

21 **Abstract**

22 Benevolent social behaviours, such as parental care, are predicted to relax selection against
23 deleterious mutations, enabling them to persist. We tested this prediction experimentally
24 using burying beetles *Nicrophorus vespilloides*, which make an edible nest for their larvae,
25 whom they nourish and defend. For 20 generations, we allowed replicate experimental
26 burying beetle populations to evolve either with post-hatching care ('Full Care' populations)
27 or without it ('No Care' populations). Lineages were seeded from these experimental
28 populations and then inbred to expose differences in their mutation load. Outbred lineages
29 served as controls. Half the lineages received post-hatching care, half did not. We found that
30 inbred lineages derived from the Full Care populations had lower breeding success and went
31 extinct more quickly than lineages derived from the No Care populations – but only when
32 offspring received no post-hatching care. We infer that Full Care lineages carried more
33 recessive deleterious mutations. When parents provided care, the developmental environment
34 was sufficiently benign that broods had higher survival, whether the population had a high
35 mutation load or not. We suggest that the increased mutation load caused by parental care
36 increases a population's dependence upon care. This could explain why care is seldom lost
37 once it has evolved.

38

39 Introduction

40 Classical population genetics models imagine that populations attain an equilibrium level of
41 genetic variation (known as mutation-selection balance [1-5]). New genetic mutations arise
42 spontaneously, through diverse mechanisms, and increase genetic variation in the population
43 [e.g. 5, 6]. However, since the majority of new mutations are mildly deleterious [e.g. 5, 6],
44 they are quickly purged by natural selection. Mutation-selection balance is theoretically
45 achieved when the rate of input of new genetic variants through spontaneous mutation is
46 perfectly balanced by the rate of their elimination by selection [1-5].

47

48 The concept of mutation-selection balance has long been used as a theoretical reference point
49 for understanding the effects of mutation rate on the health of human populations, partly
50 because it is recognised that humans can modify their own environment and so change the
51 forces of natural selection to which they are exposed [1-5]. Better quality housing, improved
52 diets, and benevolent social activities, such as a welfare state or the universal provision of
53 medical care, are suggested to have been particularly influential in preventing natural
54 selection from purging deleterious mutations in human populations [1, 2, 4, 5]. Consistent
55 with this suggestion, recent comparative genomic analyses have revealed a greater incidence
56 of genetic pathologies in western industrialised populations than in traditional, pre-industrial
57 human societies which are more exposed to natural selection [4, 5, 7-9]. Nevertheless, it is
58 impossible to demonstrate that a more benign physical and social environment, in which
59 selection is relaxed, has *caused* this difference.

60

61 Elaborate architecture, enhanced access to resources and benevolent social behaviours are
62 relatively commonplace in other animals too, especially among the many bird, mammal and

63 insect species that cooperate with each other and live socially [10]. For these species, any
64 *causal* effects of this social and physical environment on genetic variation can more easily be
65 investigated. A complication in other animal societies, however, is that additional factors
66 might perturb the mutation-selection balance. For example, animals that breed cooperatively
67 also tend to produce fewer, larger offspring. This life history strategy is known to reduce
68 genetic diversity [11] and could potentially oppose, or even conceal, any increases in genetic
69 variation that are due to cooperation buffering the effects of natural selection. Cooperative
70 animal societies are also commonly associated with a high incidence of reproductive skew.
71 Since only a few dominant individuals are typically able to reproduce, the effective
72 population size is greatly reduced [12]. This can lead to a reduction in the efficiency of natural
73 selection and a greater influence of genetic drift [6], potentially confounding any increases in
74 genetic variation that are due solely to relaxed selection. Similarly, animal societies typically
75 comprise related individuals that derive kin-selected benefits from their cooperative social
76 interactions. Theoretical analyses have shown that kin selection acts more weakly than direct
77 selection [13]. Consequently, loci under kin selection are predicted to harbour more sequence
78 variation than loci under direct selection [3, 13].

79
80 We tested the effect of kin-selected cooperative actions on the maintenance of genetic
81 variation by focusing on parental care, a widespread form of cooperation [14]. Since care is
82 commonly exhibited by pair-breeding individuals, this form of cooperation is unlikely to
83 change effective population size – eliminating this potentially confounding effect. By building
84 protective nests, defending their brood from attack and nourishing them, animal parents shield
85 their young from environmental stressors [15] and weaken the correlation between the
86 phenotypic variation seen by selection and the underlying genetic variation [3, 16]. In these
87 ways, parents relax selection on the offspring phenotype [3, 15-18] theoretically allowing

88 mildly deleterious alleles to accumulate [3, 6, 15]. Previous experimental work with insects
89 has shown that parental care relaxes selection sufficiently that new mutants [15] and inbred
90 offspring [19] can survive - at least for one generation. However, it is not yet known whether
91 parental care also enables mildly deleterious mutations to persist over multiple generations.

92

93 We tested this prediction by evolving replicate laboratory populations of burying beetles
94 *Nicrophorus vespilloides* under sharply contrasting levels of parental care, for 20 generations.
95 Comparing populations within species also allowed us to eliminate the confounding effect of
96 propagule number on genetic diversity [11]. Burying beetles breed on the body of a small
97 dead vertebrate [20], which the parents jointly convert into a carrion nest by removing the fur
98 or feathers, rolling the flesh into a ball, covering it with anti-microbial anal exudates, and
99 burying it. This is pre-hatching parental care [21]. Parents also guard and feed larvae after
100 hatching, though larvae can survive in the lab with no post-hatching care at all [22]. In two of
101 our evolving populations, larvae were able to receive both pre-hatching and post-hatching
102 parental care (these were called the ‘Full Care’ lines) while in two other populations we
103 prevented parents from supplying any post-hatching care by removing them before the larvae
104 hatched, after the carrion nest was complete (these were called the ‘No Care’ lines). During
105 the first 20 or so generations of experimental evolution, No Care lines rapidly adapted to a life
106 without parental care [23], through divergent phenotypic change in both larval [e.g. 24]) and
107 parental [21] traits.

108

109 To determine whether parental care causes deleterious genetic variation to accumulate over
110 the generations, we inbred sub-populations, each derived from the replicate experimental
111 evolving populations, for 8 successive generations (we called this The Evolutionary History

112 Experiment). For these 8 generations, we measured the extent to which inbreeding reduced
113 measures of reproductive success in comparison with control outbred populations. To
114 determine whether parental care could temper the rate of extinction (as implied by [19]), in
115 half of all our treatments parents were allowed to provide care after their offspring hatched,
116 while in the remainder they were prevented from supplying post-hatching care. This
117 generated 8 different treatments in total (see Supplementary Figure 1, for the design of the
118 Evolutionary History Experiment).

119
120 We used the data from the Evolutionary History Experiment, to test three predictions: (1) that
121 the No Care environment is harsher than the Full Care environment. (2) That the more benign
122 conditions of the Full Care environment relax selection and promote the survival of more
123 genetic variants. (3) That inbred populations from the Full Care lines should exhibit greater
124 inbreeding depression than inbred populations from the No Care lines (having accumulated a
125 greater number of deleterious recessive mutations under relaxed selection). The outbred
126 populations acted as a control treatment for tests of all three predictions.

127

128 **Methods**

129 *Nicrophorus vespilloides* natural history.

130 The common burying beetle *N. vespilloides* breeds on a small dead vertebrate (like a songbird
131 or mouse). The larvae hatch from eggs laid nearby in the soil and crawl to their carrion nest,
132 which they can feed upon themselves [20]. Once at the carcass, larvae receive post-hatching
133 biparental care. Parents supply fluids to their offspring through oral trophallaxis, and defend
134 their brood and the carrion nest from attack by predators, microbes and rival beetles [20]. The
135 duration and extent of post-hatching care are highly variable, however. For example, when

136 wild beetles are brought into the lab to breed, roughly 5% of larvae receive no post-hatching
137 care at all, yet larvae can still survive to become reproductively competent adults (e.g. [22,
138 25]. Within roughly a week of hatching, the larvae complete development and at this point
139 (which we refer to as ‘dispersal), they start to crawl away from the scant remains of the
140 carcass to pupate in the soil. The parents, meanwhile, fly off in search of a new carcass.

141

142 **Experimental evolution**

143 The experimental lines used in this work have been described in detail elsewhere [e.g. 21, 24].
144 In brief, we established a large founding population of *N. vespilloides* by interbreeding wild-
145 caught individuals from four different woodlands. This was then divided into four
146 experimental lines. In two lines, larvae experienced ‘Full Care’ at each generation, with both
147 parents staying in the breeding box throughout the breeding bout and able to provide post-
148 hatching care as well as pre-hatching care. In the other two ‘No Care’ lines, parents engaged
149 in pre-hatching care but at each generation they were removed from the breeding box around
150 53 h after they were paired, so that they never interacted with their larvae. The work reported
151 here began when these lines had been exposed to 20 generations of experimental evolution
152 under these contrasting regimes of care.

153

154 **Evolutionary History Experiment**

155 **Preparatory common garden generation**

156 The experiment began by exposing individuals drawn from the four lines (Full Care replicated
157 twice and No Care replicated twice) to a common garden Full Care environment for one
158 generation (N = 60 pairs for each No Care line (to counter-balance the slightly lower breeding
159 success caused by the No Care environment) and N = 50 pairs for each Full Care line). In this

160 way, we minimised any potentially confounding transgenerational effects prior to starting the
161 Evolutionary History Experiment.

162 **Overview (see Supplementary Figure 1)**

163 Broods from the common garden generation were used to seed lineages in the experimental
164 treatments: broods derived from the Full Care populations (FC_{POP}) founded lineages that were
165 Inbred or Outbred, in either a Full Care (FC_{ENV}) or No Care (NC_{ENV}) environment, and the
166 same was true for broods derived from the No Care populations (NC_{POP}). Thus, for each
167 experimental line of origin, individuals in the different treatments came from a similar genetic
168 pool. From Generation 1 onwards, half of the beetles drawn from each line were exposed to
169 continuous inbreeding (full-sibling crosses) for up to 8 generations (by which point all the
170 inbred lineages had gone extinct) (N = c. 45 crosses per treatment at Generation 1). The
171 remaining beetles were outbred in identical conditions to provide a control baseline for
172 comparison with the inbred lineages (N = c. 35-40 crosses per treatment, per generation). Half
173 of all inbred lineages, and half of the outbreeding populations, were allowed to provide post-
174 hatching care for their young (Full Care environment), while the remaining beetles were only
175 allowed to provide pre-hatching care (No Care environment). The experiment therefore had a
176 2 x 2 x 2 design, with 8 treatments in all (Full Care versus No Care line of origin; Inbred
177 versus Outbred; Full Care environment versus No Care environment), with each treatment
178 replicated twice due to replicate Full Care and No Care populations (Supplementary Figure
179 1).

180 **Detailed methods**

181 Beetle maintenance was carried out following standard protocols [23]. Briefly, adult beetles
182 were kept individually in plastic boxes (12 x 8 x 6cm) filled with moist soil and fed twice a
183 week with raw beef mince. Adults were bred at 2-3 weeks post-eclosion in a breeding box (17

184 x 12 x 6cm) with soil and a mouse carcass (11-13 g for all treatments except for the
185 individuals derived from the Full Care lines, that were outbred under Full Care conditions (8-
186 14 g)). To ease the considerable burden of work, data for broods in this treatment were
187 collected from the ongoing experimental evolution lines in the laboratory. Carcass size was
188 included, where appropriate, as a factor in the statistical analyses (see below).

189 For the inbreeding treatments, we paired full siblings (one pair per family) whereas for the
190 outbreeding treatments we paired males and females at random and did not pair siblings or
191 cousins. Each pair was given a breeding box with a dead mouse sitting on soil, and the
192 breeding boxes were placed in a dark cupboard to simulate natural underground conditions.

193 For broods assigned to a No Care environment, parents were removed around 53 h after
194 pairing. Eight days after pairing (which is when the larvae have completed their development
195 and start to disperse away from the carcass) we scored two standard measures of reproductive
196 success in burying beetles [21]: brood success (fail = no larvae produced; success = some
197 larvae produced) and brood size at dispersal. Larvae were then placed into cells (2 x 2 x 2cm)
198 in an eclosion box (10 x 10 x 2cm), with one eclosion box per brood, which was filled with
199 soil until larvae had developed into sexually immature adults (about 18 days after dispersal).

200 At this point, adults were transferred to individual boxes until they reached sexual maturity
201 roughly 2 weeks later. Both the eclosion boxes and the individual boxes were kept on shelves
202 in the laboratory at 21°C on a 16L:8D hour light cycle.

203

204 **Statistical Analyses**

205 All statistical tests were conducted in R version 3.5.1 [26]. Data handling and visualisation
206 were carried out using the ‘tidyverse’ [27] and ‘survminer’ [28] R packages. All data and

207 code presented in the manuscript is available through: <https://github.com/r->
208 mashoodh/nves_MutationLoad.

209

210 *Testing predictions (1) and (2)*

211 To test predictions (1) and (2) we focused on the data collected from Generation 1. Using a
212 binomial generalised linear model (GLM) in the base ‘statistics’ package in R, we tested the
213 effect of evolutionary history (*i.e.* derived from a No Care evolving population or from a Full
214 Care evolving population), current care environment (*i.e.* experienced No Care or Full Care
215 during Generation 1), and inbreeding (*i.e.* inbred or outbred) on brood success. We defined
216 brood success at dispersal in the following way: broods that produced at least one larva that
217 survived to breed were defined as successful (following [21, 23]) whereas those that did not
218 produce any surviving young were classified as failures.

219

220 We subsequently ran analyses separately for the inbreeding and outbreeding conditions to
221 examine any interactions between evolutionary history (*i.e.* derived from a No Care evolving
222 population (NC_{POP}) or from a Full Care evolving population (FC_{POP})) and the current
223 environment (*i.e.* experienced No Care (NC_{ENV}) or Full Care (FC_{ENV}) during Generation 1)
224 dropping non-significant interaction terms where appropriate. We included block and carcass
225 weight as covariates to ensure any effects we detected occurred over and above any variation
226 in these variables.

227

228 *Testing prediction (3)*

229 *Calculation of inbreeding depression.*

230 For direct comparison with previous work [19], we calculated the inbreeding depression rate:

231 $\delta = (w_o - w_i)/w_o$, where w_o and w_i are respectively the number of surviving outbred and
232 inbred offspring at dispersal. We combined data from both blocks.

233

234 *Survival analysis across generations*

235 To determine the effect of evolutionary history (*i.e.* derived from a No Care evolving
236 population or from a Full Care evolving population), and current care environment (*i.e.*
237 experienced No Care or Full Care during Generation 1) on the survival of the different
238 lineages in the Evolutionary History Experiment (Supplementary Figure 1), we fit accelerated
239 time hazard models with a log-logistic distribution using the ‘survival’ R package [27]. Again
240 carcass weight and block were included as covariates. A lineage was considered to be extinct
241 if it did not survive to reproduce in the subsequent generation. We additionally used the non-
242 parametric Kruskal Wallis test to determine if median survival times of each inbred lineage
243 differed, by comparing the effect of evolutionary history (*i.e.* derived from a No Care
244 evolving population or from a Full Care evolving population) in separate analyses, one for
245 each current care environment (No Care versus Full Care). Model diagnostics were checked
246 visually.

247

248 **Results**

249 To test predictions (1) and (2) we initially focused on the data collected from the first
250 generation of breeding in the Evolutionary History Experiment. In support of prediction (1),
251 we found that exposure to a No Care environment reduced reproductive success, regardless of
252 the evolutionary history of the lineage (Figure 1, Table 1). However, in support of prediction
253 (2), we found that a supply of post-hatching care enabled more broods to survive, even if they

254 were inbred - and regardless of the evolutionary history of their lineage (Figure 1, Table 1),
255 replicating previous work [19].

256

257 To test prediction (3), we continued to examine inbred families in the first generation of
258 breeding in the Evolutionary History Experiment. In this generation, we found an interaction
259 between evolved history and the current environment in inbred but not outbred lineages
260 (Table 2). We split the dataset by the current level of care supplied, to be able to examine the
261 effect of evolutionary history in more detail. In support of prediction (3), we found inbred
262 families derived from the Full Care populations had lower brood survival than inbred families
263 drawn from the No Care populations ($\log(\text{OR}) = 1.12 [0.49-1.80]$, $z=3.42$, $p<0.001$) – though
264 only when broods were raised in a No Care current environment. No equivalent differences
265 were observed in the Full Care current environment ($\log(\text{OR})=0.20 [-1.4,1.9]$, $z=0.25$,
266 $p=0.80$). For the outbred families, the evolutionary history of the lineage had no effect on
267 breeding success, though broods were in general less successful when they received no post-
268 hatching care (Table 2).

269

270 To further test prediction (3), we expanded our analyses to consider all generations, beginning
271 by calculating the extent of inbreeding depression at each generation. Inbreeding depression
272 was greater in Generation 1 for families descended from the Full Care evolving populations
273 than the No Care evolving populations, in the No Care current environment (Figure 2A). We
274 found the same pattern in the Full Care current environment – though here the differences
275 between lineages were first seen at Generation 3 (Figure 2A).

276

277 Finally, we compared the survival of all lines across generations in the Evolutionary History
278 Experiment, by fitting accelerated failure time hazard models (Figure 2B). A lineage was
279 considered extinct if none of its members survived to reproduce in the subsequent generation.
280 Whilst all inbred lineages in our experiments eventually went extinct, outbred lineages were
281 still reproducing successfully at the point at which the experiment was terminated
282 (Supplementary Figure 2, Supplementary Table 2).

283 For the inbred lineages, there was once again an interaction between the evolutionary
284 history of a population and current care received (Supplementary Table 1). This resulted, in
285 part, from a No Care current environment causing particularly rapid extinction (Figure 2B;
286 Supplementary Table 2). When there was No Care, inbred lineages seeded from the Full Care
287 evolving populations had significant lower median survival than inbred lineages seeded from
288 the No Care evolving populations (Estimate=0.20 [0.05-0.36], $p<0.01$; Figure 2B). Lineages
289 seeded from the Full Care evolving populations reached 50% extinction one generation
290 sooner under a No Care environment than inbred lineages seeded from the No Care evolving
291 populations (non-parametric Kruskal Wallis test: $H(1)=4.59$, $p=0.03$; Supplementary Table 2).
292 In a Full Care environment, by contrast, we could detect no equivalent difference in lineage
293 survival between the No Care and Full Care populations (Estimate=-0.01 [-0.13-0.10],
294 $p=0.85$; Figure 2B; Supplementary Table 2).

295

296 **Discussion**

297 Burying beetles care for their offspring by making a nest for them to inhabit during
298 development, providing them with plentiful carrion to feed upon and defending them from
299 attack by rival microbes and animals [20]. Our experiments show that the supply of post-
300 hatching care is sufficient to perturb the mutation-selection balance by relaxing selection - as
301 predicted generally by evolutionary theory [1-5]. We cannot tell from our experiments

302 whether selection is relaxed because the primary beneficiaries of care are kin [3] or because
303 parental care more generally buffers against harsh environments and so weakens the effects of
304 natural selection [14], or both.

305

306 By supplying care, parents shield their young from relatively harsh environmental conditions:
307 larvae receiving parental care had higher survival than those that had no care. Indeed, we
308 found that when parents provided care, the developmental environment was sufficiently
309 benign, and the strength of selection then sufficiently weak, that diverse genetic variants were
310 able to survive - even those that were inbred, just as previous work has shown [19].

311 Consequently, after 20 generations of experimental evolution in these contrasting
312 environments, we found that the Full Care populations carried a greater mutation load than
313 the No Care populations (confirmed in a companion paper [29] which uses SNPs to quantify
314 the extent of genetic variation in the two types of experimental population). The difference
315 between the populations was especially pronounced during the first generation of inbreeding,
316 and most readily detectable when inbred individuals were prevented from supplying care.

317 This suggests that some of the additional mutations present in the Full Care populations were
318 recessive and / or only mildly deleterious [5]. Given the relatively short timeframe of this
319 experiment, we presume that these mutations were present in the founding populations of
320 wild-caught beetles but were removed from the No Care populations by selection acting more
321 strongly against them. In this sense, our findings are similar to previous work on *Tribolium*
322 which found that deleterious genetic variation was purged when populations were exposed
323 experimentally to more intense sexual selection [30].

324

325 Although it is now well-understood why individuals evolve cooperative behaviour, the
326 mechanisms that cause cooperation to persist and diversify remain relatively unclear [31].

327 Recent theoretical work suggests that positive feedback cycles could play a key role in
328 entrenching cooperation, following its initial evolution [32]. Cooperative social interactions
329 facilitate the transfer of beneficial microbes, for example, upon which social partners might
330 then become dependent over evolutionary time, ensuring that cooperation must persist [e.g.
331 33-36]. Likewise, cooperative interactions can promote the division of labour between social
332 partners, causing a degree of interdependence that ensures cooperation must continue [37].
333 Our results, together with those obtained by Pilakouta et al. [19], suggest a third mechanism
334 through which cooperation can become entrenched, hinted at originally by Crow [2]. We have
335 shown that parental care creates a problem (increased mutation load: our results) for which it
336 is also the solution (enhanced survival of all genetic variants: [19], our results). By relaxing
337 selection, parental care causes an increase mutation load which increases the population's
338 dependence upon care. Care ensures that the diverse genetic variants, whose existence it has
339 facilitated, are able survive until the end of development. This could explain why parental
340 care has evolved more frequently than it has been evolutionarily lost [14]. As Crow [2] put it:
341 'there is no turning back...A return to the original conditions leads to the immediate full
342 impact of all the mutants that have accumulated during the period of improved environment".
343 In principle, this reasoning can be extended to any form of cooperation that relaxes selection.
344 Indeed, Crow [2] made the argument originally in the context of environmental improvements
345 in human societies and their effect on genetic variation.
346
347 Finally, we have focused on the immediate effects of parental care on genetic variation, but
348 the longer-term consequences are still unclear and need not match the effects seen in the
349 short-term. For example, although greater intensity of intrasexual selection is beneficial in the
350 short term, because it purges deleterious mutations from the population [30], in the longer run
351 more intense intrasexual selection can make lineages more prone to extinction [38]. This

352 might be due to a lack of beneficial genetic diversity. Likewise, although parental care
353 enables mildly deleterious mutations to persist in the short-term, perhaps in the longer-term it
354 builds up genetic diversity that could be beneficial and underpin rapid evolution, especially if
355 environmental conditions change suddenly, or if mutations promote novelty through
356 compensatory evolution [26]. In future work, it would be interesting to isolate the longer-term
357 effects of parental care on genetic diversity and the effects it might have on the evolutionary
358 resilience of wild populations in a changing world [39].

359 **References**

- 360 1. Wright, S. 1960. On the number of self-incompatibility alleles maintained in
361 equilibrium by a given mutation rate in a population of a given size: a reexamination.
362 *Biometrics* **16**, 61-85.
- 363 2. Crow JJ. 1966 The quality of people: Human evolutionary changes. *BioScience* **16**,
364 863-867.
- 365 3. Linksvayer TA, Wade MJ. 2009 Genes with social effects are expected to harbor more
366 sequence variation within and between species. *Evolution* **63**, 1685-1696.
- 367 4. Lynch M. 2016. Mutation and human exceptionalism: Our future genetic load.
368 *Genetics* **202**, 869-875. (doi: 10.1534/genetics.115.180471)
- 369 5. Kondrashov A. 2017 *Crumbling Genome: The impact of deleterious mutations on*
370 *human populations*. Wiley Online Library 2017.
- 371 6. Baer CF, Miyamoto MM, Denver DR. 2007 Mutation rate variation in multicellular
372 eukaryotes: causes and consequences. *Nat. Rev. Gen.* **8**, 619-631
373 (doi:10.1038/nrg2158)
- 374 7. You W, Henneberg H. 2017 Cancer incidence increasing globally: The role of relaxed
375 natural selection. *Evol. Appl.* **11**, 140-152. (doi: [10.1111/eva.12523](https://doi.org/10.1111/eva.12523)).
- 376 8. Aris-Brosou S. 2019 Direct evidence of an increasing mutational load in humans. *Mol.*
377 *Biol. Evol* **36**, 2823-2829. (doi: 10.1093/molbev/msz192)
- 378 9. Saniotis A, Hennberg M, Mohammadi K. 2021 Genetic load and biological changes to
379 extant humans. *J. Biosoc. Sci.* **53**, 639-642. (doi: 10.1017/S0021932020000413)
- 380 10. Davies NB, Krebs JR, West SA. 2012 *An Introduction to Behavioural Ecology*
381 (Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford).
- 382 11. Romiguier J, Gayrai P, Ballenghien M, Bernard A, Cahais V, Chenuil A, Chiari Y,
383 Dernat R, Faivre N, Loire E et al. 2014 Comparative population genomics in animals

- 384 uncovers the determinants of genetic diversity. *Nature* **515**, 261-263.
385 (doi:10.1038/nature13685)
- 386 12. Rubinstein DR, Ågren JA, Carbone L, Elde NC, Hoekstra HE, Kapheim KM, Keller
387 L, Moreau CS, Toth AL, Yeaman A et al. 2019 Coevolution of genomic architecture
388 and social behavior. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **34**, 844-855. (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2019.04.011)
- 389 13. Linksvayer TA, Wade MJ. 2016 Theoretical predictions for sociogenomic data: the
390 effects of kin selection and sex-limited expression on the evolution of social insect
391 genomes. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* **4**, 65 (doi: 10.3389/fevo.2016.00065)
- 392 14. Royle NJ, Smiseth PT, Kölliker M. 2012 *The Evolution of Parental Care* (Oxford
393 University Press, Oxford).
- 394 15. Snell-Rood EC, Burger M, Hutton Q, Moczek AP. 2016 Effects of parental care on the
395 accumulation and release of cryptic genetic variation: review of mechanisms and a
396 case study of dung beetles. *Evol. Ecol.* **30**, 251-265. (doi: 10.1007/s10682-015-9813-
397 4)
- 398 16. Wade MJ 1998. The evolutionary genetics of maternal effects. pp 5-21 In *Maternal*
399 *Effects as Adaptations* (eds Mousseau TA, Fox C. Oxford University Press, Oxford
400 1998).
- 401 17. Whitlock MC 1996. The red queen beats the jack-of-all trades: the limitations on the
402 evolution phenotypic plasticity and niche breadth. *Am. Nat.* **148**, S65-S77.
403 (doi:10.1086/285902).
- 404 18. Van Dyken JD, Wade MJ 2010. The genetic signature of conditional expression.
405 *Genetics* **184**, 557–570.
- 406 19. Pilakouta N, Jamieson S, Moorad JA, Smiseth PT. 2015. Parental care buffers against
407 inbreeding depression in burying beetles. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **112**, 8031-
408 8035 (doi:10.1073/pnas.1500658112)

- 409 20. Scott MP. 1998 The ecology and behavior of burying beetles. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* **43**,
410 595–618 (doi: 10.1146/annurev.ento.43.1.595).
- 411 21. Duarte A, Rebar D, Hallett AC, Jarrett BJM, Kilner RM. 2021 Evolutionary change in
412 the construction of the nursery environment when parents are prevented from caring
413 for their young directly. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **48**, e2102450118. (doi:
414 10.1073/pnas.2102450118)
- 415 22. Eggert AK, Reinking M, Müller JK. 1998 Parental care improves offspring survival
416 and growth in burying beetles. *Anim. Behav.* **55**, 97–107. (doi:
417 10.1006/anbe.1997.0588)
- 418 23. Schrader M, Jarrett BJM, Kilner RM. 2015 Using experimental evolution to study
419 adaptations for life within the family. *Am. Nat.* **185**, 610-619 (doi: [10.1086/680500](https://doi.org/10.1086/680500))
- 420 24. Rebar D, Bailey NW, Jarrett BJM, Kilner RM. 2020 An evolutionary switch from
421 sibling rivalry to sibling cooperation, caused by a sustained loss of parental care. *Proc.*
422 *Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **117**, 2544-2550. (doi: 10.1073/pnas.1911677117)
- 423 25. Jarrett BJM, Evans E, Haynes HB, Leaf MR, Rebar D, Duarte A, Schrader M, Kilner
424 RM. 2018 A sustained change in the supply of parental care causes adaptive evolution
425 of offspring morphology. *Nature Comms* **9**, 1-8 (doi: 10.1038/s41467-018-06513-6).
- 426 26. Farkas Z, Kovács K, Sarkadi Z, Kalapis D, Fekete G, Birtyik F, Ayaydin F, Molnár C,
427 Horváth P, Pál C, Papp, B. 2022 Gene loss and compensatory evolution promotes the
428 emergence of morphological novelties in budding yeast. *Nature Ecol. Evol.* **6**, 763-773
429 (doi: 10.1038/s41559-022-01730-1).
- 430 27. Therneau T 2021. A Package for Survival Analysis in R. R package version 3.2-
431 13, <URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=survival>>.

- 432 28. Kassambara A, Kosinski M, Biecek P. 2021 survminer: Drawing Survival Curves
433 using 'ggplot2'. R package version 0.4.9. [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=survminer)
434 [project.org/package=survminer](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=survminer)
- 435 29. Mashoodh R, Trowsdale AT, Manica A, Kilner RM. 2023 Parental care drives the
436 evolution of molecular genetic variation.
437 <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.01.09.523216v1>
- 438 30. Lumley AJ, Michalczyk L, Kitson JJN, Spurgin LG, Morrison CA, Godwin JL,
439 Dickinson ME, Martin OY, Emerson BC, Chapman T, Gage MJG 2015. Sexual
440 selection protects against extinction. *Nature* **522**, 470-473. (doi: 10.1038/nature14419)
- 441 31. West SA, Cooper GA, Ghoul MB, Griffin AS 2021. Ten recent insights for our
442 understanding of cooperation. *Nature Ecol. Evol.* **5**, 419-430. (doi: 10.1038/s41559-
443 020-01384-x)
- 444 32. Franz M, Schülke, Ostner J. 2013 Rapid evolution of cooperation in group-living
445 animals. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* **13**, 235 (doi:10.1186/1471-2148-13-235).
- 446 33. Nalepa CA, Bignell DE, Bandi C. 2001 Detritivory, coprophagy, and the evolution of
447 digestive mutualisms in Dictyoptera. *Insectes Sociaux* **48**, 194-201
448 (doi:10.1007/PL00001767).
- 449 34. Lombardo MP. 2008 Access to mutualistic endosymbiotic microbes: an
450 underappreciated benefit of group living. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **62**, 479-497. (doi:
451 10.1007/s00265-007-0428-9)
- 452 35. Ezenwa VO, Archie EA, Craft ME, Hawley DM, Martin LB, Moore J, White L. 2016
453 Host behaviour – parasite feedback: an essential link between animal behaviour and
454 disease ecology. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* **283**, 20153078. (doi: 10.1098/rspb.2015.3078)
- 455 36. Dillard J, Benbow ME. 2020 From symbionts to societies: how wood resources have
456 shaped insect sociality. *Front Ecol. Evol.* **8**, 173 (doi: 10.3389/fevo.2020.00173)
- 457

- 458 37. Cooper GA, West SA. 2018 Division of labour and the evolution of extreme
459 specialisation. *Nature Ecol. Evol.* **2**, 1161-1167. (doi:10.1038/s41559-018-0564-9)
- 460 38. Martins MJF, Puckett TM, Lockwood R, Swaddle JP, Hunt G. 2018 High male sexual
461 investment as a driver of extinction in fossil ostracods. *Nature* **556**, 366-369
462 (doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0020-7).
- 463 39. Balmford A. 1996 Extinction filters and current resilience: the significance of past
464 selection pressure for conservation biology. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **11**, 193-196. (doi:
465 10.1016/0169-5347(96)10026-4)
- 466

467 **Acknowledgements**

468 We thank Sue Aspinall and Chris Swannack for helping with beetle maintenance. We also
469 thank Benjamin Jarrett and Darren Rebar for collecting data from the experimental evolution.

470 **Funding statement:** This project was supported by a Consolidator's Grant from the European
471 Research Council (310785 Baldwinian_Beetles), by a Wolfson Merit Award from the Royal
472 Society, The Leverhulme Trust (RPG-2018-232) and The Isaac Newton Trust (18.23(q)), each
473 to RMK. RM was supported by a Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council
474 Future Leaders Fellowship (BB/R01115X/1). HS was partially supported by the Japan Society
475 for the Promotion of Science (KAKENHI Grant Number: JP19K21569).

476 **Author contributions:** Conceived the idea and designed the Evolutionary History
477 Experiment: RMK, SP; Performed the Evolutionary History Experiment: SP; Collected data
478 from Experimentally evolving populations: RM; Analysed the data: RM, HS; Wrote the
479 manuscript: RMK, RM. All authors discussed the results and commented on the manuscript.

480 **Competing interests:** The authors declare no competing financial or nonfinancial interests.

481 **Data and materials availability:** Data and code needed to evaluate the conclusions in the
482 paper are available from https://github.com/r-mashoodh/nves_MutationLoad.

483

484 **TABLES**

485 **Table 1.** Summary of binomial generalised linear model estimates for brood success in all
 486 treatments in Generation 1 of the Evolutionary History Experiment, predicted by the type of
 487 population in which they Evolved (*i.e.* whether families were derived from the No Care or
 488 Full Care evolving populations), Current Environment (*i.e.* whether families experienced No
 489 Care or Full Care in the current generation) and Breeding Condition (*i.e.* whether families
 490 were inbred or outbred). Carcass weight and Block were included as a covariate for inbred
 491 lineages (see Supplementary Figure 1 for experimental design).

Characteristic	log(HR) ¹	95% CI ¹	p-value
Evolved			
Full Care	—	—	
No Care	-0.05	-0.40, 0.30	0.8
CurrentEnv			
Full Care	—	—	
No Care	-1.4	-1.7, -1.0	<0.001
Breeding			
inbred	—	—	
outbred	0.33	0.10, 0.56	0.006
as.numeric(Block)	-0.02	-0.24, 0.20	0.9
Carcass.weight	0.12	-0.01, 0.25	0.10
Evolved * CurrentEnv			
No Care * No Care	0.48	0.02, 0.93	0.042

¹HR = Hazard Ratio, CI = Confidence Interval

493 **Table 2** Summary of binomial generalised linear model estimates for brood success in
 494 Generation 1 of the Evolutionary History Experiment, with Inbred and Outbred populations
 495 analysed separately. For each analysis we tested whether brood success was predicted by the
 496 type of population in which they Evolved (*i.e.* whether families were derived from the No
 497 Care (NC_{POP}) or Full Care (FC_{POP}) evolving populations) and Current Environment (*i.e.*
 498 whether families experienced No Care (NC_{ENV}) or Full Care (FC_{ENV}) in the current generation).
 499 Carcass weight and Block were included as covariates (see Supplementary Figure 1 for
 500 experimental design). Separate models were run for Inbred and Outbred families.

501

Characteristic	Inbred			Outbred		
	log(HR) ¹	95% CI ¹	p-value	log(HR) ¹	95% CI ¹	p-value
Evolved						
Full Care	—	—		—	—	
No Care	0.08	-0.38, 0.54	0.7	-0.13	-0.71, 0.45	0.7
CurrentEnv						
Full Care	—	—		—	—	
No Care	-1.7	-2.2, -1.3	<0.001	-0.92	-1.4, -0.43	<0.001
as.numeric(Block)	-0.09	-0.40, 0.22	0.6	0.11	-0.21, 0.45	0.5
Carcass.weight	0.20	-0.05, 0.45	0.13	0.05	-0.13, 0.22	0.7
Evolved * CurrentEnv						
No Care * No Care	0.64	0.02, 1.3	0.043	0.25	-0.46, 0.97	0.5


¹HR = Hazard Ratio, CI = Confidence Interval

502

503

504 **FIGURES**

505 **Figure 1**




506

507 **Figure 1. Breeding success of evolved populations in Generation 1 of the Evolutionary**
508 **History Experiment.** Predicted means \pm S.E brood survival probabilities in populations that
509 have evolved under Full Care (red lines and datapoints, FC_{POP}) or No Care (blue lines and
510 datapoints NC_{POP}) are shown, based on the current care environment (Full Care vs No Care)
511 under inbred (left) and outbred (right) conditions.

512

513 **Figure 2**



514

515 **Figure 2. Survival of inbred populations across generations.**

516 **A.** Inbreeding depression values for population lineages from the Evolutionary History

517 Experiment, shown in their native (FC_{POP}FC_{ENV} and NC_{POP}NC_{ENV}) and reciprocal current

518 environments (FC_{POP}NC_{ENV} and NC_{POP}FC_{ENV}). **B.** Survival curves for inbred population

519 lineages from the Evolutionary History Experiment and associated 95% confidence intervals

520 for the inbred lines, also shown in their native (FC_{POP}FC_{ENV} and NC_{POP}NC_{ENV}) and reciprocal

521 current environments (FC_{POP}NC_{ENV} and NC_{POP}FC_{ENV}). (FC = Full Care, NC = No Care).

522