1 **Sperm gatekeeping: 3D imaging reveals a constricted**

2 **entrance to zebra finch sperm storage tubules**

4 **Authors:** T. Mendonca, A. J. Cadby and N. Hemmings

6 **Short Title:** Sperm gatekeeping

Abstract:

Females across many internally fertilising taxa store sperm, often in specialised storage organs in their reproductive tracts. In birds, several hundred sperm storage tubules exist in the utero-vaginal junction of the oviduct and there is growing evidence that sperm storage in these tubules is selective. The mechanisms underlying female sperm storage in birds remain unknown due to our limited ability to make three dimensional, live observations inside the large, muscular avian oviduct. Here, we describe a new application of fluorescence selective plane illumination microscopy to optically section oviduct tissue from zebra finch *Taeniopygia guttata* females label-free, by harnessing tissue autofluorescence. Our data provide the first description of the 3D structure of sperm storage organs in any vertebrate and reveal the presence of gate-like constricted openings that may play a role in sperm selection.

Statement of Significance:

Female birds can store sperm in microscopic tubular structures in their reproductive tract for up to several months, depending on species. Studying these sperm storage tubules has been a major challenge due to the muscular and opaque nature of reproductive tracts in birds. We have developed a new method for imaging live reproductive tract tissue using selective plane illumination microscopy, a fluorescence microscopy technique. From these images, we could extract three-dimensional measurements of sperm storage tubules and found these structures to have a gate-like constriction, providing evidence that females can actively select sperm at storage and ultimately influence the paternity of her offspring. Understanding these reproductive adaptations can help improve captive breeding programs and similar conservation strategies.

Introduction:

Across many internal fertilisers, females have evolved the capacity to maintain viable

sperm in specialised sperm storage organs in their reproductive tract as a strategy to

maximise fertility. Sperm storage ensures the female has sufficient sperm for

fertilisation when copulation and ovulation are not synchronised (1). Since female

promiscuity is common across taxa (e.g. birds (2), mammals (3–5), reptiles (6), fishes

(7) and insects (8–10)), storage also provides the opportunity for females to exert

control over post-copulatory processes (11–13). Post-copulatory sexual selection has

driven the diversification of sperm storage organs, which vary from single bean-shaped

structures in damselflies (14, 15) or one or more sac-like spermathecae in certain fly

species (16) (17), to multiple epithelial crypts in snakes (18), lizards (19), turtles (20)

and birds (21, 22).

In birds, epithelial sperm storage crypts are called sperm storage tubules (SSTs) and are

located in the utero-vaginal junction (UVJ) of the oviduct (23). The number of SSTs

possessed by a single female ranges from around 500 in the budgerigar (*Melopsittam*

undulates) to 20,000 in the turkey (*Meleagris gallopavo*) (24). A growing body of

evidence suggests that avian SSTs are an important site of sperm selection. Steele and

Wishart (25) experimentally demonstrated that chicken (*Gallus domesticus*) sperm

without surface membrane proteins could not enter the SSTs after normal intra-vaginal

artificial insemination, even though these sperm were capable of fertilising the ovum

when inseminated beyond the vagina and UVJ. Bobr *et al.* (23) also noted a lack of

abnormal sperm in chicken SSTs, suggesting that abnormal sperm are unable to reach

or enter sperm storage sites. The large number of SSTs present in the avian oviduct may

also allow spatio-temporal segregation of sperm from competing ejaculates (26–28).

Despite evidence that SSTs may act as a filter for high quality sperm, the mechanisms by

which sperm are selected at the time of storage remain poorly understood, and how

sperm enter and exit the SSTs is unknown. Froman (29) proposed a model where sperm

motility, rather than SST function, is pivotal in sperm retention in SSTs. According to

this model, sperm must maintain an optimum swimming velocity to maintain their

position and counter a fluid current within the SST. This model was supported by

evidence that faster sperm emerged out of SSTs later than slower sperm (30), and that

passive loss of sperm from storage might be sufficient to explain last male precedence in

the domestic fowl, turkeys, and zebra finches (*Taeniopygia guttata*) [31,32; but see 27].

However, there have been no published observations of sperm swimming inside the

SSTs, and our own unpublished observations suggest sperm are not motile in storage

(see Supplementary Material). Several studies have detected the presence of sperm

motility suppressors such as lactic acid in Japanese quail (*Coturnix japonica*) SSTs (33),

calcium and zinc in the SSTs of chicken, turkeys and Japanese quail (34, 35), and

carbonic anhydrase in the SSTs of turkeys, common quail (*Coturnix coturnix*) and

ostriches (*Struthio camelus*) (36–38), and the neurotransmitter acetylcholine, released

by nerve endings detected in the vicinity of SSTs (39), has been shown to enhance

sperm motility (40), implying a nervous control on sperm mobilisation at ejection from

SSTs. Additionally, Hiyama *et al.* (41) presented evidence for the potential role of heat

shock protein 70 (HSP70) (42) in enhancing sperm motility at the point of sperm

release. The presence of such sperm motility suppressors and activators within or near

the SSTs suggests that release of sperm from storage may not be as passive as Froman

(29) suggested.

Rather than acting as passive refugia, SSTs may instead be dynamic structures, capable

of active constriction and dilation to mediate the entrance and exit of sperm. Although

numerous studies have failed to find smooth muscle fibres or myoepithelial cells (39,

43, 44) around SSTs, Freedman *et al.* (39) detected fibroblast-like cells and an F-actin

rich cytoskeletal mesh called the "terminal web" in turkey SST epithelia. The terminal

web is composed of contractile proteins (actin and myosin) and has been shown to

contribute to contractility in other tissues, such as intestinal brush border cells (45, 46)

and embryonic pigmented epithelia in chickens (47). Freedman *et al.* (39) also found

terminal innervations in the turkey UVJ, suggesting there may be some degree of

nervous control over SST function. Recent evidence also suggests the possibility of SST

contraction, influenced hormonally by the action of progesterone (48, 49). It is

therefore possible that the passage of sperm into and out of storage is controlled, to

some degree, by the physical structure of SSTs themselves.

Our understanding of how SST structure influences sperm storage is limited by our

relatively basic knowledge of SST morphology. The avian oviduct is convoluted, with

opaque, muscular walls, creating numerous practical limitations for making

observations of tubules in living epithelial tissue using conventional microscopy

techniques. Empirical studies of SST morphology have so far used histology (23, 50, 51)

and electron microscopy (34, 43, 52) on fixed tissue sections, but these approaches not

only remove functional information, but typically provide two-dimensional information

only. Moreover, serial sectioning is laborious, and loss of material can be difficult to

avoid. Commonly used light microscopy techniques rely on thin sections and squash

preparations (26, 53), which are inappropriate for large tissue samples since they

distort structures of interest and allow only limited imaging depths.

In this study we developed a novel method for live, *ex vivo* 3D imaging of SST structure

using selective plane illumination microscopy (SPIM). SPIM is highly suitable for

imaging large samples at cellular resolution and has lower phototoxicity levels than

with other optical sectioning methods which makes it a viable option for imaging living

tissue (54, 55). Using SPIM, we were able to optically section UVJ mucosal tissue up to

depths of 100 μm without distorting or damaging their structure. We provide the first

quantitative estimates of the 3D structure of sperm storage tubules in living tissue,

including the relationship between SST length and diameter, and report the existence of

a previously undescribed gate-like constriction at the entrance to tubules that may act

to regulate sperm transport into and out of storage.

Materials and Methods:

Animals

This study was approved by the University of Sheffield, UK. All procedures performed

conform to the legal requirements for animal research in the UK and were conducted

under a project licence (PPL 40/3481) issued by the Home Office.

Zebra finches were from a captive population kept at the University of Sheffield (56,

57). Females (all between one to three years old) were placed in unisex housing for

at least two weeks before being paired with males, in double-cages (dimensions of

each individual cage: 0.6m x 0.5m x 0.4m) separated by a wire-mesh with the male

and female on either side. Each double-cage had a modified nest-box, also with a

wire-mesh partition, to allow both birds to enter the nest. This set up allowed the

male and female to establish a normal breeding pair bond and enter breeding

condition, while preventing them from copulating and therefore ensuring the female

had no sperm in her SSTs (sperm can be stored for up to 12 days after mating in

zebra finches (24)). Females were only included in the study once they had started

to lay eggs, to ensure their oviduct was in full reproductive condition. After they laid

their second egg, females were euthanized (in accordance with Schedule 1 [Animals

(Scientific Procedures) Act 1986)] and dissected immediately.

Sample preparation

The oviduct, including the cloaca, was immediately removed from the female and the

connective tissue surrounding it was cleared to uncoil and straighten the vagina and

the UVJ. The lower end of the oviduct was cut through the middle of the uterus to

obtain a segment that included the UVJ, vagina and cloaca. This piece of the oviduct

was then cut open lengthwise and pinned flat on a petri-dish filled with silicone

elastomer (SYLGARD® 184; Dow Corning). A sufficient quantity of Ham's F10

Nutrient Mix (Invitrogen, UK) was added to keep the tissue moist but not submerged.

For SPIM imaging, UVJ folds were cut individually with iris scissors and mounted one

at a time, on a custom-made sample holder (see Supplementary Material) using fine

insect needles. The sample holder, with the UVJ fold mounted, was immersed in

phenol-free DMEM/F12 media, at 37º C during imaging.

SPIM imaging

Live UVJ tissue samples, prepared as above, were imaged using a custom-built SPIM

microscope (at the University of Sheffield) with laser excitation at 473 nm and a 520

nm long pass (LP) fluorescence emission filter (Semrock, Inc.). The microscope

hardware and optical components was based on the OpenSPIM platform (58) but

with modifications detailed in Mendonca *et al.* [59; supplementary materials]. The

camera, detection and illumination objectives, and magnification were fixed for the

system, ensuring that the imaging results were reproduceable. The autofluorescence

image stacks were acquired using 500 ms exposure, starting at the outer surface and

moving up to 100 µm deep into the tissue fold.

Characterisation of autofluorescence

SSTs were clearly identifiable in live UVJ tissue during fluorescence imaging on the

SPIM and had a punctate appearance on account of autofluorescent granules (Figure

1) which appeared to be mostly confined to SST epithelial cells and were present

along the entire length of the SST from orifice to blind end. No other cell structure or

organelle was visible in these autofluorescence images.

To determine the organisation of the autofluorescent granules in the SST epithelium,

label-free images from live UVJ folds (n = 10 birds) were compared to those of fixed

UVJ folds that had been stained for nucleic acids (n = 3 birds). Folds were also

examined on a bright-field microscope after histological sectioning and general

histochemical staining (n = 3 birds) (Supplementary Material).

Figure 1: **(A)** Schematic of SST transverse section showing cellular polarisation with nuclei (N) towards the basement membrane (BM) and microvilli (MV) at the apical end of the epithelium. The punctate autofluorescence (PA) detected by the SPIM is present proximal to the nucleus but not at the apical end of the epithelium near the lumen (L). **(B)** Max intensity projection of a UVJ fold with multiple detectable SSTs imaged on the SPIM. Scale – 50 μm **(C)-(E)** Cross section of SST from histology, autofluorescence imaged on the SPIM, and SYTO-13 labelled nuclei imaged on the SPIM respectively. Scale – 10 μm.

Image Analysis

The image stacks acquired using the SPIM were used to reconstruct 480 μm x 480

μm x 100 μm tissue sections containing 3D information on SST structure (n = 10

females, one SST per female). SST shape information was extracted by measuring the

diameter enclosed by the autofluorescence from images of live tissue, at ten

equidistant points along the length of the SST.

UVJ tissue image stacks were first pre-processed in Fiji (60). Individual unbranched

SSTs were selected from each female such that the entire SST structure was included

in the 3D image stacks. The SSTs follow convoluted paths through the UVJ fold tissue,

so in order to measure cross-sectional diameter at multiple points, it was necessary

to slice the image volume at arbitrary angles to ensure the measurement planes

were perpendicular to the direction of the SST structure. This was accomplished by

first tracing the direction of the SST structure using a dilated version of the SST

image (generated using the 'MorphoLibJ' plugin (61) followed by the application of

Gaussian blur), to smooth the punctate autofluorescence. Two outlines for each SST

were then semi-automatically traced in 3D, from the orifice to the blind end and

along opposite sides of the SST lumen, using the 'Simple Neurite Tracer' (62) plugin

in Fiji.

The next stage of image analysis was performed using MATLAB® (2015b, version

8.6, MathWorks, Natick, MA). An average trace which passed through the SST lumen

was computed from the two traces for each SST. SST lengths were measured from

these average traces. For each SST (n = 10), the average trace was interpolated at ten

equidistant points (the first at the orifice and the tenth point before the blind end of

the tubule) and at each interpolated point a vector describing the direction of the

SST at that point was computed using its nearest neighbouring points on the trace

(Figure 2). By using these vectors and the interpolated points, slicing planes normal

to the vectors were defined. The indices for these slicing planes were used to extract

2D image sections from the un-dilated original image stacks using the

'ExtractSlice.m' (63) function. For every extracted slice, its distance from the orifice

along the luminal trace of the SST was computed using the 'Arclength.m' (64)

function, and the major axis diameter (d1) and the minor axis diameter (d2) of the

SST (enclosed by autofluorecence) were measured.

Figure 2: Illustration of the image analysis pipeline. (A) 3D rendering of an SST overlaid with traces along the sides (dotted lines), the computed trace through the centre and slices perpendicular to the direction of the SST at 4 example positions (SSTs were sampled at 10 positions represented by grey dots). **(B-E)** Corresponding slices through the SST. Measurements were taken of the major axis and minor axis diameter for each of the slices. Axis units in pixels (converted to microns before data analysis).

Statistical Analysis:

Data analysis was performed using the statistical package R, version 3.2.3 (65). We

tested whether SST diameter varied with SST length using a mixed effects model

('lmer' function from the 'lme4' package (66) along with the 'lmerTest' package (67))

with average SST diameter [(d1+ d2) / 2] at the sampled point as the dependent

variable, the distance of sampled point from SST orifice and the SST total length as

fixed effects, and the bird ID as a random effect to account for repeated measures

from each female.

We also assessed if the SST was elliptical or circular in cross-section (the former

providing greater epithelial apical surface area for increased contact with sperm)

and whether any such ellipticity changed in response to SST length. A circularity

index was first calculated by dividing the major axis diameter (d1) by the minor axis

diameter (d2), where a circularity index of one indicates a circular SST cross-section.

Data were then analysed via a mixed effects model using the 'lmer' function (66),

with the circularity index as the dependent variable and the total length of the SST as

a fixed effect. The sum of the major and minor axis diameters (d1+ d2) was also

incorporated as a fixed effect to account for magnitude of change in diameter along

each axis, as well as the distance of sampled point from SST orifice, with an

interaction term between them. As before, bird ID was included as a random effect to

account for repeated measures from each female.

Results:

The diameter of SSTs was found to be notably constricted at their orifice, suggestive

of a structural 'barrier' for entry and exit (Figure 3 (A)). Beyond this constricted

entrance, SSTs were largely tubular in shape, with diameter increasing marginally

along the SST's length until its mid-point, after which diameter decreased again

towards the blind end of the SST. This shape can be described by a significant

quadratic relationship between SST diameter and the distance from the SST orifice

(estimated effect = -16.761, t = -3.085, p = 0.003; Figure 3 (B)). The relationship

between SST diameter and distance from the SST orifice was also found using data

from labelled tissue (Supplementary Figure S4), confirming that the shape measured

from autofluorescence images was not an artefact resulting from the distribution of

the autofluorescence granules. Long SSTs were neither wider nor thinner than short

SSTs (estimated effect = 0.038, t = 1.058, p = 0.319).

Figure 3: (A) 3D rendering of an SST showing its constricted orifice (arrowhead). **(B)** SST diameter
has a quadratic relationship with distance from the SST opening suggesting a constriction at the
orifice and a slight increase in diameter along its length up to the middle of the SST. Each colour on
the plot represents measurements from the same SST (n = 10). Scale on red bounding box is in
microns.

SSTs were found to be slightly elliptical in cross-section, with the major axis

diameter being 1.642 ± 0.168 times larger than the minor axis diameter. The

circularity of the SST in cross-section did not vary significantly with SST diameter

(estimated effect = 0.014, t = 0.979, p = 0.330), distance from orifice (estimated

effect = 0.003, t = 0.587, p = 0.558), or the interaction between these two variables

(estimated effect = -0.00009, t = -0.587, p = 0.559). Circularity was also not related

to SST total length (estimated effect = -0.004, t = -1.14, p = 0.282).

Comparisons between the SST measurements from histology and SPIM images

indicate that the autofluorescent granules are present in the supranuclear region of

the SST epithelium (Figure 1). The size of the lumen diameter scaled linearly with

the width of the SST (Supplementary Figure S4), indicating that epithelial cells

remained the same thickness in cross-section with increasing SST diameter. This

allowed us to extrapolate shape information from the above analyses to the SST

lumen, and using this method, we estimated the diameter of the SST orifice to be

3.278 ± 1.115 μm (mean ± SD; Table 1).

	Diameter (mean ± SD)	
	at orifice (μm)	at widest section (μm)
inter-nuclear diameter[1]	12.060 ± 1.419	30.830 ± 11.055
autofluorescence[1]	10.065 ± 4.288	16.374 ± 6.610
lumen diameter[2]	3.278 ± 1.115	9.128 ± 1.377

Table 1: SST dimensions at orifice and widest section - SST diameter is the smallest at its orifice

and widest near the middle along its length.

[1]Measurements acquired from SPIM image z-stacks

[2]SST lumen diameter values were predicted from the model describing the relationship between lumen

and inter-nuclear diameter.

Discussion:

Using novel 3D imaging methods, we have demonstrated for the first time the

existence of a constricted orifice at the entrance/exit of avian SSTs. Such a structure

is likely to play an important role in sperm selection at storage. Zaferani *et al.* (68)

recently used *in vitro* techniques to demonstrate how constrictions can act as gate-

like selective barriers to sperm, allowing only sperm swimming above a threshold

velocity to overcome the shear rate at the constriction and pass through. The narrow

SST orifices we have found have a mean diameter of ~3 µm; this, with the added

obstruction of microvilli (1-2 µm in length (52)), must act to restrict the rate of

sperm (mean diameter at mid-piece - ~0.6 µm (59)) entering and exiting the SST. We

therefore propose that the constricted opening we have found in SST tubules

provides a mechanism by which sperm storage and release can be regulated. This

supports the idea that avian SSTs play an active and selective role in sperm storage,

regulating sperm uptake and release (33–38). The constricted orifice, together with

its microvilli, may act as a valve, enforcing unidirectional movement of sperm and

preventing them from being flushed back out. The small luminal diameter along the

SST (mean: 9 µm, Table 1) may also limit the ability of sperm to turn around inside

the SST and swim out.

In terms of overall structure, we found SSTs to be slightly elliptical in cross-section,

with the major axis diameter being about 1.6 times larger than the minor axis

diameter. This ellipticity was independent of SST radius, the distance along the SST

from orifice, or total SST length. Cross-sectional ellipticity increases the surface area

of the SST epithelial apical surface, allowing for a greater number of microvilli (as

compared to a circular lumen with the same volume) for increased contact with

sperm and optimum exchange of nutrients and waste.

We found SST diameter to vary widely across zebra finch SSTs. Birkhead *et al.* (69)

suggested that some SSTs might remain inactive in the zebra finch UVJ, even in its

fully developed state. It is possible that some of the variation in SST shape that we

observed can be explained by the presence of functional and non-functional SSTs,

but it is unclear whether thinner, more uniform SSTs, or more distended morphs

would represent the active state. Mero and Ogasawara (70), and Burke (71)

described 'swollen' tubules in chickens and suggested swelling to be associated with

sperm release. Such swellings might help explain the outliers in our data (Figure 3

(B)). It is possible that conformational changes in SST shape from functional to non-

functional states may be enabled by the F-actin rich terminal web, as seen in turkey

SSTs (39), and caused by neural stimulation (39, 72) and/or hormonal effects (48,

49). Variation in SST shape might also be explained by factors not tested in this

study, including age, hormone levels and location of the SST in the UVJ.

About 4 – 27% of all the sperm storage tubules in the zebra finch UVJ are branched

(28, 73). Branched tubules were not included in our study, but individual branches

are expected to show similar shapes as unbranched tubules. Hemmings and

Birkhead (28) described sperm from different males differentially stored in separate

branches of an SST (albeit a single observation, since in most cases sperm from

different males were stored in different SSTs). Further study of the 3D structure of

branched SSTs could shed light on mechanisms that prevent sperm mixing in

branched tubules.

Our novel 3D data on SST structure were made possible by the presence of

punctate/granular autofluorescence, confined to the SST epithelial cells and

uniformly distributed throughout the SST's entire length. These granules were found

to have a supranuclear localisation in the SST epithelial cells (Figure 1). Although

identifying the exact source of the autofluorescence was beyond the scope of this

study, autofluorescence in a similar range has been noted in the ewe (*Ovis aries*)

endometrium ($\lambda_{ex}/\lambda_{em}$ = 488/525-575 nm) (74) and in human colonic crypts ($\lambda_{ex}/\lambda_{em}$

= 488/580 nm) (75). While such autofluorescence has been attributed to NADH

metabolism in mitochondria (74, 76), another likely source might be lipofuscin in

lysosomes (75). Mitochondria are not confined to the apical cytoplasm of SST

epithelium as observed in turkeys (77) and chickens (78), so it is unlikely that these

granules represent mitochondria. Lysosomes on the other hand, are globular

vesicles similar in size (< 1 μm) to the autofluorescent granules observed here (79),

and have been detected in the apical cytoplasm of turkey SST epithelia (77), and less

abundantly in chickens (78) and passerine alpine accentor (*Prunella collaris*) (79).

Multiple studies have also detected the presence of acid phosphatase, an enzyme

found in lysosomes, in the supranuclear cytoplasm of SST epithelia in turkeys (21),

quail (80), chickens, (81) and ducks (*Anas sp.*) (82), but not in the SST lumen, which

corresponds with the autofluorescence pattern we observed here in the zebra finch.

Acid phosphatase has been implicated in autolysis associated with oviduct

regression (83) as well as with sperm release (82). If this is true, the label-free

imaging methods developed here may provide exciting new means for investigating

SST functional development throughout the reproductive cycle. Identifying the

chemical nature of the autofluorescent substance present in SST granules therefore

represents an important avenue for future research.

In summary, we have demonstrated that sperm storage structures in living

vertebrate oviductal tissue can be imaged label-free using SPIM microscopy, and this

novel 3D imaging technique has enabled us to produce the most detailed account of

avian SST structure to date, including the discovery of a previously undescribed

gate-like constriction at the entrance/exit of tubules that is likely to act as a key

selective barrier. The imaging methods described here hold immense potential for

studying *in vivo* sperm storage and sperm-female interactions.

Authors' contributions:

T.M. coordinated the study, conducted the experiments and analyses, and wrote the

manuscript; N.H. conceived the study, conducted the sperm motility experiment and

advised on data analyses. All authors participated in the design of the study, helped

draft the manuscript and gave final approval for publication.

Acknowledgements:

The authors are grateful to Prof Tim Birkhead and Prof Simon Jones from the University

of Sheffield for support. Thanks to Mark Kinch from Skelet.AL, Phil Young, Lynsey

Gregory, Emily Glendenning and Jamie Thompson from the University of Sheffield for

technical assistance.

References:

1.   Birkhead, T.R. 1992. Sperm Storage and the Fertile Period in the Bengalese Finch.

Auk. 109: 620–625.

2.   Birkhead, T.R., and A.P. Møller. 1995. Extra-pair copulation and extra-pair

paternity in birds. Anim. Behav. 49: 843–848.

3.   Hanken, J., and P.W. Sherman. 1981. Multiple paternity in Belding's ground

squirrel litters. Science (80-.). 212: 351–353.

4.   Tegelström, H., J. Searle, J. Brookfield, and S. Mercer. 1991. Multiple paternity in

wild common shrews (Sorex araneus) is confirmed by DNA-fingerprinting.

Heredity (Edinb). 66 (Pt 3): 373–379.

5.   Amos, W., S. Twiss, P.P. Pomeroy, and S.S. Anderson. 1993. Male mating success

and paternity in the grey seal, Halichoerus grypus: a study using DNA

fingerprinting. Proc. R. Soc. B. 252: 199–207.

6.   Uller, T., and M. Olsson. 2008. Multiple paternity in reptiles: Patterns and

processes. Mol. Ecol. 17: 2566–2580.

7.   Avise, J.C., A.G. Jones, D. Walker, and J.A. DeWoody. 2002. Genetic mating systems

and reproductive natural histories of fishes: lessons for ecology and evolution.

Annu. Rev. Genet. 36: 19–45.

8.   Gromko, M.H., D.G. Gilbert, and R.C. Richmond. 1984. Sperm transfer and use in

the multiple mating system of Drosophila. Sperm Compet. Evol. Anim. mating

Syst. : 371–426.

9.   Moritz, R.F.A., P. Kryger, G. Koeniger, N. Koeniger, A. Estoup, and S. Tingek. 1995.

High degree of polyandry in Apis dorsata queens detected by DNA microsatellite

variability. Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol. 37: 357–363.

10. Crozier, R.H., and E.J. Fjerdingstad. 2001. Polyandry in social Hymenoptera -

disunity in diversity? Ann. Zool. Fennici. 38: 267–285.

11. Birkhead, T.R., and A.P. Møller. 1998. Sperm competition and sexual selection.

Academic Press.

12.   Simmons, L.W. 2001. Sperm competition and its evolutionary consequences in the

insects. Princeton University Press.

13.   Eberhard, W.G. 1996. Female Control: Sexual Selection by Cryptic Female Choice.

Princeton University Press.

14.   Córdoba-Aguilar, A., E. Uhía, and A.C. Rivera. 2003. Sperm competition in Odonata

(Insecta): the evolution of female sperm storage and rivals' sperm displacement.

J. Zool. 261: 381–398.

15.   Siva-Jothy, M.T. 1987. The structure and function of the female sperm-storage

organs in libellulid dragonflins. J. Insect Physiol. 33: 559–567.

16.   Ward, P.I. 1993. Females influence sperm storage and use in the yellow dung fly

Scathophaga stercoraria (L.). Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol. 32.

17.   Pitnick, S., T. Markow, and G.S. Spicer. 1999. Evolution of Multiple Kinds of Female

Sperm-Storage Organs in Drosophila. Evolution (N. Y). 53: 1804.

18.   Fox, W. 1956. Seminal receptacles of snakes. Anat. Rec. 124: 519–539.

19.   Conner, J., and D. Crews. 1980. Sperm transfer and storage in the lizard Anolis

carolinensis. J. Morphol. 163: 331–348.

20.   Gist, D.H., and J.M. Jones. 1989. Sperm storage within the oviduct of turtles. J.

Morphol. 199: 379–384.

21.   Zavaleta, D., and F. Ogasawara. 1973. A review of the mechanism of the release of

spermatozoa from storage tubules in the fowl and turkey oviduct. Worlds. Poult.

Sci. J. 43: 132–139.

22.   Bakst, M.R. 1987. Anatomical basis of sperm-storage in the avian oviduct.

Scanning Microsc. 1: 1257.

23.   Bobr, L.W., F.W. Lorenz, and F.X. Ogasawara. 1964. Distribution of Spermatozoa in

the Oviduct and Fertility in Domestic Birds. I. Residence Sites of Spermatozoa in

Fowl Oviducts. J. Reprod. Fertil. 8: 39–47.

24. Birkhead, T.R., and A.P. Møller. 1992. Numbers and size of sperm storage tubules

and the duration of sperm storage in birds: a comparative study. Biol. J. Linn. Soc.

45: 363–372.

25. Steele, M.G., and G.J. Wishart. 1996. Demonstration that the removal of sialic acid

from the surface of chicken spermatozoa impedes their transvaginal migration.

Theriogenology. 46: 1037–1044.

26. King, L.M., J.P. Brillard, W.M. Garrett, M.R. Bakst, and A.M. Donoghue. 2002.

Segregation of spermatozoa within sperm storage tubules of fowl and turkey

hens. Reproduction. 123: 79–86.

27. Briskie, J. V. 1996. Spatiotemporal patterns of sperm storage and last-male sperm

precedence in birds. Funct. Ecol. 10: 375–383.

28. Hemmings, N., and T.R. Birkhead. 2017. Differential sperm storage by female

zebra finches Taeniopygia guttata. Proc. R. Soc. B. 284: 20171032.

29. Froman, D.P. 2003. Deduction of a model for sperm storage in the oviduct of the

domestic fowl (Gallus domesticus). Biol. Reprod. 69: 248–53.

30. Froman, D.P., T. Pizzari, A.J. Feltmann, H. Castillo-Juarez, and T.R. Birkhead. 2002.

Sperm mobility: mechanisms of fertilizing efficiency, genetic variation and

phenotypic relationship with male status in the domestic fowl, Gallus gallus

domesticus. Proc. R. Soc. B. 269: 607–12.

31. Birkhead, T.R., J.E. Pellatt, and F.M. Hunter. 1988. Extra-pair copulation and sperm

competition in the zebra finch. Nature. 334: 60–2.

32. Birkhead, T.R., and J.D. Biggins. 1998. Sperm competition mechanisms in birds:

models and data. Behav. Ecol. 9: 253–260.

33.   Matsuzaki, M., S. Mizushima, G. Hiyama, N. Hirohashi, K. Shiba, K. Inaba, T. Suzuki,

466   H. Dohra, T. Ohnishi, Y. Sato, T. Kohsaka, Y. Ichikawa, Y. Atsumi, T. Yoshimura, and

467   T. Sasanami. 2015. Lactic acid is a sperm motility inactivation factor in the sperm

468   storage tubules. Sci. Rep. 5: 17643.

469   34.   Holm, L., H. Ekwall, G.J. Wishart, Y. Ridderstråle, and Y. Ridderstrale. 2000.

470   Localization of calcium and zinc in the sperm storage tubules of chicken, quail and

471   turkey using X-ray microanalysis. J. Reprod. Fertil. 118: 331–336.

472   35.   Bakst, M.R., and M.P. Richards. 1985. Concentrations of selected cations in turkey

473   serum and oviductal mucosae. Poult. Sci. 64: 555–563.

474   36.   Holm, L., and Y. Ridderstråle. 1998. Localization of carbonic anhydrase in the

475   sperm-storing regions of the turkey and quail oviduct. Histochem. J. 30: 481–488.

476   37.   Holm, L., and G.J. Wishart. 1998. The effect of pH on the motility of spermatozoa

477   from chicken, turkey and quail. Anim. Reprod. Sci. 54: 45–54.

478   38.   Holm, L., S.D. Ruziwa, V. Dantzer, and Y. Ridderstråle. 2000. Carbonic anhydrase

479   in the utero-vaginal junction of immature and mature ostriches. Br. Poult. Sci. 41:

480   244–9.

481   39.   Freedman, S.L., V.G. Akuffo, and M.R. Bakst. 2001. Evidence for the innervation of

482   sperm storage tubules in the oviduct of the turkey (Meleagris gallopavo).

483   Reproduction. 121: 809–814.

484   40.   Atherton, R.W., C.M. Cisson, B.W. Wilson, and T.K. Golder. 1980. Quantitation of

485   avian spermatozoan motility: Neurochemical regulation. Gamete Res. 3: 17–24.

486   41.   Hiyama, G., M. Matsuzaki, S. Mizushima, H. Dohra, K. Ikegami, T. Yoshimura, K.

487   Shiba, K. Inaba, and T. Sasanami. 2014. Sperm activation by heat shock protein 70

488   supports the migration of sperm released from sperm storage tubules in Japanese

489   quail (Coturnix japonica). Reproduction. 147: 167–178.

42.　Lindquist, S., and E.A. Craig. 1988. the Heat -Shock Proteins. Annu. Rev. Genet. 22:

631–677.

43.　Van Krey, H.P., F.X. Ogasawara, and J. Pangborn. 1967. Light and Electron

Microscopic Studies of Possible Sperm Gland Emptying Mechanisms. Poult. Sci.

46: 69–78.

44.　Gilbert, A.B., M.E. Reynolds, and F.W. Lorenz. 1968. Distribution of spermatozoa in

the oviduct and fertility in domestic birds. V. Histochemistry of the uterovaginal

sperm-host glands of the domestic hen. J. Reprod. Fertil. 16: 433–44.

45.　Hirokawa, N., T.C.S. Keller, R. Chasan, and M.S. Mooseker. 1983. Mechanism of

brush border contractility studied by the quick-freeze, deep-etch method. J. Cell

Biol. 96: 1325–1336.

46.　Keller, T.C.S., K.A. Conzelman, R. Chasan, and M.S. Mooseker. 1985. Role of myosin

in terminal web contraction in isolated intestinal epithelial brush borders. J. Cell

Biol. 100: 1647–1655.

47.　Owaribe, K., R. Kodama, and G. Eguchi. 1981. Demonstration of contractility of

circumferential actin bundles and its morphogenetic significance in pigmented

epithelium in vitro and in vivo. J. Cell Biol. 90: 507–514.

48.　Ito, T., N. Yoshizaki, T. Tokumoto, H. Ono, T. Yoshimura, A. Tsukada, N. Kansaku,

and T. Sasanami. 2011. Progesterone is a sperm-releasing factor from the sperm-

storage tubules in birds. Endocrinology. 152: 3952–3962.

49.　Hemmings, N., T.R. Birkhead, J.P. Brillard, P. Froment, and S. Briere. 2015. Timing

associated with oviductal sperm storage and release after artificial insemination

in domestic hens. Theriogenology. 83: 1174–1178.

50.　Bakst, M.R. 1998. Structure of the avian oviduct with emphasis on sperm storage

in poultry. J. Exp. Zool. 282: 618–626.

51.   Van Drimmelen, G.C. 1946. "Spermnests" in the oviduct of the domestic hen. J.

South African Vet. Med. Assoc. 17: 42–52.

52.   Bakst, M.R., and G. Bauchan. 2015. Apical blebs on sperm storage tubule epithelial

cell microvilli: Their release and interaction with resident sperm in the turkey

hen oviduct. Theriogenology. 83: 1438–44.

53.   Bakst, M.R. 1992. Observations on the turkey oviductal sperm-storage tubule

using differential interference contrast microscopy. J. Reprod. Fertil. 95: 877–883.

54.   Huisken, J., J. Swoger, F. Del Bene, J. Wittbrodt, and E.H.K. Stelzer. 2004. Optical

Sectioning Deep Inside Live Embryos by Selective Plane Illumination Microscopy.

Science (80-.). 305: 1007–1009.

55.   Reynaud, E.G., U. Krzic, K. Greger, and E.H.K. Stelzer. 2008. Light sheet-based

fluorescence microscopy: more dimensions, more photons, and less

photodamage. HFSP J. 2: 266–75.

56.   Birkhead, T.R., J.E. Pellatt, P. Brekke, R. Yeates, and H. Castillo-Juarez. 2005.

Genetic effects on sperm design in the zebra finch. Nature. 434: 383–7.

57.   Bennison, C., N. Hemmings, J. Slate, and T. Birkhead. 2015. Long sperm fertilize

more eggs in a bird. Proc. R. Soc. B. 282: 20141897.

58.   Pitrone, P.G., J. Schindelin, L. Stuyvenberg, S. Preibisch, M. Weber, K.W. Eliceiri, J.

Huisken, and P. Tomancak. 2013. OpenSPIM: an open-access light-sheet

microscopy platform. Nat. Methods. 10: 598–599.

59.   Mendonca, T., T.R. Birkhead, A.J. Cadby, W. Forstmeier, and N. Hemmings. 2018. A

trade-off between thickness and length in the zebra finch sperm mid-piece. Proc.

R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 285: 20180865.

60.   Schindelin, J., I. Arganda-Carreras, E. Frise, V. Kaynig, M. Longair, T. Pietzsch, S.

Preibisch, C. Rueden, S. Saalfeld, B. Schmid, J.-Y. Tinevez, D.J. White, V.

Hartenstein, K. Eliceiri, P. Tomancak, and A. Cardona. 2012. Fiji: an open-source

platform for biological-image analysis. Nat. Methods. 9: 676–82.

61.   Legland, D., I. Arganda-Carreras, and P. Andrey. 2016. MorphoLibJ: integrated

library and plugins for mathematical morphology with ImageJ. Bioinformatics. 32:

3532–3534.

62.   Longair, M.H., D.A. Baker, and J.D. Armstrong. 2011. Simple neurite tracer: Open

source software for reconstruction, visualization and analysis of neuronal

processes. Bioinformatics. 27: 2453–2454.

63.   Teng, P. 2011. Extract Slice from Volume. .

64.   D'Errico, J. 2012. arclength. .

65.   R Development Core Team. 2015. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical

Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

66.   Bates, D.M., M. Machler, B.M. Bolker, and S.C. Walker. 2014. Fitting Linear Mixed-

Effects Models using lme4. J. Stat. Softw. 67: 1--48.

67.   Kuznetsova, A., P.B. Brockhoff, and R.H.B. Christensen. 2017. lmerTest Package:

Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models. J. Stat. Softw. 82: 1–26.

68.   Zaferani, M., G.D. Palermo, and A. Abbaspourrad. 2019. Strictures of a

microchannel impose fierce competition to select for highly motile sperm. Sci.

Adv. 5: eaav2111.

69.   Birkhead, T.R., J.E. Pellatt, and F.M. Hunter. 1990. Numbers and Distribution of

Sperm in the Uterovaginal Sperm Storage Tubules of the Zebra Finch. Condor. 92:

508–516.

70.   Mero, K.N., and F.X. Ogasawara. 1970. Dimensions of uterovaginal sperm-storage

tubules of the chicken and their possible significance in sperm release. Poult. Sci.

49: 1304–1308.

71.   Burke, W.H. 1968. Release of spermatozoa from storage sites in the hen's oviduct.

566   .

567   72.   Gilbert, A.B., and P.E. Lake. 1963. Terminal Innervation of the Uterus and Vagina

568   of the Domestic Hen. Reproduction. 5: 41–NP.

569   73.   Birkhead, T.R., and F.M. Hunter. 1990. Numbers of sperm-storage tubules in the

570   Zebra Finch (Poephila guttata) and Bengalese Finch (Lonchura striata). Auk. 107:

571   193–197.

572   74.   Druart, X., J. Cognié, G. Baril, F. Clément, J.L. Dacheux, J.L. Gatti, J. Cognie, G. Baril, F.

573   Clement, J.L. Dacheux, and J.L. Gatti. 2009. In vivo imaging of in situ motility of

574   fresh and liquid stored ram spermatozoa in the ewe genital tract. Reproduction.

575   138: 45–53.

576   75.   DaCosta, R.S. 2005. Autofluorescence characterisation of isolated whole crypts

577   and primary cultured human epithelial cells from normal, hyperplastic, and

578   adenomatous colonic mucosa. J. Clin. Pathol. 58: 766–774.

579   76.   Brookner, C.K., M. Follen, I. Boiko, J. Galvan, S. Thomsen, A. Malpica, S. Suzuki, R.

580   Lotan, and R. Richards-Kortum. 2000. Autofluorescence Patterns in Short-term

581   Cultures of Normal Cervical Tissue. Photochem. Photobiol. 71: 730–736.

582   77.   Schuppin, G.T., H.P. Van Krey, D.M. Denbow, M.R. Bakst, and G.B. Meyer. 1984.

583   Ultrastructural analyses of uterovaginal sperm storage glands in fertile and

584   infertile turkey breeder hens. Poult Sci. 63: 1872–1882.

585   78.   Burke, W.H., F.X. Ogasawara, and C.L. Fuqua. 1972. A study of the ultrastructure of

586   the uterovaginal sperm-storage glands of the hen, Gallus domesticus, in relation

587   to a mechanism for the release of spermatozoa. J. Reprod. Fertil. 29: 29–36.

588   79.   Chiba, A., and M. Nakamura. 2001. Microscopic structure of the sperm storage

589   tubules in the polygynandrous alpine accentor, Prunella collaris (Aves). Acta Zool.

82: 299–306.

80.   Renden, J.A., E.B. May, and F.H. Benoff. 1981. Histochemistry of uterovaginal

sperm-host glands in Japanese Quail (Coturnix coturnix japonica) with reference

to the period of oviposition. Poult. Sci. 60: 2529–2535.

81.   Gilbert, A.B., M.E. Reynolds, and F.W. Lorenz. 1968. Distribution of spermatozoa in

the oviduct and fertility in domestic birds. 8. The effect of a foreign object in the

uterus on secretions of the sperm-host glands and the survival of spermatozoa in

the oviduct of the domestic hen. J. Reprod. Fertil. 17: 311–4.

82.   Pal, D. 1977. Histochemistry of the utero-vaginal junction with special reference

to the sperm-host glands in the oviduct of the domestic duck. Folia Histochem.

Cytochem. (Krakow). 15: 235–42.

83.   Heryanto, B., Y. Yoshimura, T. Tamura, and T. Okamoto. 1997. Involvement of

Apoptosis and Lysosomal Hydrolase Activity in the Oviducal Regression During

Induced Molting in Chickens : A Cytochemical Study for End Labeling of

Fragmented DNA and Acid Phosphatase Treatment of Birds and Collection of

Samples. Poult. Sci. 76: 67–72.