

1 **How to get the most bang for your buck: the evolution and physiology of**  
2 **nutrition-dependent resource allocation strategies**

3 Enoch Ng'oma<sup>1</sup>, Anna M. Perinchery<sup>1</sup>, and Elizabeth G. King<sup>1</sup>

4 <sup>1</sup>Division of Biological Sciences, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211

5 **Abstract**

6 All organisms utilize resources to grow, survive, and reproduce. The supply of  
7 these resources varies widely across landscapes and time, imposing ultimate  
8 constraints on the maximal trait values for allocation-related traits. In this review, we  
9 address three key questions fundamental to our understanding of the evolution of  
10 allocation strategies and their underlying mechanisms. First, we ask: how diverse are  
11 flexible resource allocation strategies among different organisms? We find there are  
12 many, varied, examples of flexible strategies that depend on nutrition. However, this  
13 diversity is often ignored in some of the best-known cases of resource allocation shifts,  
14 such as the commonly observed pattern of lifespan extension under nutrient limitation.  
15 A greater appreciation of the wide variety of flexible allocation strategies leads directly  
16 to our second major question: what conditions select for different plastic allocation  
17 strategies? Here, we highlight the need for additional models that explicitly consider the  
18 evolution of phenotypically plastic allocation strategies and empirical tests of the  
19 predictions of those models in natural populations. Finally, we consider the question:  
20 what are the underlying mechanisms determining resource allocation strategies?  
21 Although evolutionary biologists assume differential allocation of resources is a major  
22 factor limiting trait evolution, few proximate mechanisms are known that specifically  
23 support the model. We argue that an integrated framework can reconcile evolutionary

24 models with proximate mechanisms that appear at first glance to be in conflict with  
25 these models. Overall, we encourage future studies to 1) mimic ecological conditions in  
26 which those patterns evolve, and 2) take advantage of the ‘omic’ opportunities to  
27 produce multi-level data and analytical models that effectively integrate across  
28 physiological and evolutionary theory.

29 Keywords: resource availability, resource allocation, phenotypic plasticity, evolutionary  
30 theory, proximate mechanisms, ecological context

### 31 **1. The central importance of the interplay between resource acquisition and** 32 **allocation**

33 The amount of resources available to organisms, whether the source is sunlight,  
34 plant matter, or prey animals, is inherently variable over the landscape and across time.  
35 This variability presents a fundamental challenge to all organisms, from the smallest  
36 microorganisms to the largest plants and animals, all of which must coordinate the  
37 acquisition of resources from the environment with allocation of those resources among  
38 the many competing functions and structures that contribute to the organisms' fitness.  
39 When faced with variation in available resources, individuals could respond in one of  
40 two ways: (1) maintaining the same relative proportion allocated to each trait or (2)  
41 exhibiting phenotypic plasticity in resource allocation by altering the relative amount of  
42 resources allocated to one trait versus others. When the optimal allocation strategy  
43 changes with resource availability, selection will favour the evolution of a phenotypically  
44 plastic allocation strategy.

45 The inescapable link between the amount of resources available to an organism  
46 and subsequent allocation of those resources means it is critical to consider how

47 allocation strategies change across a range of resource availabilities. There are many  
48 examples of flexible strategies that depend on availability. For example, an adaptive  
49 shift in resource allocation is thought to underlie the commonly observed pattern of  
50 lifespan extension under dietary restriction (reviewed in [1–5]). Likewise, sexually  
51 selected traits often show strong condition dependence (i.e. dependence on  
52 acquisition), also thought to result from an adaptive shift in allocation (reviewed in [6,7]).  
53 Even the current obesity epidemic in modern human populations is often hypothesized  
54 to result from a mismatch between a selective environment favouring increased storage  
55 under high resources and the modern environment of constant high resource availability  
56 [8] (see [9] for a recent review). To understand this wide diversity in allocation strategies  
57 in the natural world, we must understand how different ecological conditions select for  
58 different strategies and what mechanistic changes underlie these strategies.

59       Understanding how and why this coordination of resource allocation with  
60 availability evolves has implications for nearly all areas of biology. Energetic costs to  
61 biological structures and functions (i.e. allocation trade-offs) are assumed to be  
62 universal and a major factor limiting trait evolution [10,11]. Typically, less attention is  
63 focused on the role of variation in the acquisition of resources, though it is no less  
64 important in determining trait values, and can obscure the detection of functional trade-  
65 offs. In a seminal paper, van Noordwijk and de Jong introduced the Y model - a  
66 mathematical model linking resource acquisition and resource allocation [12], which has  
67 been a central concept in the field of life history evolution. In the Y model, two traits  
68 draw from a single resource pool, with trait values determined by the proportion of  
69 resources allocated to each (Figure 1 [12]). One of the key strengths of this model is its

70 simplicity and generality; it can be applied to diverse questions such as why and how  
71 organisms age, what limits crop yields in different environments, why some species  
72 produce hundreds of offspring while others produce very few, and what constrains the  
73 evolution of fitness. While the Y model provides a conceptual starting point to  
74 understand the evolution of acquisition and allocation, in the Y model the underlying  
75 mechanisms governing these processes are treated as a black box. Likewise, our  
76 empirical knowledge of the genetic and physiological mechanisms underlying these  
77 processes is still limited, due in large part to their vast complexity [13,14]. The allocation  
78 of resources is thought to influence nearly all the major structures and functions of an  
79 organism, is affected by an array of interacting physiological pathways, is variable  
80 across the lifetime of the organism, and interacts with many different environmental  
81 factors. To achieve a complete understanding of how resource allocation trade-offs  
82 govern these processes, we must explicitly consider its interaction with resource  
83 acquisition and integrate across genomics, physiology, and evolution.

84       As we advance our ability to collect “omic” data at multiple levels (genomics,  
85 transcriptomics, proteomics, metabolomics, etc.) and in multiple environments,  
86 achieving this integration is becoming increasingly feasible. A major challenge now is  
87 developing new analytical methods to address multi-level, multi-environment data, and  
88 pulling out emergent themes that will help us better understand the complex processes  
89 underlying trade-offs and linking these with evolutionary models. We argue that  
90 resource allocation is a natural focal point in this effort. This relatively straightforward  
91 concept has the potential to integrate knowledge across fields and address key  
92 questions facing the intersection between evolutionary and molecular biology.

93           In this review, our goals are to: 1) detail the diversity of resource allocation  
94 strategies in response to environmental fluctuations in resource availability, 2) review  
95 the evolutionary explanations for these strategies and highlight where new models are  
96 needed, and 3) evaluate current approaches and suggest strategies for understanding  
97 the genetic and physiological mechanisms underlying resource allocation strategies.

98           **2. The diversity of phenotypically plastic resource allocation strategies in the**  
99           **natural world**

100 In the wild, organisms vary widely between species and populations in how they  
101 respond to variation in resource acquisition, with a diverse array of examples of  
102 phenotypically plastic resource allocation strategies (Table S1). Variation in resource  
103 acquisition can result from variation in resource abundance in the environment, and/or  
104 from differences among individuals in their ability to acquire resources. By far the  
105 largest challenge in describing broad patterns of phenotypic plasticity in allocation  
106 strategies is to directly quantify resource acquisition and the amount of those resources  
107 allocated to different traits. In only a very few cases have resource acquisition and  
108 allocation been successfully estimated in terms of energy units (e.g. [15–18]). In the  
109 majority of studies, these patterns must instead be inferred indirectly from phenotypic  
110 patterns.

111           The problem of estimating acquisition can be avoided in part when acquisition  
112 can be experimentally manipulated via resource restriction. When resource levels are  
113 restricted, the expectation for resource-based trait values is that they will also decrease.  
114 When trait values increase instead or remain constant, it suggests increased allocation  
115 to that trait (Figure 1). A well-examined example of this type of pattern is the commonly

116 observed increase in lifespan (hypothesized to be due to increased allocation to somatic  
117 maintenance) under food restriction coupled with reduced reproduction (reviewed in [1–  
118 5]). The majority of the work on the response of lifespan to food restriction has been  
119 focused on model organisms. While there are several examples in non-model species  
120 that show a similar response (Table S1), not all species live longer on food restriction  
121 [19], including some species of water striders [20], house flies [21], squirrel monkeys  
122 [22], and rotifers [23,24]. Additionally, several species show a marked *increase* in  
123 reproductive allocation under low resource conditions (flatworms [25], guppies [26],  
124 rotifers [24]), demonstrating reproductive allocation does not always decrease under  
125 food restriction. Another trade-off that is particularly well characterized in terms of  
126 differential resource allocation is the trade-off between flight capability and reproduction  
127 in several wing dimorphic insect species (reviewed in [27–30]). In these species, there  
128 exist discrete flight capable (macropterous) and flightless (micropterous or apterous)  
129 morphs. Wing morphology displays phenotypic plasticity in response to several  
130 environmental variables including rearing density, a likely correlate with acquisition, with  
131 different species displaying very different responses. In aphids and planthoppers,  
132 induction of flight capable morphs increases in response to crowding and low nutrition  
133 [31,32], while in crickets, group rearing and other stressors increase induction of  
134 flightless morphs [33,34]. Both of these examples, the lifespan-reproduction trade-off  
135 and the flight capability-reproduction trade-off, demonstrate the wide variation in  
136 allocation patterns across different species.

137         Most experimental manipulations of acquisition simply consider a single “low”  
138 and single “high” resource environment, and often the diet used is artificial and quite

139 different from the organism's natural diet. Recently, the community has begun to take a  
140 “nutritional geometry” perspective, considering wider ranges of nutritional conditions,  
141 both in terms of caloric content and individual diet components (i.e. protein,  
142 carbohydrate, and lipid content), as well as a wider range of the timing of resource level  
143 changes across an organism's lifetime [35–37]. These efforts provide a much more  
144 complete picture of how an organism responds to diet, in that they distinguish between  
145 allocation changes due to limitation in specific nutrient classes vs effects due to more  
146 general caloric restriction [38,39]. However, this approach increases complexity, which  
147 can make interpreting the results in an evolutionary context a challenge when patterns  
148 are highly dynamic. To best place diet manipulations in an evolutionary context, we  
149 need ecological studies that characterize typical diet sources, and the degree of natural  
150 variation in resource availability experienced by populations in the wild. For many  
151 populations, this goal will be a challenge.

152 Overall, a broad view of trait variation reveals many examples of variation in  
153 plastic resource allocation in response to variation in acquisition (Table S1). Often,  
154 patterns vary substantially among closely related species (e.g. [20,22,23,25]), among  
155 populations of the same species (e.g. [20,26]), or between different inbred strains [40].  
156 These examples argue against any hard and fast, universal resource allocation  
157 strategies in response to variation in acquisition and lead to the key questions of why  
158 and how environmental variation in resource availability leads to the evolution of  
159 different resource allocation strategies. From the resource allocation strategies detailed  
160 in Table S1, we can conclude two basic points: 1) phenotypic plasticity in resource  
161 allocation is common, and 2) the pattern of plasticity varies widely among populations

162 and taxa. Beyond these points, it is difficult to draw any general conclusions given that  
163 the dataset is biased (e.g. model organisms are overrepresented), and there are many  
164 different methods for estimating resource allocation (see discussion of these methods  
165 above), making it challenging to generalize across studies. Clearly, we require a better  
166 understanding of the ecological conditions that would lead to the evolution of such  
167 different populations.

### 168 **3. Why do phenotypically plastic resource allocation strategies evolve?**

169 There is a long and rich history of theoretical evolutionary models addressing both  
170 optimal resource allocation patterns in different environmental conditions (i.e. life history  
171 evolution models; e.g. [41–45]; see [10,46] for extensive reviews), and the evolution of  
172 phenotypic plasticity [47–53]. However, there are few models that specifically focus on  
173 the evolution of phenotypically plastic resource allocation in response to variation in  
174 resource availability [54–56]. While this category might seem to be a special case, there  
175 is reason to expect general models of phenotypic plasticity might not be fully applicable  
176 to variation in resource availability. Resource availability places an ultimate constraint  
177 on the maximal trait values for allocation-related traits, and in that way, it is  
178 fundamentally different from other types of environmental conditions. The dependency  
179 creates the somewhat paradoxical situation in which no plasticity in allocation will lead  
180 to plasticity in trait values, as they will necessarily decrease with resource availability  
181 (Figure 1). Thus, it is critical for theoretical models to explicitly consider variability in  
182 resource availability when predicting how plastic allocation strategies will evolve.

183 One emergent property of models that do explicitly consider the interplay  
184 between acquisition and allocation is that environmental predictability (i.e. whether



185 current resource availability is correlated with future availability) is a major determinant  
186 of the pattern of phenotypic plasticity that evolves [54–56]. In a model considering  
187 allocation to flight capability versus reproduction, King *et al* [54] showed completely  
188 opposite patterns of plasticity in allocation are expected to evolve in environments with  
189 predictable versus unpredictable patterns of resource availability. Fischer and co-  
190 workers [55,56] showed that, in response to short term resource availability fluctuations,  
191 populations should evolve to allocate toward somatic maintenance under low food  
192 conditions. However, this response is more complicated. If conditions are low enough to  
193 be indicative of low survival probability, allocation to survival is not favoured. Rather, a  
194 terminal investment strategy, investing heavily in reproduction at the expense of  
195 survival, is favoured.

196         One area where models of the evolution of condition-dependent (i.e. acquisition-  
197 dependent) resource allocation strategies is well developed is in the field of sexual  
198 signalling. In many cases, male advertisements to females are dependent on the  
199 condition of the male, producing so-called ‘honest’ signals (e.g. [57,58]; for reviews see  
200 [59–61]). This condition dependence can be continuous (e.g. call duration in male grey  
201 tree frogs [57]) or a discrete polymorphism (e.g. sexually dimorphic mandible growth in  
202 stag beetles [62]). There are several models considering how the benefits and costs of  
203 increased allocation toward a sexual signal change depending on an individual’s  
204 condition [59,61,63], with models predicting low condition individuals that allocate more  
205 toward sexual signals experience lower benefits and/or higher costs depending on the  
206 assumptions of the model (see [61]). These models are a subset of models considering  
207 allocation strategies in poor condition as a ‘best of a bad lot’ strategy [46]. In essence, it

208 does not pay to invest heavily in a sexual signal if one simply does not have enough  
209 resources to produce a high-quality signal that will attract many mates.

210         The majority of evolutionary models focus solely on why, not how, allocation  
211 patterns evolve, ignoring the underlying mechanisms. Often, this is a sensible strategy,  
212 given that when mechanisms don't act as ultimate constraints, evolutionary endpoint will  
213 remain the same, irrespective of the specifics of the mechanistic underpinning.  
214 Nevertheless, evolutionary models that incorporate explicit mechanisms, can be highly  
215 informative in explaining the mechanisms underlying evolutionary patterns. For  
216 example, Mangel and Munch [64] integrated physiological parameters such as oxidative  
217 damage associated with faster growth and resource allocation to damage repair in a  
218 model predicting when compensatory growth (increased allocation to growth following a  
219 period of food restriction) should evolve. Only by explicitly incorporating the  
220 physiological mechanisms of damage and repair, were they able to simulate patterns of  
221 compensatory growth that matched observations. Compensatory growth never arose  
222 using a simple optimality framework, demonstrating that explicitly incorporating  
223 physiology can fundamentally change the predictions of life history models in some  
224 cases. We encourage the development of evolutionary models that integrate proximate  
225 mechanisms as a way to expand our understanding of the evolution of resource  
226 allocation strategies in multiple systems.

#### 227         **4. Genetic and physiological mechanisms underlying phenotypic plasticity in** 228         **resource allocation**

229         It is clear organisms have evolved the ability to shift the allocation of resources in  
230 response to their nutritional state in many different ways, but *how* do they accomplish

231 this change? What physiological changes accompany a shift in allocation strategy and  
232 what genes are involved? Not surprisingly, the greatest progress in the effort to uncover  
233 the mechanisms governing the coordination between acquisition and allocation comes  
234 from model organisms (e.g. yeast, worms, flies, and mice) that have been the focus of  
235 studies for decades. However, the relatively recent "omic" technologies available, and  
236 the decreasing cost of these technologies, make it increasingly feasible to gather data  
237 at multiple levels of the genotype to phenotype map in multiple environments for nearly  
238 any organism, opening up the possibility of moving beyond unnatural manipulations in  
239 model organisms and toward more ecologically relevant contexts.

240 **a. Evolutionary endocrinology suggests key role of hormones in resource**  
241 **allocation**

242 At first glance, resource acquisition and allocation might seem hopelessly  
243 complex, casting doubt on the prospect of uncovering the proximate mechanisms  
244 involved in the relatively subtle variation, at least when compared to mutants, in natural  
245 populations. However, an emergent theme from several systems, including many of the  
246 above detailed examples in model organisms, is the key role of hormone pathways as  
247 major determinants of resource allocation. These discoveries have spurred the  
248 expansion of the field of “evolutionary endocrinology” [65–68]. For instance, we have  
249 learned a great deal about the mechanisms governing allocation of resources in  
250 response to environmental changes from genetic screens and mutational analysis in  
251 model organisms (e.g. [68–70]). In this section, we review our current knowledge in  
252 model and non-model systems on how plasticity in nutrient allocation and hormonal

253 signalling impact reproduction-lifespan and reproduction-dispersal trade-offs. The  
254 hormone pathways we discuss here include insulin, ecdysone, and juvenile hormone.

255 **i. Large effect mutations support the idea that major signalling pathways**  
256 **modulate allocation**

257 Studies that have yielded the most insights have tended to focus on mutations of  
258 large effect. Several studies have implicated leptin as a mediator of acquisition and  
259 allocation of nutrients. In mammals, leptin together with AMPK (AMP-activated protein  
260 kinase) control appetite thus regulating nutrient intake [71], and leptin also mediates the  
261 energetic trade-off of reproduction with the immune system by acting as a proximate  
262 endocrine indicator of the energy state to the immune system [72]. In *D. melanogaster*,  
263 Upd2 (unpaired 2), a functional homolog of leptin [73], causes a nutrient dependent  
264 effect on growth, mediating production of Dilps (*Drosophila* insulin-like peptides) in the  
265 fed state, and subsequent secretion of insulin in response to dietary fat [73]. These  
266 studies demonstrate a direct connection between nutrient limitation and allocation.

267 Both ecdysone and the insulin/insulin-like signalling pathway (IIS) have a role in  
268 the plastic allocation of nutrients. Sequential perturbation of IIS and ecdysone signalling  
269 in ovarian somatic cells of *D. melanogaster* on different diets showed that ecdysone  
270 signalling regulated the rate of increase in ovary volume in general while IIS conferred  
271 the same effect before larvae attained critical weight [74,75]. This nutrient-dependent  
272 development of the ovary illustrates the role of hormonal signalling in plastic allocation  
273 of nutrients. Perhaps one of the most significant contributions emerging from mutation  
274 studies is that IIS signalling pathways are critical in the regulation of lifespan in many  
275 species. In several model organisms (including fly, mice and worm), reduced IIS

276 phenocopies nutrient deprivation, resulting in longer-lived individuals (e.g. [76–78]). In  
277 addition, a suppressed IIS or removal of the germ-line produces life extending effects by  
278 activating the forkhead transcription factor (FOXO) which is conserved across *C.*  
279 *elegans* (*daf-16*), *D. melanogaster* (*dFOXO*) and mammals (*FOXO3a*) [79,80].

280 At the whole-body level [71], AMPK regulates metabolic energy balance by  
281 affecting feeding behaviour and circadian rhythms. When nutrient abundance is low, the  
282 elevated AMP to ATP ratio activates AMPK, with subsequent gain in health span and  
283 longevity in *D. melanogaster*. AMPK is a conserved modulator of lifespan in flies and  
284 mammals linking energy sensing to longevity, and is emerging as a major mechanism  
285 accounting for variation in longevity [71].

## 286 ii. Lessons from studies with more ecological context

287 Hormone pathways have also been implicated in nutrient allocation shifts in non-  
288 model systems. Studies in flies and beetles have likewise suggested the IIS as a major  
289 pathway involved in resource distribution. An exonic indel polymorphism in the Insulin-  
290 like Receptor (*InR*) gene was identified as a functional direct candidate target of natural  
291 selection in wild *D. melanogaster* [81,82]. In rhinoceros beetles, horn size is highly  
292 sensitive to nutrition and to perturbations in the IIS than are other body structures [83].  
293 The precise details about how nutrients are mobilized toward competing traits have  
294 perhaps been best characterized in the wing dimorphic sand cricket, *Gryllus firmus* [84].  
295 Juvenile hormone (JH) levels determine the morph, and trigger a whole host of  
296 processes leading to differential allocation of actual resource components toward flight  
297 capability versus reproduction. Flight capable morphs preferentially metabolize amino  
298 acids and convert a larger proportion of fatty acids to triglycerides while flightless

299 morphs preferentially metabolize fatty acids and convert a larger proportion of amino  
300 acids to ovarian protein [65,84]. Adult crickets on low food diets allocate proportionally  
301 fewer resources toward flight capability [17,18], however, whether this diet-dependent  
302 shift is also mediated through JH has not yet been established. Juvenile hormone  
303 signalling is also involved in nutrition-based sex-specific mandible development via  
304 *doublesex* gene in the staghorn beetle [62].

305         These studies support the hypothesis that the evolution of allocation patterns  
306 ultimately results from the evolution of key endocrine pathways [66–68], potentially  
307 providing a simple theme in complex web of traits at various levels. Thus, while there is  
308 no denying acquisition and allocation of resources are highly complex processes, it is  
309 clear that hormone pathways serve as major mediators in many cases.

### 310         **iii. Understanding the underlying genetics of natural variation**

311         Most of the above-described studies that identify key genes (except a few e.g.  
312 [81,82]) rely on evidence from large effect mutations or major perturbations and they  
313 have been very successful at identifying genes involved in the regulation of metabolism  
314 and resource allocation and of the effects of large alterations to individual genes. Our  
315 knowledge of the genetic basis of *natural* variation in metabolism and resource  
316 allocation is severely lacking in comparison, a predicament that is shared by the  
317 majority of complex traits [85–87]. The large effect genetic mutants identified via  
318 classical genetic techniques are typically not segregating in natural populations, which  
319 is not surprising given the central role of the pathways involved [88]. Additionally,  
320 despite the fact that several large effect mutations have been found to influence lifespan  
321 in *D. melanogaster* (see [3]), mapping studies and evolution experiments using natural

322 populations have not independently identified these same genes as important  
323 contributors to natural genetic variation (e.g. [3,89–91]), with few exceptions [85,86].  
324 These results are not due to a lack of genetic variation at these loci, given the  
325 populations used are derived from wild populations and typically have high heritabilities  
326 for most phenotypes, including gene expression levels of some of these same genes  
327 [92]. There are several possible explanations for this large disconnect regarding genes  
328 in these hormone pathways: 1) they do not contribute to natural genetic variation, 2)  
329 their effects are subtle and thus difficult to detect, 3) their effects stem from *trans*  
330 regulatory changes affecting gene expression [93]. Large effect mutant studies may  
331 represent the extreme tail of effect size distribution in nature [14], or, in the case of  
332 increase in longevity, different mechanisms altogether may induce altered nutrient  
333 signalling pathways in captive populations due to absence of stressors [86,87,94].

334 One of the strongest messages to emerge from modern quantitative genetics is  
335 that the genotype to phenotype map is more complex than some anticipated [95]. Within  
336 this complexity, our goals should be to find the main roads and general patterns. Newer  
337 mapping strategies, such as multi-parental populations, will help to assay multi-level  
338 traits on the same set of lines and leverage what is known about hormone pathways to  
339 reveal mechanistic bases of plastic resource allocation in natural organisms.

340 **b. Integrating genetic and physiological mechanisms into evolutionary**  
341 **perspectives of resource allocation**

342 As with the above evolutionary models, traditionally, questions surrounding  
343 proximate mechanisms have been considered separately from evolutionary questions,  
344 with a more recent movement toward integration across sub-disciplines. In particular, a

345 major question surrounding hypothesized resource-based trade-offs is the degree to  
346 which the proximate mechanism underlying trade-offs stems from functional resource  
347 competition, or whether some other mechanism (e.g. hormone signalling), produces the  
348 relationship between traits. Here, we argue that these proximate mechanisms are not in  
349 conflict with the conceptual framework of the Y model.

#### 350 **i. Challenge of a resource-based Y model**

351 The Y model of resource allocation, as a framework to explain proximate  
352 mechanisms underlying life history trade-offs [12,96], has in recent years been criticized  
353 by some as inadequate, leading some to seek revision of life history theory (see  
354 exchanges in [97–101]). The challenge to a resource-centered model is based on new  
355 empirical data showing that 1) abrogation of reproduction does not always extend  
356 lifespan, 2) some mutations that extend lifespan do not affect, or in fact, increase  
357 fecundity, and 3) male and female organisms of several species respond differently to  
358 interventions that increase lifespan. The most notable of these are studies in *C. elegans*  
359 [102,103] and *D. melanogaster* [104,105] in which gonad ablation failed to increase  
360 lifespan, while ablation of the germline only, doubled lifespan. Evidence suggests this  
361 effect is mediated largely by the insulin/IGF-1 system, which is thought to integrate  
362 molecular signals from the germ line and those from the somatic gonad to determine  
363 lifespan, rather than direct redistribution of resources. This hormonal signalling  
364 alternative has spurred a vigorous debate [99,100] whose reconciliation, in our view,  
365 depends on the eventual and successful integration of proximate mechanisms of trade-  
366 offs into evolutionary theory.

#### 367 **ii. Is the new data really in conflict with the Y model?**



368 We have reviewed above, case studies that directly or indirectly offer support for a  
369 resource model of life history evolution. Of particular note are studies demonstrating  
370 preferential amino acid metabolism and allocation of fatty acids to either flight or  
371 reproduction in winged vs wingless cricket morphs [84,106–110]. These works  
372 represent compelling evidence for differential resource allocation associated with the  
373 flight capability-reproduction trade-off. In addition, studies that quantified amino acid  
374 metabolism *in vivo* confirmed the predictions of the Y model for this trade-off [84,107].  
375 Studies that fail to find the trade-off or find a positive relationship may not logically  
376 invalidate those that observe a negative correlation as multiple factors may be  
377 responsible. Further, the bulk of known mechanisms have been described in non-  
378 natural laboratory mutant organisms with limited or zero selection pressures  
379 experienced in the wild [86,87,94]. Although, the evidence for the connection between  
380 signalling and resource allocation is unclear, this absence of evidence should not be  
381 treated as evidence of absence.

### 382 **iii. Opportunities for integration of fields**

383 Conceptual dichotomies where available empirical data do not sufficiently fit  
384 standing theoretical principles are not new to biology. These apparent conflicts have  
385 fuelled progress of the broad field and successfully led to the integration of once thought  
386 disparate fields – Mendelian, molecular, and quantitative genetics in the last century  
387 (see [111]). Instead of asking whether survival costs are best explained either by literal  
388 resource competition or by resource-free signalling, it may be useful to explore how the  
389 two integrate into the observed trade-off. This strategy can redirect attention to potential  
390 connections between nutrients and signals and factors that affect that connection. There

391 is strong evidence that hormonal signalling is involved in nutrient sensing mechanisms  
392 implicated in aging [112], and that these mechanisms are at the base of appetite  
393 regulation and redistribution of nutrients [71]. It is thus possible to see how hormonal  
394 signalling may regulate optimal allocation and account for evolution of diverse resource  
395 allocation patterns. Thus, new data showing that signals regulate lifespan do not,  
396 presently, preclude the evolutionary role of resource constraints, especially in natural  
397 settings. It is completely fitting with evolutionary theory to expect organisms to use  
398 specific cues to indicate environmental conditions such as food availability. Thus, when  
399 results find that a single amino acid level can change how organisms allocate resources  
400 [113], an evolutionary interpretation is that that amino acid is what is cueing the  
401 organism about the environment, not that actual resource levels are not important to the  
402 response.

403         We do not yet know whether one or more proximate explanations govern a given  
404 trade-off. A possible scenario to emerge may negate the notion of a single proximate  
405 explanation since there may be unique mechanisms in different species and/or  
406 environmental settings. For example, in selected lines of *D. melanogaster*, offspring  
407 ovariole number increased in response to maternal starvation [114]; in wild-living *D.*  
408 *melanogaster* larval age and larval weight predicted survival in temperate and tropical  
409 regions, respectively [115]; and, in redback spider dietary restriction extended lifespan  
410 in mated, but imposed cost in unmated females [116]. These examples suggest multiple  
411 mechanistic possibilities defining a given phenotypic trade-off in different species or  
412 within species in different environments. Whether the trade-off is affected by diet,  
413 temperature, or behaviour, molecular signalling could lead to changes in how resources

414 are allocated. It will benefit both fields if future studies take advantage of the ‘omic’  
415 technologies to step up cross-field approaches in the search for mechanisms governing  
416 these traits in nature.

## 417 **5. Future Directions**

418 In this review, we have attempted to argue that a resource-based Y model is  
419 uniquely favoured to facilitate integration of evolutionary life history theory with  
420 proximate mechanisms underlying the near-ubiquitous trade-offs in life history traits. In  
421 doing so we have brought to the fore two key areas where significant progress is  
422 attainable, especially with the aid of ‘omic’ approaches: 1) performing studies in more  
423 ecologically-relevant contexts, and 2) increasing the level of integration between fields.

424 A major gap in our understanding of life history trade-offs in general, and the  
425 relationship between survival and reproduction in particular, is a general paucity of  
426 studies focusing on the underlying mechanisms in natural species, and lack of  
427 concordance between results of mutational studies in model species and those from  
428 studies of natural variation in the few cases where these have been undertaken. Here,  
429 we have attempted to show the wide variety of plastic resource allocation strategies in  
430 response to environmental fluctuations in availability that exist among natural  
431 populations and species. Understandably, many of the patterns so far uncovered have  
432 been demonstrated using laboratory studies with explicit diet manipulations (at most,  
433 three diet variations). We support this approach but, in addition, advocate for a broader,  
434 more realistic consideration of experimental diets. In this direction, studies taking  
435 ‘nutritional geometry’ approaches discussed earlier have the potential to provide a  
436 broader understanding of how organisms respond to changes in diet. In addition to

437 considerations of mere nutritional content, experimental diets should attempt to mimic  
438 the natural diet of the organism as closely as possible, and the natural range of  
439 availability in the field in order to ensure that results most reflect evolutionarily relevant  
440 patterns that occur in nature.

441         Secondly, we have highlighted gaps in theoretical evolutionary models that  
442 address both optimal resource allocation patterns, and the evolution of phenotypic  
443 plasticity. To our knowledge, very few models specifically focus on evolution of  
444 phenotypically plastic resource allocation in response to variation in resource  
445 availability. We encourage the development of evolutionary models that integrate  
446 proximate mechanisms as a way to expand our understanding of the evolution of  
447 resource allocation strategies in multiple systems. In addition, testing the predictions of  
448 models predicting the evolution of different resource allocation strategies should be a  
449 major priority. Natural systems where patterns of availability differ among populations  
450 and species, can also inform these questions. Alternatively, experimental evolution  
451 approaches, where resource availability can be altered in a controlled way, and different  
452 types of variability across time can be induced, are potentially a powerful way to test  
453 these models. An experimental evolution approach could also allow for tracking change  
454 across the genotype to phenotype map in an integrative way, tracking changes in  
455 proximate mechanisms as evolution occurs.

456         Overall, viewing phenotypes within a framework of resource acquisition and  
457 allocation allows for a natural integration of physiology, genetics, and evolution. Studies  
458 that measure phenotypes at multiple levels (genomic, physiological, organismal levels)  
459 and in multiple resource environments provide a potentially productive path forward.

460 **Funding**

461 This work was supported by NIH grant R01 GM117135 to E.G.K.

462 **Competing interests**

463 We have no competing interests.

464 **Author's contributions**

465 EGK and EN conceived the idea and wrote the manuscript; AMP and EN compiled

466 Table S1, EN, AMP and EGK provided editorial comments. All authors gave final

467 approval for publication.

468 **References**

469 1. Sohal R, Weindruch R. 1996 Oxidative stress, caloric restriction, and aging. *Sci. N. Y.*

470 *NY*

471 2. Browner WS, Kahn AJ, Ziv E, Reiner AP, Oshima J, Cawthon RM, Hsueh W-C,

472 Cummings SR. 2004 The genetics of human longevity. *Am. J. Med.* **117**, 851–860.

473 (doi:10.1016/j.amjmed.2004.06.033)

474 3. Hughes KA, Reynolds RM. 2005 Evolutionary and mechanistic theories of aging.

475 *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **50**, 421–445. (doi:10.1146/annurev.ento.50.071803.130409)

476 4. Kenyon CJ. 2005 The plasticity of aging: insights from long-lived mutants. *Cell* **120**,

477 449–460. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2005.02.002)

478 5. Partridge L, Alic N, Bjedov I, Piper MDW. 2010 Ageing in *Drosophila*: the role of the

479 insulin/Igf and TOR signalling network. *EXG* **46**, 1–6.

480 (doi:10.1016/j.exger.2010.09.003)

- 481 6. Andersson M. 1986 Evolution of condition-dependent sex ornaments and mating  
482 preferences: sexual selection based on viability differences. *Evolution* **40**, 804–816.  
483 (doi:10.2307/2408465)
- 484 7. Warren IA, Gotoh H, Dworkin IM, Emlen DJ, Lavine LC. 2013 A general mechanism  
485 for conditional expression of exaggerated sexually-selected traits. *BioEssays News*  
486 *Rev. Mol. Cell. Dev. Biol.* **35**, 889–899. (doi:10.1002/bies.201300031)
- 487 8. Neel J. 1962 Diabetes mellitus: A ‘thrifty’ genotype rendered detrimental by  
488 ‘progress’? *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **14**, 353–362.
- 489 9. Wells JCK. 2009 Thrift: a guide to thrifty genes, thrifty phenotypes and thrifty norms.  
490 *Int. J. Obes. 2005* **33**, 1331–1338. (doi:10.1038/ijo.2009.175)
- 491 10. Stearns SC. 1992 *The evolution of life histories*. Oxford University Press Oxford.
- 492 11. Roff DA, Mostowy S, Fairbairn DJ. 2002 The evolution of trade-offs: testing  
493 predictions on response to selection and environmental variation. *Evol. Int. J. Org.*  
494 *Evol.* **56**, 84–95.
- 495 12. van Noordwijk AJ, de Jong G. 1986 Acquisition and allocation of resources: their  
496 influence on variation in life history tactics. *Am. Nat.* **128**, 137–142.
- 497 13. Manolio TA *et al.* 2009 Finding the missing heritability of complex diseases. *Nature*  
498 **461**, 747–753. (doi:10.1038/nature08494)
- 499 14. Rockman MV. 2012 The QTN program and the alleles that matter for evolution: all  
500 that’s gold does not glitter. *Evolution* **66**, 1–17. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-  
501 5646.2011.01486.x)
- 502 15. Simmons F, Bradley T. 1997 An analysis of resource allocation in response to  
503 dietary yeast in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J. Insect Physiol.* **43**, 779–788.

- 504 16. Casas J, Pincebourde S, Mandon N, Vannier F, Poujol R, Giron D. 2005 Lifetime  
505 nutrient dynamics reveal simultaneous capital and income breeding in a parasitoid.  
506 *Ecology* **86**, 545–554. (doi:10.1890/04-0812)
- 507 17. King EG, Roff DA, Fairbairn DJ. 2011 Trade-off acquisition and allocation in *Gryllus*  
508 *firmus*: a test of the Y model. *J. Evol. Biol.* **24**, 256–264. (doi:10.1111/j.1420-  
509 9101.2010.02160.x)
- 510 18. King EG, Roff DA, Fairbairn DJ. 2011 The evolutionary genetics of acquisition and  
511 allocation in the wing dimorphic cricket, *Gryllus firmus*. *Evolution* **65**, 2273–2285.  
512 (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2011.01296.x)
- 513 19. Mockett RJ, Cooper TM, Orr WC, Sohal RS. 2006 Effects of caloric restriction are  
514 species-specific. *Biogerontology* **7**, 157–160. (doi:10.1007/s10522-006-9004-3)
- 515 20. Kaitala A. 1991 Phenotypic plasticity in reproductive behavior of waterstriders: trade-  
516 offs between reproduction and longevity during food stress. *Funct. Ecol.* **5**, 12–18.
- 517 21. Cooper TM, Mockett RJ, Sohal BH, Sohal RS, Orr WC. 2004 Effect of caloric  
518 restriction on life span of the housefly, *Musca domestica*. *FASEB J. Off. Publ. Fed.*  
519 *Am. Soc. Exp. Biol.* **18**, 1591–1593. (doi:10.1096/fj.03-1464fje)
- 520 22. Weindruch R, Marriott BM, Conway J, Knapka JJ, Lane MA, Cutler RG, Roth GS,  
521 Ingram DK. 1995 Measures of body size and growth in rhesus and squirrel monkeys  
522 subjected to long-term dietary restriction. *Am. J. Primatol.* **35**, 207–228.
- 523 23. Kirk KL *et al.* 2001 Dietary restriction and aging: comparative tests of evolutionary  
524 hypotheses. *J. Gerontol. A. Biol. Sci. Med. Sci.* **56**, B123-9.
- 525 24. Stelzer C. 2001 Resource limitation and reproductive effort in a planktonic rotifer.  
526 *Ecology* **82**, 2521–2533.

- 527 25. Calow P, Woollhead A. 1977 The relationship between ration, reproductive effort  
528 and age-specific mortality in the evolution of life-history strategies — some  
529 observations on freshwater triclads. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **46**, 765–781.
- 530 26. Bashey F. 2006 Cross-generational environmental effects and the evolution of  
531 offspring size in the Trinidadian guppy *Poecilia reticulata*. *Evolution* **60**, 348–361.
- 532 27. Harrison R G. 1980 Dispersal polymorphisms in insects. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **11**,  
533 95–118. (doi:10.1146/annurev.es.11.110180.000523)
- 534 28. Roff DA. 1986 The evolution of wing dimorphism in insects. *Evolution* **40**, 1009–  
535 1020. (doi:10.2307/2408759)
- 536 29. Dingle H. 1996 *Migration: the biology of life on the move: the biology of life on the*  
537 *move*. California: Oxford University Press, USA.
- 538 30. Zera AJ, Denno RF. 1997 Physiology and ecology of dispersal polymorphism in  
539 insects. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **42**, 207–230.
- 540 31. Denno RF, Douglas LW, Jacobs D. 1985 Crowding and host plant nutrition:  
541 environmental determinants of wing-form in *Prokelisia marginata*. *Ecology* **66**, 1588–  
542 1596. (doi:10.2307/1938021)
- 543 32. Braendle C, Davis GK, Brisson JA, Stern DL. 2006 Wing dimorphism in aphids.  
544 *Heredity* **97**, 192–199. (doi:10.1038/sj.hdy.6800863)
- 545 33. Zera AJ, Tiebel KC. 1988 Brachypterizing effect of group rearing, juvenile hormone  
546 III and methoprene in the wing-dimorphic cricket, *Gryllus rubens*. *J. Insect Physiol.*  
547 **34**, 489–498. (doi:10.1016/0022-1910(88)90190-4)
- 548 34. Roff D. 1990 Antagonistic pleiotropy and the evolution of wing dimorphism in the  
549 sand cricket, *Gryllus firmus*. *Heredity* **65**, 169–177.



- 550 35. Simpson SJ, Raubenheimer D. 1995 The geometric analysis of feeding and  
551 nutrition: a user's guide. *J. Insect Physiol.* **41**, 545–553. (doi:10.1016/0022-  
552 1910(95)00006-G)
- 553 36. Lee KP, Simpson SJ, Clissold FJ, Brooks R, Ballard JWO, Taylor PW, Soran N,  
554 Raubenheimer D. 2008 Lifespan and reproduction in *Drosophila*: new insights from  
555 nutritional geometry. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **105**, 2498–2503.  
556 (doi:10.1073/pnas.0710787105)
- 557 37. Behmer ST. 2009 Insect herbivore nutrient regulation. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **54**, 165–  
558 187. (doi:10.1146/annurev.ento.54.110807.090537)
- 559 38. Clark RM, Zera AJ, Behmer ST. 2015 Nutritional physiology of life-history trade-offs:  
560 how food protein-carbohydrate content influences life-history traits in the wing-  
561 polymorphic cricket *Gryllus firmus*. *J. Exp. Biol.* **218**, 298–308.  
562 (doi:10.1242/jeb.112888)
- 563 39. Cotter SC, Simpson SJ, Raubenheimer D, Wilson K. 2011 Macronutrient balance  
564 mediates trade-offs between immune function and life history traits. *Funct. Ecol.* **25**,  
565 186–198. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2010.01766.x)
- 566 40. Forster MJ, Morris P, Sohal RS. 2003 Genotype and age influence the effect of  
567 caloric intake on mortality in mice. *FASEB J.* **17**, 690–692 (doi:10.1096/fj.02-  
568 0533fje)
- 569 41. Williams G. 1966 Natural selection, the costs of reproduction, and a refinement of  
570 Lack's principle. *Am. Nat.* **100**, 687.
- 571 42. Gadgil M, Bossert WH. 1970 Life historical consequences of natural selection. *Am.*  
572 *Nat.* **104**, 1–24.

- 573 43. Charlesworth B. 1980 *Evolution in age-structured populations*. Cambridge, England:  
574 Cambridge University Press.
- 575 44. Perrin N, Sibly R. 1993 Dynamic models of energy allocation and investment. *Annu.*  
576 *Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **24**, 379–410.
- 577 45. McNamara JM, Houston AI. 1996 State-dependent life histories. *Nature* **380**, 215–  
578 221. (doi:10.1038/380215a0)
- 579 46. Roff DA. 2002 *Life history evolution*. Sinauer Associates, Inc. Sunderland, MA.
- 580 47. Via S, Lande R. 1985 Genotype-environment interaction and the evolution of  
581 phenotypic plasticity. *Evolution* **39**, 505–522.
- 582 48. Kawecki T, Stearns S. 1993 The evolution of life histories in spatially heterogeneous  
583 environments: optimal reaction norms revisited. *Evol. Ecol.* **7**, 155–174.
- 584 49. Dewitt TJ, Sih A, Wilson DS. 1998 Costs and limits of phenotypic plasticity. *Trends*  
585 *Ecol. Evol.* **13**, 77–81.
- 586 50. Scheiner SM. 1998 The genetics of phenotypic plasticity. VII. Evolution in a spatially-  
587 structured environment. *J. Evol. Biol.* **11**, 303–320. (doi:10.1046/j.1420-  
588 9101.1998.11030303.x)
- 589 51. De Jong G. 1999 Unpredictable selection in a structured population leads to local  
590 genetic differentiation in evolved reaction norms. *J. Evol. Biol.* **12**, 839–851.  
591 (doi:10.1046/j.1420-9101.1999.00118.x)
- 592 52. de Jong G, Behera N. 2002 The influence of life-history differences on the evolution  
593 of reaction norms. *Evol. Ecol. Res.* **4**, 1–25.

- 594 53. Ernande B, Dieckmann U. 2004 The evolution of phenotypic plasticity in spatially  
595 structured environments: implications of intraspecific competition, plasticity costs  
596 and environmental characteristics. *J. Evol. Biol.* **17**, 613–628.
- 597 54. King EG, Roff DA. 2010 Modeling the evolution of phenotypic plasticity in resource  
598 allocation in wing-dimorphic insects. *Am. Nat.* **175**, 702–716. (doi:10.1086/652434)
- 599 55. Fischer B, Dieckmann U, Taborsky B. 2010 When to store energy in a stochastic  
600 environment. *Evolution* **65**, 1221–1232. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2010.01198.x)
- 601 56. Fischer B, Taborsky B, Dieckmann U. 2009 Unexpected patterns of plastic energy  
602 allocation in stochastic environments. *Am. Nat.* **173**, E108–E120.  
603 (doi:10.1086/596536)
- 604 57. Welch AM, Semlitsch RD, Gerhardt HC. 1998 Call duration as an indicator of  
605 genetic quality in male gray tree frogs. *Science* **280**, 1928–1930.  
606 (doi:10.1126/science.280.5371.1928)
- 607 58. Holzer B, Jacot A, Brinkhof MWG. 2003 Condition-dependent signaling affects male  
608 sexual attractiveness in field crickets, *Gryllus campestris*. *Behav. Ecol.* **14**, 353–359.  
609 (doi:10.1093/beheco/14.3.353)
- 610 59. Hamilton WD, Zuk M. 1982 Heritable true fitness and bright birds: a role for  
611 parasites? *Science* **218**, 384–387. (doi:10.1126/science.7123238)
- 612 60. Hunt J, Bussière LF, Jennions MD, Brooks R. 2004 What is genetic quality? *Trends*  
613 *Ecol. Evol.* **19**, 329–333. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2004.03.035)
- 614 61. Getty T. 2006 Sexually selected signals are not similar to sports handicaps. *Trends*  
615 *Ecol. Evol.* **21**, 83–88. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2005.10.016)

- 616 62. Gotoh H, Miyakawa H, Ishikawa A, Ishikawa Y, Sugime Y, Emlen DJ, Lavine LC,  
617 Miura T. 2014 Developmental link between sex and nutrition; doublesex regulates  
618 sex-specific mandible growth via juvenile hormone signaling in stag beetles. *PLOS*  
619 *Genet.* **10**, e1004098. (doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1004098)
- 620 63. Zahavi A. 1975 Mate selection — A selection for a handicap. *J. Theor. Biol.* **53**, 205–  
621 214. (doi:10.1016/0022-5193(75)90111-3)
- 622 64. Mangel M, Munch SB. 2005 A life-history perspective on short- and long-term  
623 consequences of compensatory growth. *Am. Nat.* **166**, E155–E176.
- 624 65. Zera AJ, Harshman LG. 2009 Laboratory selection studies of life-history physiology  
625 in insects. In *Experimental evolution: Concepts, methods, and applications of*  
626 *selection experiments*, pp. 236–281. University of California Press.
- 627 66. Flatt T, Tu M-P, Tatar M. 2005 Hormonal pleiotropy and the juvenile hormone  
628 regulation of *Drosophila* development and life history. *BioEssays News Rev. Mol.*  
629 *Cell. Dev. Biol.* **27**, 999–1010. (doi:10.1002/bies.20290)
- 630 67. Tatar M, Bartke A, Antebi A. 2003 The endocrine regulation of aging by insulin-like  
631 signals. *Sci. N. Y. NY* **299**, 1346–1351.
- 632 68. Zera AJ, Harshman LG, Williams TD. 2007 Evolutionary endocrinology: the  
633 developing synthesis between endocrinology and evolutionary genetics. *Annu. Rev.*  
634 *Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **38**, 793–817. (doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.38.091206.095615)
- 635 69. Teleman AA. 2010 Molecular mechanisms of metabolic regulation by insulin in  
636 *Drosophila*. *Biochem. J.* **425**, 13–26. (doi:10.1042/BJ20091181)
- 637 70. Wells JC. 2010 The thrifty phenotype: an adaptation in growth or metabolism? *Am.*  
638 *J. Hum. Biol.* **23**, 65–75. (doi:10.1002/ajhb.21100)

- 639 71. Hardie DG, Ross FA, Hawley SA. 2012 AMPK: a nutrient and energy sensor that  
640 maintains energy homeostasis. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **13**, 251–262.  
641 (doi:10.1038/nrm3311)
- 642 72. French SS, Denise Dearing M, Demas GE. 2011 Leptin as a physiological mediator  
643 of energetic trade-offs in ecoimmunology: implications for disease. *Integr. Comp.*  
644 *Biol.* **51**, 505–513. (doi:10.1093/icb/icr019)
- 645 73. Rajan A, Perrimon N. 2012 *Drosophila* cytokine unpaired 2 regulates physiological  
646 homeostasis by remotely controlling insulin secretion. *Cell* **151**, 123–137.  
647 (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2012.08.019)
- 648 74. Mirth C, Truman JW, Riddiford LM. 2005 The role of the prothoracic gland in  
649 determining critical weight for metamorphosis in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Curr.*  
650 *Biol.* **15**, 1796–1807. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2005.09.017)
- 651 75. Mendes CC, Mirth CK. 2016 Stage-specific plasticity in ovary size is regulated by  
652 insulin/insulin-like growth factor and ecdysone signaling in *Drosophila*. *Genetics*  
653 **202**, 703–719. (doi:10.1534/genetics.115.179960)
- 654 76. Clancy DJ, Gems D, Harshman LG, Oldham S, Stocker H, Hafen E, Leevers SJ,  
655 Partridge L. 2001 Extension of life-span by loss of CHICO, a *Drosophila* insulin  
656 receptor substrate protein. *Sci. N. Y. NY* **292**, 104–106.  
657 (doi:10.1126/science.1057991)
- 658 77. Tatar M, Kopelman A, Epstein D, Tu M, Yin C, Garofalo R. 2001 A mutant  
659 *Drosophila* insulin receptor homolog that extends life-span and impairs  
660 neuroendocrine function. *Sci. N. Y. NY* **292**, 107–110.

- 661 78. Kenyon C, Chang J, Gensch E, Rudner A, Tabtiang R. 1993 A *C. elegans* mutant  
662 that lives twice as long as wild type. *Nature* **366**, 461–464. (doi:10.1038/366461a0)
- 663 79. Puig O, Marr MT, Ruhf ML, Tjian R. 2003 Control of cell number by *Drosophila*  
664 FOXO: downstream and feedback regulation of the insulin receptor pathway. *Genes*  
665 *Dev.* **17**, 2006. (doi:10.1101/gad.1098703)
- 666 80. Motta MC, Divecha N, Lemieux M, Kamel C, Chen D, Gu W, Bultsma Y, McBurney  
667 M, Guarente L. 2004 Mammalian SIRT1 represses forkhead transcription factors.  
668 *Cell* **116**, 551–563.
- 669 81. Paaby AB, Blackett MJ, Hoffmann AA, Schmidt PS. 2010 Identification of a candidate  
670 adaptive polymorphism for *Drosophila* life history by parallel independent clines on  
671 two continents. *Mol. Ecol.* **19**, 760–774. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2009.04508.x)
- 672 82. Paaby AB, Bergland AO, Behrman EL, Schmidt PS. 2014 A highly pleiotropic amino  
673 acid polymorphism in the *Drosophila* insulin receptor contributes to life-history  
674 adaptation. *Evolution* **68**, 3395–3409. (doi:10.1111/evo.12546)
- 675 83. Emlen DJ, Warren IA, Johns A, Dworkin I, Lavine LC. 2012 A mechanism of  
676 extreme growth and reliable signaling in sexually selected ornaments and weapons.  
677 *Science* **337**, 860–864. (doi:10.1126/science.1224286)
- 678 84. Zhao Z, Zera AJ. 2006 Biochemical basis of specialization for dispersal vs.  
679 reproduction in a wing-polymorphic cricket: Morph-specific metabolism of amino  
680 acids. *J. Insect Physiol.* **52**, 646–658. (doi:10.1016/j.jinsphys.2006.03.003)
- 681 85. Reed LK *et al.* 2014 Systems genomics of metabolic phenotypes in wild-type  
682 *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genetics* **197**, 781–793.  
683 (doi:10.1534/genetics.114.163857)

- 684 86. Briga M, Verhulst S. 2015 What can long-lived mutants tell us about mechanisms  
685 causing aging and lifespan variation in natural environments? *Exp. Gerontol.* **71**,  
686 21–26. (doi:10.1016/j.exger.2015.09.002)
- 687 87. Savory FR, Benton TG, Varma V, Hope IA, Sait SM. 2014 Stressful environments  
688 can indirectly select for increased longevity. *Ecol. Evol.* **4**, 1176–1185.  
689 (doi:10.1002/ece3.1013)
- 690 88. Van Voorhies WA, Curtsinger JW, Rose MR. 2006 Do longevity mutants always  
691 show trade-offs? *Exp. Gerontol.* **41**, 1055–1058. (doi:10.1016/j.exger.2006.05.006)
- 692 89. Remolina SC, Chang PL, Leips J, Nuzhdin SV, Hughes KA. 2012 Genomic basis of  
693 aging and life-history evolution in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolution* **66**, 3390–  
694 3403. (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01710.x)
- 695 90. Magwire MM, Yamamoto A, Carbone MA, Roshina NV, Symonenko AV, Pasyukova  
696 EG, Morozova TV, Mackay TFC. 2010 Quantitative and molecular genetic analyses  
697 of mutations increasing *Drosophila* life span. *PLOS Genet.* **6**, e1001037.  
698 (doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1001037)
- 699 91. Burke MK, King EG, Shahrestani P, Rose MR, Long AD. 2014 Genome-wide  
700 association study of extreme longevity in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Genome Biol.*  
701 *Evol.* **6**, 1–11. (doi:10.1093/gbe/evt180)
- 702 92. Najjarro MA, Hackett JL, Smith BR, Highfill CA, King EG, Long AD, Macdonald SJ.  
703 2015 Identifying loci contributing to natural variation in xenobiotic resistance in  
704 *Drosophila*. *PLOS Genet.* **11**, e1005663. (doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1005663)


- 705 93. Pomp D, Allan MF, Wesolowski SR. 2004 Quantitative genomics: exploring the  
706 genetic architecture of complex trait predisposition. *J. Anim. Sci.* **82 E-Suppl**, E300-  
707 312.
- 708 94. Holliday R, Rattan SIS. 2010 Longevity mutants do not establish any 'new science'  
709 of ageing. *Biogerontology* **11**, 507–511. (doi:10.1007/s10522-010-9288-1)
- 710 95. Robinson MR, Wray NR, Visscher PM. 2014 Explaining additional genetic variation  
711 in complex traits. *Trends Genet. TIG* **30**, 124–132. (doi:10.1016/j.tig.2014.02.003)
- 712 96. Boggs CL. 2009 Understanding insect life histories and senescence through a  
713 resource allocation lens. *Funct. Ecol.* **23**, 27–37. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-  
714 2435.2009.01527.x)
- 715 97. Flatt T, Promislow DEL. 2007 Still pondering an age-old question. *Science* **318**,  
716 1255–1256. (doi:10.1126/science.1147491)
- 717 98. Flatt T. 2011 Survival costs of reproduction in *Drosophila*. *Exp. Gerontol.* **46**, 369–  
718 375. (doi:10.1016/j.exger.2010.10.008)
- 719 99. Flatt T, Heyland A, Stearns SC. 2011 What mechanistic insights can or cannot  
720 contribute to life history evolution - an exchange between Stearns, Heyland, and  
721 Flatt. In *Mechanisms of life history evolution: the genetics and physiology of life*  
722 *history traits and trade-offs*. (eds T Flatt, A Heyland), New York: Oxford University  
723 Press.
- 724 100. Stearns SC. 2011 Does impressive progress on understanding mechanisms  
725 advance life history theory? In *Mechanisms of life history evolution: the genetics and*  
726 *physiology of life history traits and trade-offs*. (eds T Flatt, A Heyland), New York:  
727 Oxford University Press.



- 728 101. Edward DA, Chapman T. 2011 Mechanisms underlying reproductive trade-offs:  
729 costs of reproduction. In *Mechanisms of life history evolution: the genetics and*  
730 *physiology of life history traits and trade-offs* (eds T Flatt, A Heyland), New York:  
731 Oxford University Press.
- 732 102. Hsin H, Kenyon C. 1999 Signals from the reproductive system regulate the  
733 lifespan of *C. elegans*. *Nature* **399**, 362–366. (doi:10.1038/20694)
- 734 103. Barnes AI, Partridge L. 2003 Costing reproduction. *Anim. Behav.* **66**, 199–204.  
735 (doi:10.1006/anbe.2003.2122)
- 736 104. Barnes AI, Boone JM, Jacobson J, Partridge L, Chapman T. 2006 No extension  
737 of lifespan by ablation of germ line in *Drosophila*. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **273**,  
738 939–947. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2005.3388)
- 739 105. Flatt T, Min K-J, D’Alterio C, Villa-Cuesta E, Cumbers J, Lehmann R, Jones DL,  
740 Tatar M. 2008 *Drosophila*, germ-line modulation of insulin signaling and lifespan.  
741 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **105**, 6368–6373. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0709128105)
- 742 106. Mole S, Zera AJ. 1993 Differential allocation of resources underlies the dispersal-  
743 reproduction trade-off in the wing-dimorphic cricket, *Gryllus rubens*. *Oecologia* **93**,  
744 121–127.
- 745 107. Zera AJ, Zhao Z. 2006 Intermediary metabolism and life-history trade-offs:  
746 differential metabolism of amino acids underlies the dispersal-reproduction trade-off  
747 in a wing-polymorphic cricket. *Am. Nat.* **167**, 889–900. (doi:10.1086/503578)
- 748 108. Zera AJ. 2005 Intermediary metabolism and life history trade-offs: lipid  
749 metabolism in lines of the wing-polymorphic cricket, *Gryllus firmus*, selected for flight  
750 capability vs. early age reproduction. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* **45**, 511–524.

- 751 109. Zera AJ, Brink T. 2000 Nutrient absorption and utilization by wing and flight  
752 muscle morphs of the cricket *Gryllus firmus*: implications for the trade-off between  
753 flight capability and early reproduction. *J. Insect Physiol.* **46**, 1207–1218.
- 754 110. Zera AJ, Larsen A. 2001 The metabolic basis of life history variation: genetic and  
755 phenotypic differences in lipid reserves among life history morphs of the wing-  
756 polymorphic cricket, *Gryllus firmus*. *J. Insect Physiol.* **47**, 1147–1160.
- 757 111. Provine W B. 1971 *The origins of theoretical population genetics*. Chicago:  
758 University of Chicago Press.
- 759 112. López-Otín C, Blasco MA, Partridge L, Serrano M, Kroemer G. 2013 The  
760 hallmarks of aging. *Cell* **153**, 1194–1217. (doi:10.1016/j.cell.2013.05.039)
- 761 113. Grandison RC, Piper MDW, Partridge L. 2009 Amino-acid imbalance explains  
762 extension of lifespan by dietary restriction in *Drosophila*. *Nature* **462**, 1061–1064.  
763 (doi:10.1038/nature08619)
- 764 114. Wayne ML, Soundararajan U, Harshman LG. 2006 Environmental stress and  
765 reproduction in *Drosophila melanogaster*: starvation resistance, ovariole numbers  
766 and early age egg production. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **6**, 57. (doi:10.1186/1471-2148-6-57)
- 767 115. Bochdanovits Z, de Jong G. 2003 Temperature dependent larval resource  
768 allocation shaping adult body size in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J. Evol. Biol.* **16**,  
769 1159–1167. (doi:10.1046/j.1420-9101.2003.00621.x)
- 770 116. Stoltz JA, Hanna R, Andrade MCB. 2010 Longevity cost of remaining unmated  
771 under dietary restriction. *Funct. Ecol.* **24**, 1270–1280. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-  
772 2435.2010.01729.x)
- 773  
774

775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790



791 Figure 1: Expectations for trait values for two traits involved in a resource allocation  
792 trade-off when A) there is no phenotypic plasticity in allocation in response to resource  
793 availability, and B) there is phenotypic plasticity in allocation with increasing proportions  
794 allocated to trait Y as resource availability increases.

795  
796  
797  
798

799 Table S1: Examples of the diversity of resource allocation strategies in some life history  
 800 traits across the animal kingdom.  
 801

| Trade-off   | Taxa   | Increased allocation with low resource availability                | Selected examples |
|---|--|--|-------------------|
| <b>a) Trade-offs presented in the literature as two-trait cases</b> |  |  |                   |
| Dispersal–reproduction  | <i>Prokelisia marginata</i>                      | dispersal  | [1]               |
|   | <i>Gryllus rubens</i>                            | flightlessness   | [2]               |
|   | <i>Gryllus firmus</i>                            | flightlessness   | [3]               |
|   | <i>Gryllus firmus</i>                            | adults to dispersal;<br>juveniles to reproduction                  | [4,5]             |
| Growth–reproduction*  | <i>Daphnia magna</i>                             | growth   | [6]               |
| Current reproduction–future reproduction                            | <i>Synchaeta pectinata</i>                       | current reproduction <sup>^</sup>                                  | [7]               |
| Storage–reproduction  | <i>Drosophila melanogaster</i>                   | storage  | [8]               |
| Survival–reproduction <sup>#</sup>                                  | <i>Nothobranchius furzeri</i>                    | survival   | [9]               |
|   | <i>Trichoptera</i> spp.                          | to storage in short lived species; no change in long lived species | [10]              |
|   | <i>Elephas maximus</i>                           | survival   | [11]              |
|   | <i>Poecilia reticulata</i>                       | reproduction <sup>\$</sup>   | [12]              |
|   | Theraphosidae                                    | survival   | [13]              |
|   | <i>Callosobruchus maculatus</i>                  | survival   | [14]              |
|   | <i>Asobara tabida</i>                            | survival   | [15]              |
|   | <i>Anastrepha ludens</i>                         | survival   | [16]              |
|   | <i>Notiophilus buguttatu</i>                     | survival   | [17]              |
|   | <i>D. melanogaster</i>                           | survival   | [18–22]           |
|   | <i>Rhabditophora</i>                             | reproduction   | [23]              |
|   | 10 rotifer species                               | most to survival   | [24]              |
|   | <i>Eupelmus vuilletti</i>                        | depends on nutrient (lipid vs sugar)                               | [25]              |
|   | <i>Romalea microptera</i>                        | similar allocation to both traits                                  | [26]              |
|   | <i>Odocoileus virginianus</i>                    | survival   | [27]              |
| <i>Larus michahellis</i>  | survival   | [28]   |                   |
| <i>Saccopteryx bilineata</i>  | survival   | [29]   |                   |
| <i>Gerris</i> spp.  | survival   | [30]   |                   |
| <i>Diomedea exulans</i>   | survival (with terminal reproductive investment) | [31]   |                   |
| Survival–body size  | <i>Macaca mulatta</i> ,<br><i>Saimiri</i> sp.    | M. mulatta to survival; Saimiri sp no effect                       | [32]              |
| Starvation resistance–reproduction                                  | <i>D. melanogaster</i>                           | starvation resistance  | [18]              |
| Egg mass–clutch size  | <i>Microlophus delanonis</i>                     | to none  | [33]              |

| Trade-off   | Taxa   | Increased allocation with low resource availability | Selected examples |
|---|--|---|-------------------|
| Total clutch mass–post-nesting condition                              | <i>Microlophus delanonis</i>                           | to none   | [33]              |
| Egg size–egg number   | <i>Northobranchius furzeri</i>                         | egg size  | [9]               |
| Offspring quality–reproduction  | examines 24 bird species on elevational gradient       | quality in high elevation species                   | [34]              |
| <b>b) Trade-offs presented in the literature as multi-trait cases</b> |  |   |                   |
| Body condition–progeny quality <sup>†</sup>                           | <i>Paroedura picta</i>                                 | body condition                                      | [35]              |
| Dispersal–survival–reproduction–body mass                             | <i>Speyeria mormonica</i>                              | survival  | [36]              |
| Dispersal–lifespan–reproduction                                       | <i>Colias eurytheme</i> ,<br><i>Speyeria mormonica</i> | dispersal, no effect on lifespan                    | [37]              |
| Growth rate–development time–body size                                | <i>Scathophaga stercoraria</i>                         | faster growth rate and faster development time      | [38]              |
| Growth–reproduction– sprint speed                                     | <i>Anolis sagrei</i>                                   | survival  | [39]              |

<sup>†</sup>Many of these refer to early reproductive effort; \*current reproduction; ^ovary size reduction, not absolute resource allocation; <sup>‡</sup>body length, head length vs clutch size, egg size; <sup>§</sup>Study measures somatic investment which may benefit both lifespan and fecundity.

## References

- Denno RF, Douglas LW, Jacobs D. 1985 Crowding and host plant nutrition: environmental determinants of wing-form in *Prokelisia marginata*. *Ecology* **66**, 1588–1596. (doi:10.2307-1938021)
- Zera AJ, Tiebel KC. 1988 Brachypterizing effect of group rearing, juvenile hormone III and methoprene in the wing-dimorphic cricket, *Gryllus rubens*. *J. Insect Physiol.* **34**, 489–498. (doi:10.1016-0022-1910(88)90190-4)
- Roff D. 1990 Antagonistic pleiotropy and the evolution of wing dimorphism in the sand cricket, *Gryllus firmus*. *Heredity* **65**, 169–177.
- King EG, Roff DA, Fairbairn DJ. 2011 Trade-off acquisition and allocation in *Gryllus firmus*: a test of the Y model. *J. Evol. Biol.* **24**, 256–264. (doi:10.1111-j.1420-9101.2010.02160.x)
- King EG, Roff DA, Fairbairn DJ. 2011 The evolutionary genetics of acquisition and allocation in the wing dimorphic cricket, *Gryllus firmus*. *Evolution* **65**, 2273–2285. (doi:10.1111-j.1558-5646.2011.01296.x)
- Yampolsky L, Ebert D. 1994 Variation and plasticity of biomass allocation in *Daphnia*. *Funct. Ecol.* **8**, 435–440.
- Stelzer C. 2001 Resource limitation and reproductive effort in a planktonic rotifer. *Ecology* **82**, 2521–2533.
- Djawdan M, Sugiyama TT, Schlaeger LK, Bradley TJ, Rose MR. 1996 Metabolic aspects of the trade-off between fecundity and longevity in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Physiol. Zool.* **69**, 1176–1195. (doi:10.1086-physzool.69.5.30164252)
- Vrtílek M, Reichard M. 2014 Highly plastic resource allocation to growth and reproduction in females of an African annual fish. *Ecol. Freshw. Fish* **24**, 616–628. (doi:10.1111-eff.12175)
- Stevens DJ, Hansell MH, Monaghan P. 2000 Developmental trade-offs and life histories: strategic allocation of resources in caddis flies. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **267**, 1511–1515.

- 832 11. Hayward AD, Mar KU, Lahdenperä M, Lummaa V. 2014 Early reproductive investment, senescence  
833 and lifetime reproductive success in female Asian elephants. *J. Evol. Biol.* **27**, 772–783.  
834 (doi:10.1111-jeb.12350)
- 835 12. Bashey F. 2006 Cross-generational environmental effects and the evolution of offspring size in the  
836 Trinidadian guppy *Poecilia reticulata*. *Evolution* **60**, 348–361.
- 837 13. Ibler B, Michalik P, Fischer K. 2013 Factors affecting lifespan in bird-eating spiders (Arachnida:  
838 Mygalomorphae, Theraphosidae) – A multi-species approach. *Zool. Anz.* **253**, 126–136.  
839 (doi:10.1016-j.jcz.2013.09.004)
- 840 14. Messina F, Fry J. 2003 Environment-dependent reversal of a life history trade-off in the seed beetle  
841 *Callosobruchus maculatus*. *J. Evol. Biol.* **16**, 501–509.
- 842 15. Ellers J, van Alphen JJM. 1997 Life history evolution in *Asobara tabida*: plasticity in allocation of fat  
843 reserves to survival and reproduction. *J. Evol. Biol.* **10**, 771–785.
- 844 16. Carey JR, Harshman LG, Liedo P, Mller H-G, Wang J-L, Zhang Z. 2008 Longevity-fertility trade-offs in  
845 the tephritid fruit fly, *Anastrepha ludens*, across dietary-restriction gradients. *Aging Cell* **7**, 470–477.  
846 (doi:10.1111-j.1474-9726.2008.00389.x)
- 847 17. Ernsting G, Isaaks JA. 1991 Accelerated ageing: a cost of reproduction in the carabid beetle  
848 *Notiophilus biguttatus* f. *Funct. Ecol.* **5**, 299–303.
- 849 18. Chippindale A, Leroi AM, Kim S, Rose M. 1993 Phenotypic plasticity and selection in *Drosophila* life-  
850 history evolution. I. Nutrition and the cost of reproduction. *J. Evol. Biol.* **6**, 171–193.
- 851 19. Good TP, Tatar M. 2001 Age-specific mortality and reproduction respond to adult dietary restriction in  
852 *Drosophila melanogaster*. *J. Insect Physiol.* **47**, 1467–1473.
- 853 20. Sohal R, Weindruch R. 1996 Oxidative stress, caloric restriction, and aging. *Sci. N. Y. NY*
- 854 21. Partridge L, Piper MDW, Mair W. 2005 Dietary restriction in *Drosophila*. *Mech. Ageing Dev.* **126**, 938–  
855 950. (doi:10.1016-j.mad.2005.03.023)
- 856 22. Lee KP, Simpson SJ, Clissold FJ, Brooks R, Ballard JWO, Taylor PW, Soran N, Raubenheimer D.  
857 2008 Lifespan and reproduction in *Drosophila*: new insights from nutritional geometry. *Proc. Natl.*  
858 *Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **105**, 2498–2503. (doi:10.1073-pnas.0710787105)
- 859 23. Calow P, Woollhead A. 1977 The relationship between ration, reproductive effort and age-specific  
860 mortality in the evolution of life-history strategies — some observations on freshwater triclads. *J.*  
861 *Anim. Ecol.* **46**, 765–781.
- 862 24. Kirk KL et al. 2001 Dietary restriction and aging: comparative tests of evolutionary hypotheses. *J.*  
863 *Gerontol. A. Biol. Sci. Med. Sci.* **56**, B123-129.
- 864 25. Casas J, Pincebourde S, Mandon N, Vannier F, Poujol R, Giron D. 2005 Lifetime nutrient dynamics  
865 reveal simultaneous capital and income breeding in a parasitoid. *Ecology* **86**, 545–554. (doi:10.1890-  
866 04-0812)
- 867 26. Heck MJ, Pehlivanovic M, Purcell JU, Hahn DA, Hatle JD. 2017 Life-extending dietary restriction  
868 reduces oxidative damage of proteins in grasshoppers but does not alter allocation of ingested  
869 nitrogen to somatic tissues. *J. Gerontol. A. Biol. Sci. Med. Sci.* **72**, 616–623. (doi:10.1093-gerona-  
870 glw094)
- 871 27. Karns GR, Holland AM, Steury TD, Ditchkoff SS. 2014 Maternal life history of white-tailed deer:  
872 factors affecting fetal sex allocation, conception timing, and senescence. *Evol. Ecol. Res.* **16**, 165–  
873 178.
- 874 28. Noguera JC, Lores M, Alonso-Álvarez C, Velando A. 2011 Thrifty development: early-life diet  
875 restriction reduces oxidative damage during later growth. *Funct. Ecol.* **25**, 1144–1153. (doi:10.1111-  
876 j.1365-2435.2011.01856.x)
- 877 29. Greiner S, Nagy M, Mayer F, Knörnschild M, Hofer H, Voigt CC. 2014 Sex-biased senescence in a  
878 polygynous bat species. *Ethology* **120**, 197–205. (doi:10.1111-eth.12193)
- 879 30. Kaitala A. 1991 Phenotypic plasticity in reproductive behavior of waterstriders: trade-offs between  
880 reproduction and longevity during food stress. *Funct. Ecol.* **5**, 12–18.
- 881 31. Froy H, Phillips RA, Wood AG, Nussey DH, Lewis S. 2013 Age-related variation in reproductive traits  
882 in the wandering albatross: evidence for terminal improvement following senescence. *Ecol. Lett.* **16**,  
883 642–649. (doi:10.1111-ele.12092)
- 884 32. Weindruch R, Marriott BM, Conway J, Knapka JJ, Lane MA, Cutler RG, Roth GS, Ingram DK. 1995  
885 Measures of body size and growth in rhesus and squirrel monkeys subjected to long-term dietary  
886 restriction. *Am. J. Primatol.* **35**, 207–228.

- 887 33. Jordan M, Snell H. 2002 Life history trade-offs and phenotypic plasticity in the reproduction of  
888 Galapagos lava lizards (*Microlophus delanonis*). *Oecologia* **130**, 44–52. (doi:10.1007-  
889 s004420100776)
- 890 34. Badyaev AV, Ghalambor CK. 2001 Evolution of life histories along elevational gradients: trade-off  
891 between parental care and fecundity. *Ecology* **82**, 2948–2960. (doi:10.1890-0012-  
892 9658(2001)082[2948:EOLHAE]2.0.CO;2)
- 893 35. Kubička L, Kratochvíl L. 2009 First grow, then breed and finally get fat: hierarchical allocation to life-  
894 history traits in a lizard with invariant clutch size. *Funct. Ecol.* **23**, 595–601. (doi:10.1111-j.1365-  
895 2435.2008.01518.x)
- 896 36. Niitepõld K, Boggs CL. 2015 Effects of increased flight on the energetics and life history of the  
897 butterfly *Speyeria mormonia*. *PLOS ONE* **10**, e0140104. (doi:10.1371-journal.pone.0140104)
- 898 37. Niitepõld K, Perez A, Boggs CL. 2014 Aging, life span, and energetics under adult dietary restriction  
899 in lepidoptera. *Physiol. Biochem. Zool.* **87**, 684–694. (doi:10.1086-677570)
- 900 38. Blanckenhorn WU. 1998 Adaptive phenotypic plasticity in growth, development, and body size in the  
901 yellow dung fly. *Evolution* **52**, 1394–1407.
- 902 39. Cox RM, Calsbeek R. 2010 Severe costs of reproduction persist in *Anolis* lizards despite the  
903 evolution of a single-egg clutch. *Evolution* **64**, 1321–1330. (doi:10.1111-j.1558-5646.2009.00906.x)