38	11650.3	1.9
Model 4	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	41	11662.5	14.0
Model 6	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		32	11668.0	19.5
Model 8	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		32	11671.9	23.4
Model 10	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		30	11674.6	26.1
Model 12	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		30	11677.0	28.6
Model 14	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	34	11679.3	30.9
Model 16	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	32	11683.4	34.9
Model 18	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		24	11689.0	40.5
Model 20	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	32	11691.7	43.2
Model 22	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		25	11693.9	45.4
Model 24	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	29	11705.9	57.4
Model 26	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				29	11792.6	144.1
Model 28	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			19	11808.8	160.3
Model 30	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						17	11848.1	199.7
Model 32	x	x	x		x						x	x		x						15	11861.8	213.3
Model 33	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		33	11879.7	231.2
Model 35	x	x	x		x						x	x								13	11891.8	243.3
Model 36	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		24	11918.9	270.4
Model 38	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		21	11923.8	275.3
Model 40	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					27	11946.7	298.2
Model 42	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					25	11971.9	323.4
Model 44	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x									23	12006.9	358.4
Model 45	x	x	x		x						x		x	x						16	12010.8	362.3
Model 46	x	x	x		x						x			x						14	12020.6	372.1
Model 47	x	x	x		x						x	x								14	12036.6	388.1
Model 48	x										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

Table S6: Model summary for polyandry (*cf* Table 3), additionally including copulatory behaviour from a female's first mating

Fixed/*Random* effects	Coef	SE (Coef)	z	p	Var	SD
binomial GLMM (N = 416)						
Intercept (control temperature)	–0.200	0.256	–0.78	0.437		
Heat-exposure	1.820	0.426	4.27	**<0.001**		
4d reproductive output (centred & scaled)	–0.393	0.167	–2.35	**0.019**		
First mate's size (centred & scaled)	–0.234	0.139	–1.68	0.093		
Female age (centred)	0.456	0.275	1.66	0.097		
Order in assay (centred & scaled)	0.090	0.147	0.61	0.540		
Log copulation latency (centred & scaled)	0.005	0.135	0.03	0.973		
Log copulation duration (centred & scaled)	0.074	0.136	0.55	0.585		
Heat:Reproductive_output	–0.518	0.347	–1.49	0.135		
Heat:First_mate_size	–0.437	0.302	–1.45	0.148		
Male collection batch (16 levels)					<0.001	<0.001
Female isoline (10 levels)					0.40	0.64
Heat:Female_isoline (random slopes)					0.21	0.46

Copulation latency and copulation duration were log-transformed and then scaled and centred to aid model convergence.

Supplementary figures:

Fig 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).

Fig 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.

Fig S3: Heat-exposure decreased survival only in the male cohort A. 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 (cohort A) or immediately (cohort B) after eclosion. Compared to survival (Table S2), mating performance was more similar for both male cohorts 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.