Non-offspring nursing in mammals: general implications from a case study on house mice

König, B

Chapter 11

Non-offspring nursing in mammals:
General implications from a case study on house mice

Barbara König

2006. In: Cooperation in Primates and Humans. Mechanisms and
Evolution (eds. Peter M. Kappeler & Carel P. van Schaik),
Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg; pp 191-205.

Introduction

Reproduction in female mammals is associated with lactation, which involves relatively high energetic costs and influences a mother's future reproduction (Fuchs 1981; Bronson 1989; Clutton-Brock 1991). Because of these high costs, we do not expect females to provide milk to non-offspring. Hence, if they engage in such potentially altruistic or mutualistic behaviour, careful study of its evolutionary causes and mechanisms is warranted.

Non-offspring nursing (also communal nursing or allonursing) is known from both breeding and non-breeding individuals, most probably exclusively done by females (to my knowledge, there has been only one rather anecdotal documentation of lactating males in free living Dayak fruit bats, *Dyacopterus spadiceus*; Francis et al. 1994).

Among species with some kind of communal care of young, singular breeders (i.e. typically one breeding female per social unit) form the majority in most mammalian taxa, as they do in social birds and insects. Singular breeders are species with high reproductive skew, and frequently with helpers-at-the-nest (non-breeding individuals that help caring for the dominant's offspring). Sometimes, a subordinate female can also produce pups, as in suricates, dwarf mongooses, callitrichids or wild dogs. For recent reviews see Stacey (1990), Emlen (1991), Jennions (1994), Creel (1997) and Solomon (1997).

Plural breeders, instead, are species with several breeding females per group and more egalitarian reproduction among females, as in lions, house mice, most bats, most primates and most ungulates. Females in some of these species co-operate in some kind of communal care, as for example babysitting, social thermoregulation, communal defence of young, provisioning of food to pups, or non-offspring nursing (Packer et al. 1992; Jennions & Macdonald 1994; König 1997; Solomon & French 1997).

Nevertheless, there are principal differences between singular breeders with helpers-at-the-nest and co-operating plural breeders. As Lewis and Pusey (1997) have emphasised, non-breeding helpers sacrifice their direct reproductive effort in the short term, whereas co-operation among breeders does not necessarily imply a loss of current direct fitness. In singular breeders, the focus of interest is primarily on the following questions addressing non-breeding subordinates: (1) Why not disperse? (2) Why delay breeding? (3) Why help? In plural breeders, instead, questions regarding the value of breeding in groups rather than alone are most important: (1) Why live and breed in groups? (2) Why help or nurse non-offspring?

Co-operative care of young has mainly been studied in singular breeders, and relatively fewer studies analyse species with shared reproduction among breeding group members. Here, I will focus on communal nursing as an example of a specific co-operative behaviour, and I will discuss for a species with plural

breeders why lactating females nurse non-offspring. I will summarize our understanding of the ultimate causation of non-offspring nursing, and will present experiments analysing its proximate mechanisms. Furthermore, I will suggest a novel hypothesis for why it occurs, and speculate on its distribution among mammals.

Non-offspring nursing in mammals

Non-offspring nursing has been described for approximately 70 species in 12 orders. Field observations indicate that it is more common in pigs than in other Artiodactyls, and that it is more common among rodents and carnivores than in primates and bats. In carnivores, non-offspring nursing is ubiquitous in canids, but also occurs in felids like lions and domestic cats. Furthermore, it has been observed in otters, coatis and some populations of Eurasian badgers. In primates it has been documented in the field among marmosets (*Callithrix*), in *Alouatta*, *Cebus*, *Erythrocebus*, *Homo sapiens*, *Lemur*, *Microcebus*, *Miopithecus*, *Presbytis*, *Varecia*, and maybe in Goeldi's monkeys (*Callimico*). In rodents, non-offspring nursing has been documented for members of the Cricetidae, Gliridae, Muridae, Sciuridae, Cavidae and Hydrochoeridae. However, in only 10% of all species in which non-offspring nursing is recorded were non-offspring nursed as much as one's own young (for recent reviews see Packer et al. 1992;

König 1997; Lewis & Pusey 1997; Solomon & French 1997; Hayes 2000).

Why do females nurse non-offspring?

Several hypotheses have been suggested to explain the phenomenon of non-offspring nursing, and there is some controversy whether communal nursing confers a reproductive advantage or not.

   a) Non-adaptive hypotheses

Two non-adaptive hypotheses have been proposed. First, some authors consider non-offspring nursing to be milk theft by other females' young, making it obviously non-adaptive for the donor (McCracken 1984; Boness 1990). The second hypothesis is that it represents a by-product of providing parental care in a group-living context. Jamieson and Craig (Jamieson 1989; Jamieson & Craig 1987) suggested that alloparental behaviour occurs simply because the social structure of those species in which it is found provides an opportunity for parent-like behaviour. A similar explanation was offered by Pusey and Packer (1994) for non-offspring nursing in lions. Female lions live in groups and raise their young in crèches because of the advantages of defence against infanticidal males. Non-offspring nursing then occurs as an inevitable consequence of group rearing, with the costs of rejecting non-offspring being higher than the costs of allowing some nursing by non-offspring.

b) <u>Adaptive hypotheses</u>

Adaptive explanations, on the other hand, include kin selection, or direct benefits. Such direct benefits can accrue due to improved survival, growth, or future reproduction of own offspring, or due to improved breeding success of mothers in the presence of lactating peers. I will discuss later which mechanisms can result in direct benefits for either mothers or pups.

Non-offspring nursing in house mice: a case study

In order to assess which of these hypotheses best account for non-offspring nursing, we study this phenomenon in house mice. We are interested in non-offspring nursing at both the ultimate and proximate level, to complement evolutionary approaches with mechanistic ones.

House mice (*Mus domesticus*) are short-lived rodents with a high reproductive output. They have a rather flexible social structure, but most typically they live in small groups that consist of a dominant male, one or several adult females with their litters and several subordinate animals (DeLong 1967; Lidicker 1976; Bronson 1979; Berry 1981a; Singleton 1983; Gray et al. 2000). Litter size of wild house mice increases from the first to the second lactation, and decreases again after the fifth lactation (Pelikán 1981; König & Markl 1987). Almost 50

years ago, Southwick (1955) published for the first time that females of the same reproductive group can pool their litters in communal nests. Since then, this behaviour has been documented both in the field and in captivity (Sayler & Salmon 1969; Wilkinson & Baker 1988; König 1993; Manning et al. 1995).

To analyse whether non-offspring nursing in house mice is adaptive, we quantified under laboratory conditions the fitness consequences of communal rearing of young. Experimental animals were first- to third-generation wild-caught house mice, born and reared in the lab. Under otherwise standardised conditions, we simulated different social structures that are known to occur in feral or commensal house mice, and measured the females' lifetime reproductive success. We defined lifetime reproductive success as the number of offspring weaned during an experimental lifespan of 6 months (for a detailed description of the methods used see König 1993; 1994b). Although average life expectancy of newborn house mice is only 100-150 days, an experimental lifespan of 6 months is realistic for females that survived at least until maturity (Berry 1971; Berry 1981b; Pennycuik et al. 1986).

In all experiments, females always reared litters in a communal nest as soon as more than one female in a group gave birth to pups. Moreover, nursing of pups within a communal nest was indiscriminate (König 1989; 1993).

We manipulated group size (the number of adult females per group) and relatedness among females. At the age of 7-8 weeks,

females were mated with an adult, unrelated male and during the

following 4 months lived either monogamously (one female plus one

male) or in polygynous groups (for further details see König

1993; 1994a; 1994b). In polygynous groups, females were either 2

or 3 genetically full-sibs, reared together (simulating the

situation of sisters staying together), or 2 or 3 genetically

unrelated and previously unfamiliar females (simulating the

situation of females immigrating into a group).

Lifetime reproductive success of individual females differed

significantly as a function of both group size and relatedness

among the females, and reached a peak for females living with one

sister (Fig. 1). In a group of three females, however, individual

lifetime reproductive success was lower than in a monogamous

situation, irrespective of the females' relatedness. Offspring

weight at weaning did not differ significantly among the groups

(König 1993; 1994b).

- Insert Fig. 1 here -

The reason why females differed in individual reproductive

success as a function of group size and relatedness is that

females varied in the probability of reproduction and of

successfully weaning young within the experimental lifespan. Not

all females weaned young, due to competition over reproduction

despite communal nesting. The extent of this competition is

illustrated by the index of reproductive skew for the females

involved (Fig. 2; index of reproductive skew according to Reeve &

Keller 1995; data on house mice from König 1994a).

This index varies between zero and one. When a single

individual produces all the offspring, the skew is 1, reflecting

a despotic society; when reproduction is perfectly equitable

among all group members, the skew is 0, indicating egalitarian

reproduction among females.

- Insert Fig. 2 here -

The lowest index was found for pairs of sisters. In such

units, females are not only egalitarian in terms of the

probability of reproduction but also in terms of the number of

offspring weaned. The median degree of reproductive skew

increased significantly towards despotic relationships with

decreasing relatedness among the females within a group, and with

increasing group size.

These findings permit two conclusions. First, non-offspring

nursing is an integral part of the reproductive behaviour of

female house mice in egalitarian groups. Thus, the non-adaptive

hypothesis that it is milk theft by young can be rejected in this

case. The milk theft hypothesis should result in more variable

occurrences of non-offspring nursing, with an increase with

increasing age and mobility of young. Furthermore, female house

mice have the option to breed solitarily even when another female reproduces within their territory (Weidt and König, unpublished observations from a population of wild house mice in a barn), which allows us to exclude the hypotheses of misdirected maternal care, and of a by-product of group living.

Second, where a female established an egalitarian reproductive relationship, communal nursing increased her individual lifetime reproductive success, irrespective of the degree of relatedness or familiarity to the female partner (König 1994c). However, the probability for such mutualistic co-operation was highest when a female shared a nest with a familiar sister to form a low-skew society. As a consequence, non-offspring nursing of female house mice in pairs with egalitarian reproduction proved to be adaptive, and involved mutualistic, direct fitness benefits for both partners. The fact that communal nursing was most efficient among familiar relatives may indicate that kin selection played a role during the evolution of communal nursing. However, because neither familiarity during juvenile development nor high relatedness are necessary pre-requisites, direct benefits of co-operation seem to stabilise non-offspring nursing among female house mice.

Direct benefits of allomaternal care
The experiment demonstrated that female mice gained a direct mutualistic benefit from forming a communal unit characterized by

allonursing. Several hypotheses have been suggested to explain

why female mammals or their offspring gain direct benefits when

mothers exhibit allomaternal care (licking, huddling over, or

carrying non-offspring) or nursing non-offspring (for previous

reviews see Packer et al. 1992; Lewis & Pusey 1997; Hayes 2000;

Hayes & Solomon 2004).

a) Improved survival of pups

Communal nursing can reduce pup predation either by the

dilution effect (Hoogland 1989; in analogy to communal care of

eggs in birds as in ostriches, Bertram 1992), or due to improved

protection against infanticide committed by non-group members, as

suggested by Manning and co-workers (1992). When females

alternate nursing pups in a communal nest, offspring are left

alone less often and thus have a lower probability to be killed

by unfamiliar conspecifics compared with pups reared by a single

female.

b) Improved future reproduction of pups

Packer and co-workers further raised the idea of improved

co-operation, based on their long-term observations of lions.

Group size is critical for reproductive success in both male and

female lions (Packer et al. 1990; 1991; Pusey & Packer 1997).

Thus, communal care would result in their own young having more

potential allies later in life, even if no full sib survived.

Nevertheless, both hypotheses mentioned so far cannot explain why communally nursing female house mice weaned <u>more</u> offspring within their lifespan in our experiments under rather luxurious environmental conditions, with unlimited food, in a favourable climate, and in the absence of predators or cannibalistic non-group members.

c) <u>Improved growth of pups</u>

According to Caraco and Brown (1986), allomaternal (pluri-parental) care may reduce starvation of young if at least one of the participating parents will find sufficient food to allow for lactation. When there is a cost of starvation, co-operative provisioning of young might evolve through reciprocity given that breeders feed the young asynchronously. The authors further suggest that even when food is plentiful, offspring may benefit because of reduced time between meals. In house mice, communally nesting females do not nurse simultaneously so that pups are almost always cared for by one lactating female (unpublished personal observations). Litters that grew up in a communal nest have a relatively high weaning weight compared to same-sized litters from solitarily nursed mothers (König 1993; see also Table 1). It is not known, however, whether shorter time intervals between meals cause this effect, or whether other energetic benefits of communal nesting are involved, as suggested by the following hypotheses.

d) Immunological benefits for pups

As an alternative hypothesis to explain intra- and interspecific variation in allosuckling frequency, Roulin and Heeb (1999) suggested immunological benefits (the immunological function of allosuckling hypothesis). We modified the authors' hypothesis and tested the prediction that house mouse pups gain a more variable immunocompetence through milk provided by several females (Ramsauer & König, submitted).

Newborn mammals do not yet have a functioning immune system and are dependent on immune factors received through maternal milk. During the first two weeks of lactation in house mice, immunoglobulin and lymphocytes reach the pups' intestines through the milk, and then are passed on into the blood (Janeway & Travers 1997). Due to indiscriminate nursing of own and alien young in communal nests, pups might benefit by acquiring a broader immunocompetence when reared communally in comparison to pups raised by just one female. The major histocompatibility complex (MHC) is crucial for the production of immunocomponents and plays an important role in pathogen recognition. Receiving variable MHC products through maternal milk supplied by both the mother and another lactating female might thus allow for a better defence of pups against pathogens and be of importance for the growth and viability of offspring.

Immunocompetence typically is a matter of genetics and experience. The social behaviour of female house mice, however, might offer a non-genetic tool to influence offspring immunocompetence through co-operative nursing. We therefore predicted improved growth and/or earlier weaning of pups reared by females of different MHC, and differences in the immunocompetence of subadult house mice that have been nursed by two mothers compared to those receiving milk from one mother. We tested these predictions by cross-fostering newborn house mouse pups from our population of wild caught animals to a communal nest of two lactating foster mothers either of the same or of different MHC types (Ramsauer & König, submitted).

Foster mothers were from two congenic strains differing in the MHC ("A" = B10BR/OlaHsd, and "B" = C57BL/10ScSnOlaHsd). Each replicate consisted of three newborn full-sisters: one reared by "AA"-foster mothers, one by "BB"-females, and the third by one "A"- and one "B"-female. Litter size of communal nests was always standardised and consisted of 13 congenic offspring, with a sex ratio of 7 males and 6 females, plus one wild female pup. Independent sample size was 12.

Growth and weaning weight did not differ significantly for females reared by two foster mothers of either the same or different MHC. In collaboration with Andrew MacPherson from the Institute of Immunology at Zürich University, we measured immunocomponents in the pups' blood. Our treatment did not

significantly influence immunoglobulin concentrations (IgA, IgM and IgG) of young at day 15 (before the immune system of pups is fully functional). Lymphocyte concentrations (B220 representing B-cells, and CD4 representing T-cells), however, differed significantly at day 28, with intermediate values in females raised by "AB"-foster mothers (at the age of four weeks subadult house mice are already immunocompetent). "A"-females had rather high concentrations of CD4 lymphocytes in their milk which is reflected in high concentrations in pups that had been nursed by "AA"-foster mothers; "B"-females, on the other hand, had rather high concentrations of B220 lymphocytes resulting in similarly high values in their offspring (Ramsauer & König submitted).

Immunological components that are transferred via milk influence the immunocompetence of wild type house mouse pups irrespective of their own genotype. Such influence on immunocompetence, however, did not result in energetic benefits of young as reflected in improved growth or earlier weaning under our experimental conditions. Nevertheless, a female house mouse that chooses a partner for communal nursing according to MHC characteristics might be able to influence her offspring future survival and reproduction. Under more natural conditions, when offspring encounter a variety of pathogens, we therefore may expect that MHC characteristics contribute to structuring among females within social groups in house mice. Even if the influence of maternal milk on offspring immunocompetence cannot explain our

observation of improved reproductive success of communally nursing females, it might influence a female's choice of a social partner, which remains to be tested.

e) <u>Physiological benefits for the mother</u>

Wilkinson (1992) suggested that female evening bats, *Nycticeius humeralis*, nurse non-offspring to dump excess milk prior to the next feeding trip, thereby obtaining immediate energetic benefits and maintaining maximum milk production. House mouse pups, however, are limited in their growth by the milk available from the mother (König et al. 1988), and especially in communal nests with many pups it is not plausible that females have to face the problem to get rid of excess milk before they leave for a foraging trip.

For relatively small mammals such as rodents, communal care might involve direct energetic or metabolic benefits as improved thermoregulation or improved milk production, and thus allow for a higher weaning success of females that nurse non-offspring (Sayler & Salmon 1969; Boyce & Boyce 1988; Hayes & Solomon 2004).

To test whether females are more efficient in converting solid food into offspring body mass during co-operative care of young, we measured the energy costs of lactation of females rearing litters either solitarily or communally with a familiar sister. Litter size of experienced females (rearing at least the second litter) was standardised to 6-7 pups directly after birth,

and litters of communally nursing sisters did not differ by more than 6 days in age. The animals had *ad libitum* access to food and water, but were kept in a climatic chamber at an ambient temperature of 15 °C. This should reflect rather natural conditions for house mice and avoid missing an effect due to climate conditions that are too luxurious (Barnett 1965; DeLong 1967; Berry 1981a; for detailed methods see Diedrichsen 1993).

Daily food consumption of females was measured from day 2 until day 13 of lactation with the help of an automatic feeding device (Neuhäusser-Wespy & König 2000). This device allows measuring individual food consumption of group-living animals without any disturbance. At day 14, we milked females with a milking device (König et al. 1988) and measured the amount of milk produced (after 4 hours of separation from the litters), and its energy content from lipids and total solids.

Neither litter weight at birth and weaning, nor the individual female's food consumption or milk production differed significantly for solitarily or communally nursing females (Table 1).

– Insert Table 1 here –

To quantify the females' allocation of energy into lactation versus maintenance we calculated Calow's index of reproduction

(Calow 1979). This index I was analysed for day 14 of lactation,

by using the following equation:

$$I = 1 - \frac{(\text{Energy consumed}) - (\text{Energy invested})}{(\text{Energy consumed when non-reproducing})}$$

Energy consumed = energy equivalents of maternal food consumption
at day 14 of lactation; Energy invested = total energy of milk
produced at day 14; Energy consumed when non-reproducing = energy
equivalents of daily amount of food eaten (averaged over five
consecutive days) when the adult females were non-pregnant and
non-lactating. Energy equivalents of food pellets (Altromin rat
and mouse) were 12.5 kJ/g (information according to the
producer).

The index I relates a female's energy investment during lactation

to her maintenance metabolism. A value equal or less than 0

indicates that females compensate the energetic demand of

reproduction (or lactation) through increased food consumption.

For a value larger than 0, females meet the energetic costs of

lactation at the expense of their maintenance metabolism, or by

using lipid stores or other reserves that they accumulated before

reproduction.

    Energy allocation during reproduction did not differ

significantly in both social groups (Table 1). Females did not

allocate more energy to milk production, and did not lactate more

efficiently, when nursing communally compared to mothers nursing

solitarily.

f) <u>Metabolic peak load reduction</u>

In the experiment described before, both solitarily and communally nursing females met the energy need for lactation through increased food consumption from days 1-4 until days 13-16 (see also König et al. 1988). Lactating house mice were able to rear a growing litter both by increasing the amount of milk produced and by improving the quality through an increase in total solid and fat concentrations until day 16 of lactation. At the age of 17 days offspring shift to solid food and are fully weaned when they are 23 days old (König & Markl 1987). As a consequence, females go through a period of peak energy demand during lactation that is reflected in a drastic increase in daily food consumption, by over 200% in comparison to the non-reproducing state. This energetic demand can be further increased by simultaneous pregnancy during lactation. Conception during the postpartum oestrous results in the birth of one litter every 28 days, on average. Nevertheless, female house mice are limited in their maximal (or peak) sustainable metabolism especially when nursing a large litter (Hammond & Diamond 1992). This effect is called "metabolic ceiling".

In our population of house mice kept in polygynous groups over an extended period, litters in communal nests showed an average age difference of eight days (König 1994b). Due to indiscriminate care of young, females in such a situation are

19

nursing more or less continuously. Based on these observations we
assumed that the energy budget of communally nursing females
remains on a rather constant and medium level because both
litters do not simultaneously reach the period of highest energy
need (Figure 3). We therefore formulated the hypothesis of
benefits due to peak load reduction (Müller & König submitted):
By nursing litters communally, lactating females avoid peak
energy demand. Because peak energy demands at the metabolic
ceiling are especially costly, females that avoid such peaks will
benefit by improved reproductive success.

    - Insert Figure 3 here -

    To test this hypothesis, we manipulated the energy demand of
females rearing litters alone, so that other possible benefits of
communal breeding were absent. We analysed the energy output of
two groups of lactating females in which the total amount of
energy spent on rearing a litter was the same, but energy
allocation was timed differently.

    In the manipulated group, we simulated a constant, medium-
level energy output for lactating females by cross-fostering two
older pups against younger ones every 2-3 days, beginning at day
eight of the first lactation, and continuing during the females'
second lactation. As a control, we used females in which handling
was done in the same way, but without cross-fostering.

Manipulated and control females reared similar sized litters
(litter size was standardised at day 1 of lactation: 6 pups for
the first litters, and 7 for the second ones). Energetic demand
of the manipulated females during lactation was assumed to have
the same mean but lower variance as that of the control females,
without a prominent peak two weeks after giving birth (for
further details see Müller & König submitted).

To quantify energy output, we measured the females' food
consumption and resting metabolic rate. As fitness correlates we
analysed the interbirth intervals and the size and weight of the
females' second and third litter.

In accordance with our assumption, total energy output was
similar for manipulated and control females that consumed similar
amounts of food when rearing both the first and the second litter
(there was a tendency for higher total food consumption in
manipulated females during the first lactation). Daily food
consumption of control females increased significantly from day 9
until day 15 of lactation and significantly decreased afterwards.
No such variation was observed in manipulated females, with
significantly lower food consumption at peak lactation, and
higher food consumption during day 28 than in control animals,
both during then first and the second litter.

Resting metabolic rates (RMR) of manipulated and control
females were measured twice during each lactation period (at day
14 and at day 28), which allow further examination of the

assumption of a rather constant energetic burden throughout
lactation in manipulated females. RMR of control females
decreased significantly — as expected — from peak lactation to
weaning in both lactation periods. The RMR of manipulated
females, however, did not change significantly.

Given that the assumptions of our model were fulfilled, we
tested the prediction that females not experiencing peak loads
had lower reproductive costs than control females, reflected in
shorter interbirth intervals or/and larger litter sizes of
manipulated females in the next reproductive occasion.

Neither the number of young at birth of the second and third
litter, nor the proportion of females that mated post-partum
differed significantly between manipulated and control females
(Müller & König submitted). These observations support data from
a former study on house mice by Fuchs (1981; 1982), who found an
effect of the burden of lactation on the interval to the
following litter, but not on its size.

As predicted, intervals between the first and second litter
were shorter in manipulated than in control females. This effect,
however, was only significant for those females where
standardisation of litter size directly after birth resulted in
an experimentally increased litter (manipulated females gave
birth to the second litter 2 days earlier than control ones, on
average). Females, whose litters had been decreased in size at

day 1 of lactation, might not have been confronted with an energy demand at their metabolic ceiling.

These data suggest that peak load reduction results in lower future reproductive costs at least for females that suffer an energetic burden near or at their maximum metabolic capacity.

Intervals between the second and the third litter, however, did not differ significantly between the two groups (Müller & König submitted). Recent work by Johnson and co-workers (2001) has shown that the metabolic ceiling does not remain constant throughout the life of a house mouse but that it increases from the first to the second litter. Presumably, with a litter size of seven young, females were not forced to invest at their metabolic ceiling during the second lactation, and peak load reduction therefore did not result in lowered reproductive costs.

Nevertheless, the experiment suggests that communal nursing can modify a female's energy output, and can reduce peak energy demand of lactating females if litters differ in age by several days. Peak load reduction thus may affect fitness parameters of lactating house mice, and we further suggest that this effect is most pronounced if the peak forces them to approach their metabolic ceiling. However, it remains to be shown that this is not only the case in the rather artificial setting used during the experiments, but also under conditions of communal nursing.

Can peak load reduction explain non-offspring nursing in mammals?

23

Metabolic benefits due to peak load reduction are a prime

candidate to explain the observed higher reproductive output of

communally versus solitarily nursing females. It is therefore

tempting to speculate that such energetic benefits can also

underlie other cases of non-offspring nursing, including those

that have been interpreted as non-adaptive.

Packer and co-workers' (1992) investigation of the effects

of a variety of factors on the frequency of non-offspring nursing

(excluding data from captive studies!) revealed three significant

findings. First, non-offspring nursing increases with litter size

across taxa. Second, non-offspring nursing is more common and

better tolerated in polytocous (average litter size larger than

one) than in monotocous species. In species that typically nurse

only one pup, non-offspring nursing is more likely to be

classified as milk theft (as for example in Mexican free-tailed

bats, or Northern elephant seals). In contrast, in polytocous

species, non-offspring nursing is less likely to be classified as

milk theft, and also occurs in species where females can

discriminate their own from foreign young, as in African lions

(Pusey & Packer 1994). In both situations, non-offspring nursing

correlates with increased energetic costs of lactation that peak

shortly before weaning (Oftedal 1984; Oftedal & Gittleman 1989),

increasing the probability that females invest at their metabolic

ceiling. These two findings are consistent with the peak load

reduction hypothesis: females are not expected to carry such a

heavy energetic burden when litters are small and their life history is not as fast-paced.

Their third finding was that non-offspring nursing is most common in polytocous species when group size is small, and decreases significantly as group size increases. This observation is also in accordance with the hypothesis of peak load reduction if the probability of avoiding simultaneous peaks during lactation decreases with increasing number of breeding females in a group. Furthermore, the risk of exploitation by non-mutualistic individuals increases with group size and thus will hinder the evolution of stable co-operation.

The hypothesis of peak load reduction requires that females increase energy allocation during lactation up to their metabolic ceiling. Furthermore, females within a group have to be synchronized in reproduction, so that there is considerable overlap in lactation (perfect synchrony, however, that is giving birth on the same day, should not occur). Such constraints might explain why non-offspring nursing, although not very rare, nevertheless is limited to rather few taxa.

Concluding remarks

During communal nursing, female house mice do not discriminate between own and non-offspring, and gain direct, mutualistic benefits. Non-offspring nursing therefore is a co-operative behaviour that allows females to improve weaning success of pups

in a reciprocal manner, even among unrelated partners, once they have established an egalitarian relationship.

Such co-operation, however, may run the risk of being exploited. The most extreme case would be a highly pregnant female that drops her litter into another lactating female's nest and deserts. The benefits of such free-riding behaviour are high. A non-lactating female will give birth to her next litter on average 6 days earlier than a female simultaneously being pregnant and lactating (König & Markl 1987). The deserted female, on the other hand, has to invest into non-offspring because she cannot tell them apart from own young (König 1989; 1993). It is not known whether such brood parasitism exists in house mice, but some aspects of the females' social behaviour suggest protection against exploitation by non co-operative partners.

First, female aggression is rather rare within groups and among relatives. Females, however, are very aggressive towards foreign females, not belonging to the same group, and especially so, when they are lactating (Crowcroft & Rowe 1963; Haug 1978; Kareem & Barnard 1982). Second, females preferentially share nests with a familiar relative (Manning et al. 1992; Dobson et al. 2000). Interestingly, familiarity during juvenile development is of paramount importance for improved reproductive success of females in egalitarian pairs, and overrides the effect of genetic relatedness (König 1994c), despite the fact that house mice of both sexes use genetic cues to discriminate against unfamiliar

kin during mate choice (for a recent review see Penn 2002). The importance of familiarity may suggest either that a physiological mechanism is involved which requires some period of adaptation to or synchronization with a partner, or that information about the partner is of significance for successful co-operation. The rather simple rules of thumb to communally nurse with a familiar group member and to aggressively keep away strangers might prevent females from being exploited by the opportunistic free-riding of other females.

Nevertheless, even during communal nursing females might benefit when reducing their investment, given that the partner will do more. In rodents, lactation performance is influenced by litter size in utero, which determines prepartum mammary growth (Jameson 1998), but more so by the number of sucking pups (Mann et al. 1983). Due to indiscriminate nursing, we assume that lactating females do not adjust milk production according to their own litter size but that energetic investment is shared equally among the members of a communal nest (we are currently testing this assumption). Such equalised investment therefore might be a prerequisite for stable co-operation among female house mice.

Literature

Barnett, S. A. 1965 Adaptation of mice to cold. *Biol Rev* **40**, 5-51.

Berry, R. J. 1971 Life and death in an island population of the house mouse. *Exp Geront* **6**, 187-197.

Berry, R. J. 1981a *Biology of the House Mouse*: Academic Press.

Berry, R. J. 1981b Town mouse, country mouse: adaptation and adaptability in *Mus domesticus* (*M. musculus domesticus*). *Mammal Rev* **11**, 91-136.

Bertram, B. C. 1992 *The Ostrich Communal Nesting System*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Boness, D. J. 1990 Fostering behavior in Hawaiian monk seals: is there a reproductive cost? *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* **27**, 113-140.

Boyce, C. C. K. & Boyce, J. L. I. 1988 Population biology of *Microtus arvalis*. I. Lifetime reproductive success of solitary and grouped breeding females. *J Anim Ecol* **57**, 711-722.

Bronson, F. H. 1979 The reproductive ecology of the house mouse. *Q Rev Biol* **54**, 265-299.

Bronson, F. H. 1989 *Mammalian Reproductive Biology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Calow, P. 1979 The cost of reproduction - a physiological approach. *Biol Rev* **54**, 23-40.

Caraco, T. & Brown, J. L. 1986 A game between communal breeders: When is food-sharing stable? *J theor Biol* **118**, 379-393.

Clutton-Brock, T. H. 1991 *The Evolution of Parental Care.* Monographs in Behavior and Ecology. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Creel, S. R. & Waser, P. M. 1997 Variation in reproductive suppression among dwarf mongooses: interplay between mechanisms and evolution. In *Cooperative Breeding in Mammals* (ed. N. G. Solomon & J. A. French), pp. 150-170. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crowcroft, P. & Rowe, F. P. 1963 Social organization and territorial behaviour in the wild house mouse. *Proc R Soc Lond* **140**, 517-531.

DeLong, K. T. 1967 Population ecology of feral house mice. *Ecology* **48**, 611-634.

Diedrichsen, U. 1993 Ethophysiologie der Energieallokation der Jungenaufzucht von Hausmäusen (*Mus domesticus*) in unterschiedlichen Sozialsystemen: Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg.

Dobson, F. S., Jacquot, C. & Baudoin, C. 2000 An experimental test of kin association in the house mouse. *Can J Zool* **78**, 1806-1812.

Emlen, S. T. 1991 Evolution of cooperative breeding in birds and mammals. In *Behavioural Ecology. An Evolutionary Approach. 3rd edition* (ed. J. R. Krebs & N. B. Davies), pp. 301-337. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific Publications.

Francis, C. M., Anthony, E. L. P., Brunton, J. A. & Kunz, T. H. 1994 Lactation in male fruit bats. *Nature* **367**, 691-692.

Fuchs, S. 1981 Consequences of premature weaning on the reproduction of mothers and offspring in laboratory mice. *Z Tierpsychol* **55**, 19-32.

Fuchs, S. 1982 Optimality of parental investment: the influence of nursing on the reproductive success of mother and female young house mice. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* **10**, 39-51.

Gray, S. J., Jensen, S. P. & Hurst, J. L. 2000 Structural complexity of territories: effects on preference, use of space and territorial defence in commensal house mice (*Mus domesticus*). *Anim Behav* **60**, 765-772.

Hammond, K. A. & Diamond, J. 1992 An experimental test for a ceiling on sustained metabolic rate in lactating mice. *Physiol Zool* **65**, 952-977.

Haug, M. 1978 Attack by female mice on "strangers". *Aggress Behav* **4**, 133-139.

Hayes, L. D. 2000 To nest communally or not to nest communally: a review of rodent communal nesting and nursing. *Anim Behav* **59**, 677-688.

Hayes, L. D. & Solomon, N. G. 2004 Costs and benefits of communal rearing to female prairie voles (*Microtus ochrogaster*). *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* **56**, 585-593.

Hoogland, J. L., Tamarin, R. H. & Levy, C. K. 1989 Communal nursing in prairie dogs. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* **24**, 91-95.

Jameson, E. W. 1998 Prepartum mammogenesis milk production and optimal litter size. *Oecologia* **114**, 282-291.

Jamieson, I. G. 1989 Behavioral heterochrony and the evolution of birds' helping at the nest: an unselected consequence of communal breeding? *Am Nat* **133**, 394-406.

Jamieson, I. G. & Craig, J. L. 1987 Critique of helping behavior in birds: a departure from functional explanations. In *Perspectives in Ethology. Vol. 7*, vol. Vol. 7 (ed. P. Bateson & P. Klopfer), pp. 79-98. New York: Plenum Press.

Janeway, C. A. & Travers, P. 1997 *Immunology*. New York: Current Biology Ltd./Garland Publishing Inc.

Jennions, M. D. & Macdonald, D. W. 1994 Cooperative breeding in mammals. *Trends in Ecol Evol* **9**, 89-93.

Johnson, M. S., Thomson, S. C. & Speakman, J. R. 2001 Limits to sustained energy intake II. Inter-relationships between resting metabolic rate, life-history traits and morphology in *Mus musculus*. *J Exp Biol* **204**, 1937-1946.

Kareem, A. M. & Barnard, C. J. 1982 The importance of kinship and familiarity in social interactions between mice. *Anim Behav* **30**, 594-601.

König, B. 1989 Behavioural ecology of kin recognition in house mice. *Ethol Ecol Evol* **1**, 99–110.

König, B. 1993 Maternal investment of communally nursing female house mice (*Mus musculus domesticus*). *Behav Processes* **30**, 61–74.

König, B. 1994a Communal nursing in mammals. *Verh Dtsch Zool Ges* **87.2**, 115–127.

König, B. 1994b Components of lifetime reproductive success in communally and solitarily nursing house mice – a laboratory study. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* **34**, 275–283.

König, B. 1994c Fitness effects of communal rearing in house mice: the role of relatedness and familiarity. *Anim Behav* **48**, 1449–1457.

König, B. 1997 Cooperative care of young in mammals. *Naturwissenschaften* **84**, 95–104.

König, B. & Markl, H. 1987 Maternal care in house mice. I. The weaning strategy as a means for parental manipulation of offspring quality. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* **20**, 1–9.

König, B., Riester, J. & Markl, H. 1988 Maternal care in house mice (*Mus musculus*): II. The energy cost of lactation as a function of litter size. *J Zool, Lond* **216**, 195–210.

Lewis, S. E. & Pusey, A. E. 1997 Factors influencing the occurrence of communal care in plural breeding mammals. In *Cooperative Breeding in Mammals* (ed. N. G. Solomon & J. A. French), pp. 335–363. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lidicker, W. Z. J. 1976 Social behaviour and density regulation in house mice living in large enclosures. *J Anim Ecol* **45**, 677–697.

Mann, M. A., Miele, J. L., Kinsley, C. H. & Svare, B. 1983 Postpartum behavior in the mouse: The contribution of suckling stimulation to water intake, food intake and body weight regulation. *Physiol Behav* **31**, 633–638.

Manning, C. J., Dewsbury, D. A., Wakeland, E. K. & Potts, W. K. 1995 Communal nesting and communal nursing in house mice, *Mus musculus domesticus*. *Anim Behav* **50**, 741–751.

Manning, C. J., Wakeland, E. K. & Potts, W. K. 1992 Communal nesting patterns in mice implicate MHC genes in kin recognition. *Nature* **360**, 581–583.

McCracken, G. F. 1984 Communal nursing in Mexican free-tailed bat maternity colonies. *Science* **223**, 1090–1091.

Müller, C. & König, B. submitted Energetic peak load reduction in lactating wild-bred house mice can diminish reproductive costs. *Front Zool*.

Neuhäusser-Wespy, F. & König, B. 2000 Living together – feeding apart. How to measure individual food consumption in a social species. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments & Computers* **32**, 169–172.

Oftedal, O. T. 1984 Milk composition, milk yield and energy output at peak lactation: A comparative review. *Symp Zool Soc Lond* **51**, 33–85.

Oftedal, O. T. & Gittleman, J. L. 1989 Patterns of energy output during reproduction in carnivores. In *Carnivore Behavior, Ecology, and Evolution* (ed. J. L. Gittleman), pp. 355–378. London: Chapman and Hall.

Packer, C., Gilbert, D. A., Pusey, A. E. & O'Brien, S. J. 1991 A molecular genetic analysis of kinship and cooperation in African lions. *Nature* **351**, 562–565.

Packer, C., Lewis, S. & Pusey, A. E. 1992 A comparative analysis of non-offspring nursing. *Anim Behav* **43**, 265–282.

Packer, C., Scheel, D. & Pusey, A. E. 1990 Why lions form groups: food is not enough. *Am Nat* **136**, 1–19.

Pelikán, J. 1981 Patterns of reproduction in the house mouse. *Symp Zool Soc Lond* **47**, 205–229.

Penn, D. J. 2002 The scent of genetic compatibility: sexual selection and the major histocompatibility complex. *Ethology* **108**, 1–21.

Pennycuik, P. R., Johnston, P. G., Westwood, N. H. & Reisner, A. H. 1986 Variation in numbers in a house mouse population housed in a large outdoor enclosure: seasonal fluctuations. *J Anim Ecol* **55**, 371–391.

Pusey, A. E. & Packer, C. 1994 Non-offspring nursing in social carnivores: minimizing the costs. *Behav Ecol* **5**, 362-374.

Pusey, A. E. & Packer, C. 1997 The ecology of relationships. In *Behavioural Ecology. An Evolutionary Approach. 4th edition* (ed. J. R. Krebs & N. B. Davies), pp. 254-283. Oxford: Blackwell Science.

Reeve, H. K. & Keller, L. 1995 Partitioning of reproduction in mother-daughter versus sibling associations: A test of optimal skew theory. *Am Nat* **145**, 119-132.

Roulin, A. & Heeb, P. 1999 The immunological function of allosuckling. *Ecol Letters* **2**, 319-324.

Sayler, A. & Salmon, M. 1969 Communal nursing in mice: influence of multiple mothers on the growth of the young. *Science* **164**, 1309-1310.

Singleton, G. R. 1983 The social and genetic structure of a natural colony of house mice, *Muc musculus*, at Healesville Wildlife Sanctuary. *Aust J Zool* **31**, 155-166.

Solomon, N. G. & French, J. A. (ed.) 1997 *Cooperative Breeding in Mammals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Southwick, C. H. 1955 Regulatory mechanisms of house mouse populations: social behavior affecting litter survival. *Ecology* **36**, 627-634.

Stacey, P. B. & Koenig, W. D. (ed.) 1990 *Cooperative Breeding in Birds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilkinson, G. S. 1992 Communal nursing in the evening bat, *Nycticeius humeralis*. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* **31**, 225-235.

Wilkinson, G. S. & Baker, A. E. M. 1988 Communal nesting among genetically similar house mice. *Ethology* **77**, 103-114.

Tables

Table 1

Energy allocation during lactation of female house mice rearing litters solitarily or communally with a familiar sister. Litter size was standardized at birth to 6 pups.

| | Females rearing litters | | |
	Solitarily (n=7)	Communally (n=11 pairs)	z (U-test)
Female weight day 1 (g)	30.1±5.5	31.3±3.0	−0.498 ns
Female weight day 23 (g)	30.9±5.6	31.3±3.0	−0.045 ns
Offspring weight day 1 (g)	1.6±0.1	1.5±0.1	−0.126 ns
Offspring weight day 23 (g)	8.5±1.4	9.2±1.4	−1.907 p<0.10
Maternal food consumption (days 2–13; KJ)	1971±98.9	2002±113.8	−0.226 ns
Milk production at day 14 (g)	1.0±0.3	1.0±0.3	−0.317 ns
Energy provided through milk (at day 14; KJ/day)	63.7±29.1	67.1±24.9	−0.402 ns
Calow's index I (see text for explanation)	−0.7±0.3	−1.1±0.6	−1.407 ns

Figure legends

Figure 1. Number of offspring weaned during an experimental lifespan of 6 months (median±se) of female house mice as a function of group size (number of females per group ranged between 1 and 3) and of genetic relatedness. Sisters were familiar full-sibs that grew up together, unrelated females were previously unfamiliar and genetically unrelated females. An unrelated adult male was always present. Independent sample sizes (number of groups per treatment): 1 Female: n=21; 2 Sisters: n=21; 2 Unrelated: n=24; 3 Sisters: n=10; 3 Unrelated: n=10. Data modified from König 1994a.

Figure 2. Index of reproductive skew (median±se) among female house mice as a function of group size (2 or 3 females) and relatedness. The index was calculated according to Reeve & Keller 1995, for all groups in which at least one female produced a litter and in which individual reproductive success was known (groups in which females gave birth to litters on the same day were excluded, because of lack of information about maternity). Independent sample sizes: 2 Sisters: n=20; 2 Unrelated: n=20; 3 Sisters: n=6; 3 Unrelated: n=7. Data on individual lifetime reproductive success from König 1994a.

Figure 3. Model of the relative energetic demand during lactation of a female house mouse over two consecutive litters. Thin line: Female rearing litters solitarily. Bold line: Female rearing litters communally with a female conspecific, the two litters differing in age by 8 days. Dotted line: Average demand in both situations. Maximum demand is set to one. The curves were derived from data of laboratory mice rearing a medium-sized litter (König et al. 1988), calculated as daily amount of milk produced times proportion dry weight. For the communal situation we assumed equal contributions of both females to both litters.

Figure 1

Median (±se) Lifetime Reproductive Success

Figure 2

Median (±se) Index of Reproductive Skew

Figure 3

Relative energetic demand vs. Days since birth of first litter