

1 **Familiar neighbours, but not relatives, enhance fitness in a territorial mammal**

2
3 **Authors:** Erin R. Siracusa^{1,2*}, Stan Boutin³, Ben Dantzer^{4,5}, Jeffrey E. Lane⁶, David W.
4 Coltman³, Andrew G. McAdam^{1,7}

5 **Affiliations:**

6 ¹Department of Integrative Biology, University of Guelph, 50 Stone Rd E, Guelph, ON, N1G
7 2W1, CA

8 ²Centre for Research in Animal Behaviour, School of Psychology, University of Exeter, Stocker
9 Rd, Exeter, EX4 4PY, UK

10 ³Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta, 116 St & 85 Ave, Edmonton, AB,
11 T6G 2R3, CA

12 ⁴Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, 500 S State St, Ann Arbor, MI, 48109,
13 USA

14 ⁵Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, University of Michigan, 500 S State St, Ann
15 Arbor, MI, 48109, USA

16 ⁶Department of Biology, University of Saskatchewan, Science Pl, Saskatoon, SK, S7N 5C8, CA

17 ⁷Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Colorado, 1900 Pleasant Street,
18 Boulder, CO, 80309, USA


19 *Lead Contact: Erin R. Siracusa, Center for Research in Animal Behaviour, School of
20 Psychology, University of Exeter, Exeter, EX4 4QG, UK | email: erinsiracusa@gmail.com |
21 Twitter: @erin_sira

22

23 **Keywords:** dear-enemy, familiarity, fitness, kin selection, mutualism, reciprocity, red squirrel,
24 reproductive success, senescence, social behaviour, survival, territoriality

25

26 Graphical Abstract



27

28

29

30

31 **Summary**

32 One of the outstanding questions in evolutionary biology is the extent to which mutually
33 beneficial interactions and kin-selection can facilitate the evolution of cooperation by mitigating
34 conflict between interacting organisms. The indirect fitness benefits gained from associating with
35 kin are an important pathway to conflict resolution [1], but conflict can also be resolved if
36 individuals gain direct benefits from cooperating with one another (e.g. mutualism or reciprocity)
37 [2]. Owing to the kin-structured nature of many animal societies, it has been difficult for
38 previous research to assess the relative importance of these mechanisms [3-5]. However, one
39 area that might allow for the relative roles of kin-selection and mutualistic benefits to be
40 disentangled is in the resolution of conflict over territorial space [6]. While much research has
41 focused on group-living species, the question of how cooperation can first be favoured in solitary,
42 territorial species remains a key question. Using 22 years of data from a population of North
43 American red squirrels, we assessed how kinship and familiarity with neighbours affected fitness
44 in a territorial mammal. While living near kin did not enhance fitness, familiarity with
45 neighbours increased survival and annual reproductive success. These fitness benefits were
46 strong enough to compensate for the effects of aging later in life, with potential consequences for
47 the evolution of senescence. We suggest that such substantial fitness benefits provide the
48 opportunity for the evolution of cooperation between adversarial neighbours, offering insight
49 into the role that mutually beneficial behaviours might play in facilitating and stabilizing social
50 systems.

51

52 **Results and Discussion**

53 Stable social relationships among group-living species are known to play an important role in
54 mediating intragroup conflict and enhancing fitness [3,7,8]. For territorial species, maintaining
55 territorial boundaries can be a costly endeavor, and while kin can help to mitigate territorial
56 aggression and enhance fitness [9], there is also potential for stable interactions between
57 neighbours to play an important role in helping to resolve conflict over territorial space [6,10]. It
58 is well understood that familiarity among long-term neighbours allows for the formation of
59 stable social relationships that can facilitate reduced aggression and territory defence, a
60 phenomenon known as the ‘dear enemy’ effect [11,12]. Although it is not clear whether dear-
61 enemy relationships are stabilized by reciprocity or mutualism, by minimizing negotiation of
62 territory boundaries and alleviating costs of territoriality for both individuals, social familiarity
63 provides a pathway to conflict resolution through mutual direct benefits.

64 To assess the relative importance of kinship and familiarity for resolving conflict over
65 territorial space and thereby enhancing reproductive success and survival, we used 22 years of
66 data from a natural population of North American red squirrels (*Tamiasciurus hudsonicus*). Red
67 squirrels are arboreal rodents in which both sexes defend exclusive territories year-round [13].
68 Territories are important for overwinter survival [14] and are defended through vocalizations
69 called ‘rattles’ [15], which are uniquely identifiable [16]. Juveniles typically disperse 100 m on
70 average and females sometimes bequeath all or part of their territory to offspring [17]. As a
71 result, neighbours are sometimes closely related and have been shown to exhibit affiliative
72 behaviour with kin [18,19]. Red squirrels also have potential to establish long-term familiarity
73 with neighbours since individuals rarely relocate to a vacant territory following natal dispersal

74 [20]. Familiarity with neighbours is demonstrated to have important benefits for red squirrels
75 including reduced risk of territory intrusion [21] and reduced time spent on territory defence [22].

76 In this study we tested whether red squirrels that were more familiar with neighbouring
77 conspecifics had increased annual reproductive success (ARS) and a higher probability of
78 surviving to the following year, than squirrels that were less familiar with their social
79 neighbourhood (i.e. squirrels within a 130 m radius). Through genetic analysis and monitoring of
80 red squirrel pups in the natal nest we were able to establish a long-term pedigree, allowing us to
81 assess effects of social familiarity while simultaneously accounting for relatedness. We used
82 average neighbourhood familiarity and relatedness as our metrics of interest, as previous
83 research has demonstrated that these metrics have important effects on territory dynamics and
84 behaviour in red squirrels [21,22]. Given that stable social connections have been demonstrated
85 to reduce mortality risk and enhance longevity in other species [23], we also assessed whether
86 maintaining familiar social relationships into later life might help to buffer squirrels against age-
87 related declines in fitness. To do this, we looked for effects of familiarity on survival and
88 reproductive success in red squirrels specifically during the ‘senescent’ period (squirrels ≥ 4
89 years old) [24,25].

90

91 **Effects of familiarity**

92 Over the 22-year period (1994-2015) in which we analyzed survival and ARS, red squirrels, on
93 average, had 13 neighbours. Average neighbourhood familiarity ranged between 0 and 1186
94 days (mean = 191 ± 4 days; CV = 1.04) and average relatedness ranged between 0 and 0.5 (mean
95 = 0.05 ± 0.001 ; CV = 1.09). Familiarity was not strongly correlated with either relatedness ($r = -$
96 0.09) or grid-wide density ($r = -0.17$). We found no effect of average relatedness of the social

97 neighbourhood on male or female survival, number of pups sired annually, or number of pups
98 recruited annually in either the full models or senescent models (all $|\beta| < 0.14$, all $|z| < 1.48$, all P
99 > 0.13 ; Table 1). In contrast, familiarity with neighbouring individuals was associated with an
100 increase in male and female survival ($\beta = 0.18 \pm 0.06$, $z = 2.79$, $P = 0.005$; Table 1) and an
101 increase in the annual number of pups sired ($\beta = 0.18 \pm 0.09$, $z = 2.04$, $P = 0.04$; Table 1),
102 although there was no overall effect of social familiarity on the annual number of pups recruited
103 by females ($\beta = 0.06 \pm 0.05$, $z = 1.38$, $P = 0.17$; Table 1). Familiarity is, however, strongly
104 correlated with age (and therefore survival) in early life ($r = 0.60$), making it difficult to
105 disentangle whether familiarity drives survival or survival drives familiarity. However, for
106 senescent squirrels (≥ 4 years), age and familiarity are disassociated ($r = -0.04$; Figure S1), such
107 that familiarity is not driven by an individual's own survival but by the survival of its neighbours,
108 allowing us to better disentangle these effects. When analyzing effects of familiarity in the
109 senescent period (≥ 4 years old), we found that the benefits of social familiarity for all fitness
110 measures were even more substantial, and were consistently at least three times greater than the
111 effects of relatedness in the same models (Table 1). For squirrels aged 4 and older, living near
112 familiar neighbours was associated with an increase in the probability of annual survival for both
113 sexes ($\beta = 0.45 \pm 0.11$, $z = 3.40$, $P < 0.001$; Figure 1). For example, senescent squirrels with high
114 familiarity with their neighbours (500 days; third quartile) had a 69% chance of surviving to the
115 next year, while squirrels with low familiarity with their neighbours (130 days; first quartile) had
116 a 52% chance of surviving to the next year. In the senescent period, living near familiar
117 neighbours was associated with a substantial increase in the annual number of pups sired ($\beta =$
118 0.39 ± 0.15 , $z = 2.67$, $P = 0.008$; Figure 1). Males with high familiarity with their neighbours
119 (500 days, third quartile) sired 1.7 pups annually while males with low familiarity with their

120 neighbours (130 days, first quartile) sired 0.9 pups annually. For females aged 4 and older,
121 familiarity with neighbours was also associated with an increase in the annual number of pups
122 recruited ($\beta = 0.23 \pm 0.09$, $z = 2.52$, $P = 0.01$; Figure 1). Senescent females with high familiarity
123 with their neighbours (500 days; third quartile) recruited 0.7 pups annually compared to females
124 with low average familiarity with their neighbours (130 days; first quartile) that recruited 0.5
125 pups annually.

126 An important consideration is whether variation in individual quality or habitat quality
127 might lead to a spurious correlation between familiarity and survival when the causation is
128 actually reversed. Familiarity, however, is not a trait of an individual but a trait of an interaction
129 *between* individuals. Therefore, an individual with ‘good genes’ that survives well cannot obtain
130 high familiarity without also having neighbours that survive well. For this to be possible there
131 would need to be spatial clustering of ‘high quality’ individuals or spatial variation in resource
132 availability or predation risk that leads to local areas of consistently high survival (and therefore
133 high familiarity). Furthermore, in order for local areas of high habitat or individual quality to
134 confound the familiarity-fitness relationship, spatial autocorrelation in these fitness measures
135 must persist across multiple years (because familiarity is a product of past survival). To assess
136 this possibility, we calculated Moran’s I for each study grid and year to test whether similarity in
137 ARS or probability of survival was related to the spatial proximity of any two individuals.
138 Evidence of spatial autocorrelation in any of these measures was both rare and inconsistent
139 (Table S4). We found only one instance of spatial correlation in consecutive years (Table S4),
140 suggesting that a spurious correlation between ARS or survival and familiarity is unlikely. When
141 we removed the year/grid combinations with positive spatial autocorrelation from our data and
142 reran the analyses our conclusions remained the same (Table S5). In addition, while survival and

143 familiarity might be confounded in younger squirrels where familiarity increases with age, we
144 demonstrated that familiarity still has substantial effects on fitness in older squirrels where age
145 and familiarity are independent and variation in familiarity is driven by the survival of a
146 squirrel's neighbours rather than their own survival (Figure 1; Table 1). Finally, there is no
147 mechanism by which reproductive success might affect familiarity. Therefore, there is
148 substantial evidence to suggest that familiarity is a cause rather than a consequence of high
149 fitness.

150 Although we do not have direct evidence for the mechanism by which familiarity with
151 neighbours might lead to increased reproductive success, previous work in this study system has
152 shown that social familiarity results in reduced risk of pilfering [21] and reduced time spent on
153 territory defence [22]. Conceivably then, these direct fitness benefits may result from cooperative
154 'agreements' of non-intrusion among long-term neighbours, which might increase food stores or
155 reduce time and energy allocated to territory defence. Given the particularly substantial effects of
156 familiarity on male siring success, we sought to provide some mechanistic understanding of how
157 familiarity contributes to fitness by exploring two hypotheses in male red squirrels. We
158 hypothesized first that social familiarity might directly benefit males through increased mating
159 success with familiar females in their social neighbourhood. Alternatively, we hypothesized that
160 if familiarity enhances energetic resources through reduced pilferage [21,22] that this might
161 allow male squirrels in familiar social neighbourhoods to travel farther to obtain mating
162 opportunities and thereby increase their siring success [26,27]. Our analyses revealed that there
163 was no association between familiarity and a male's siring success within his social
164 neighbourhood (≤ 130 m away; $\beta = 0.12 \pm 0.10$, $t = 1.25$, $P = 0.21$; Table 2). Instead, we found
165 evidence that males traveled farther to mate ($\beta = 19.93 \pm 8.83$, $t = 2.26$, $P = 0.03$) and sired more

166 pups ($\beta = 0.39 \pm 0.10$, $z = 3.79$, $P < 0.001$) outside their social neighbourhood (>130 m away)
167 when more familiar with their neighbours (Figure 2; Table 2). This does not appear to be due to
168 inbreeding avoidance (see Table 2). Together, these results suggest that stable social
169 relationships with neighbours enhance male fitness by allowing them to travel farther and
170 increase their siring success [27]. This might result from familiarity with neighbours increasing
171 the energetic resources available to males through reduced territory defence [22] or reduced
172 cache pilfering by neighbours [21]. While the mechanisms by which social familiarity might
173 affect female recruitment remain unexplored, there are several pathways by which this might
174 occur, including familiarity increasing food resources, which might lead to earlier parturition
175 [28] or faster growth rates [29], known to be associated with enhanced juvenile survival.
176 Alternatively the reduced time spent on defence in familiar neighbourhoods might allow females
177 to spend more time in nest [22], and more attentive mothers have been found to have enhanced
178 reproductive success [30]. Exploring the mechanisms by which social familiarity contributes to
179 fitness is a viable area for future research.

180

181 **Effects on senescence**

182 Our findings also demonstrate a previously unappreciated benefit of maintaining social
183 relationships into later life. The magnitudes of the benefits of social familiarity in the senescent
184 period were sufficient to offset age-related declines in survival and reproductive success.
185 Specifically, for an average 4-year old squirrel, aging by one year decreases the probability of
186 survival from 68% to 59%. But if that individual were to maintain all of its neighbours, such that
187 average familiarity increased by one year (from the mean familiarity of 318 days to 683 days),
188 the maintenance of those stable social relationships would more than compensate for the change

189 in age, resulting in an increase in survival probability from 68% to 74%. However, despite the
190 large individual benefits of increased social familiarity late in life, few squirrels currently enjoy
191 this fitness advantage. For example, only 4% of 4-year olds surviving to age 5 maintain all of
192 their neighbours, and mean familiarity does not continue to increase with age through the
193 senescent period (Figure S1). As a result, our observed fitness increases in later life associated
194 with social stability are not currently widespread enough to affect the decline in the force of
195 natural selection with age and the arrival of the mutational ‘wall of death’ [31] (Figure S2).

196 Nevertheless, such individual fitness benefits of familiarity provide strong incentive for
197 squirrels to reduce turnover in their social neighbourhood. While squirrels compete with
198 territorial neighbours for resources [32], space [13], and reproductive success [33], here we have
199 shown that individuals also benefit from the enhanced survival of neighbours. The idea that
200 territorial neighbours might engage in cooperative behaviours to prevent neighbourhood turnover
201 has been theorized [34]. Here our documented benefits of social familiarity provide the
202 opportunity for the evolution of cooperative behaviour toward otherwise adversarial neighbours.
203 Specifically, while the loss of an unfamiliar neighbour would have no effect on survival
204 probability, the loss of a neighbour with 6 years of familiarity, although rare, would decrease the
205 owner’s probability of survival by 7%. A squirrel should, therefore, be willing to engage in
206 behaviours that ensure their neighbour’s survival as long as this does not reduce the actor’s
207 survival by more than 7%. This scope for cooperation is comparable to kin selection interactions
208 between first cousins once removed ($r = 0.06$) [1]. It is possible then that reduced aggression
209 when interacting with familiar neighbours (i.e. the dear-enemy phenomenon) [12] is a
210 mechanism that not only serves to reduce an individual’s own time and energy spent on defence,
211 but also enhances the survival of familiar neighbours, which provides indirect fitness returns

212 through increased social familiarity. In red squirrels, reduced territory defence toward familiar
213 individuals [22] may convey survival benefits to neighbours through reduced aggression or
214 lowered defense of food resources. Red squirrels have also been known to nest communally
215 during cold temperatures [18], which might enhance neighbour survival. Other mechanisms by
216 which red squirrels might reduce neighbourhood turnover such as predator alarm calling, or
217 forming defensive coalitions [e.g. 34] to prevent a territory takeover, have yet to be tested.
218 Ultimately, if cooperative behaviours enhancing the survival of familiar neighbours were to
219 become widespread enough that mean social familiarity increased with age across the population,
220 then this socially driven increase in fitness late in life could influence the force of selection and
221 consequently the evolution of senescence (Figure S2).

222

223 **Effects of relatedness**

224 Given that there is evidence of affiliative behaviour among kin in this study system [18,19], in
225 addition to localized dispersal and bequeathal of territory space to offspring [17], we expected
226 that relatedness among neighbours might play an important role in red squirrel survival and
227 reproductive success. Additionally, we were interested in the possibility that relatedness with
228 neighbours might help to mitigate the consequences of living with unfamiliar neighbours, as seen
229 in other systems [6]. However, we found no evidence to suggest that kin provide fitness benefits
230 for red squirrels (Table 1), and there were no significant interactions between relatedness and
231 familiarity in any of our models. It is possible that the observed low relatedness among
232 neighbours (average neighbourhood relatedness = 0.05 ± 0.001), which likely occurs as the result
233 of low overwinter juvenile survival [35], could have constrained the potential for kin selection to
234 act at this scale. However, our findings do not mean that neighbour relatedness has no

235 biologically meaningful effects on red squirrel fitness, but simply that the scale at which we
236 measured these effects did not exhibit any influence of kinship. If, for instance, the primary
237 benefits of kinship come from sharing resources such as food [21] or nests [18], relatedness of
238 nearest neighbours (rather than all neighbours within 130 m) may be a more relevant measure to
239 assess whether red squirrels obtain benefits from kin. Future work should therefore attempt to
240 use other measures of the social environment to offer additional insight as to the relative
241 importance of kin-selection in this system. Regardless, our results demonstrate that stable social
242 relationships are associated with increased fitness in red squirrels, independent of kinship,
243 suggesting that inclusive fitness benefits are not a necessary prerequisite to facilitate cooperation
244 between social partners.

245

246 **Conclusion**

247 Although interactions among territorial individuals are fundamentally defined by competition for
248 food, mates, or other resources, here we have shown that stable social relationships can provide
249 important fitness benefits that might feed back to limit these competitive interactions and
250 maintain strong affiliative relationships among unrelated territorial neighbours. Similar fitness
251 benefits of established relationships with neighbours have also been demonstrated in territorial
252 birds such as red-winged blackbirds [36], song sparrows [37], and great tits [10]. Our findings, in
253 conjunction with these previous studies, demonstrate that the benefits of stable social
254 relationships are not exclusive to group-living organisms but can extend to solitary species,
255 suggesting a shared evolutionary importance of stable relationships across a range of social
256 complexities. The strength of the effects of familiarity, particularly in the senescent period, was
257 surprising. We suggest that by increasing the force of selection later in life, stable social


258 relationships have the potential to lead to the evolution of slower rates of aging, although these
259 late-life social benefits are not currently widespread enough to affect senescence in red squirrels.
260 Importantly, our results indicate that intraspecific conflict can be mitigated through mutualistic
261 pathways, with resulting fitness benefits, independent of kinship effects [3,6]. Consequently,
262 stable social relationships with neighbours may be an important and overlooked contributor to
263 fitness in territorial species, and may offer insight into the relative importance of mutually
264 beneficial behaviours for facilitating conflict resolution.
265
266

267 **Acknowledgments:** We thank the Champagne and Aishihik First Nations for allowing us to
268 conduct our research within their traditional territory and thank Agnes MacDonald and her
269 family for long-term access to her trap line. We are grateful to all of the field technicians who
270 have contributed to the long-term KRSP database over the years, and J. Kapitain at KAP Design
271 for assistance with figure design. This research was supported by Discovery Grants and Northern
272 Research Supplements from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada
273 (A.G.M.: RGPIN-2015-04707; S.B.: RGPIN-2014-05874; J.E.L.: RGPIN-2014-04093, RGPNS-
274 2014-459038; D.W.C.: RGPIN-2011-312207), as well as funding from the University of
275 Michigan (B.D.), and Grants-in-Aid of research from the American Society of Mammalogists
276 and the Arctic Institute of North America (E.R.S.).

277 **Author Contributions:** E.R.S. and A.G.M. conceived of and designed the study. E.R.S.
278 conducted statistical analyses and wrote the manuscript with support from A.G.M. All authors
279 contributed to field logistics, data collection and maintenance, and assisted with review and
280 editing of the manuscript.

281 **Declaration of Interests:** The authors declare no competing interests.

282



283

284 **Figure 1. Effects of average neighbourhood familiarity on A) annual survival (N = 512), B)**


285 **male annual reproductive success (ARS; N = 78), and C) female ARS (N = 268) during the**

286 **senescent period (≥ 4 years old).** Shaded grey bars indicate 95% confidence intervals. Values

287 on x-axis are standardized measures of average familiarity. Points indicate raw data with a small

288 amount of jitter introduced to show overlapping points.

289



290

291

292 **Figure 2. Effects of average neighbourhood familiarity on A) the distance that males**
293 **traveled to mate and B) number of pups sired outside the social neighbourhood (i.e. 130 m**
294 **radius; N = 199). Shaded grey bars indicate 95% confidence intervals. Values on x-axis are**
295 **standardized measures of average familiarity. Points indicate raw data. See also Table 2 and S2.**

296

297 **Table 1. Fixed effects from annual survival, male annual reproductive success (ARS), and**
 298 **female ARS generalized linear mixed-effects models.** Models are based on the full and
 299 senescent (≥ 4 years old) datasets are shown with significant effects indicated in bold.
 300 Regression coefficients are standardized. See also Table S1 for random effects.

| Data set | N | Response | Fixed effect | Parameter \pm SE | <i>z</i> | <i>P</i> |
|-----------------------|------|---|------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| Full data | | | | | | |
| | 2346 | Probability of survival | Familiarity | 0.18 \pm 0.06 | 2.79 | 0.005 |
| | | | Age | -0.27 \pm 0.08 | -3.47 | 0.001 |
| | | | Age² | -0.11 \pm 0.04 | -2.63 | 0.01 |
| | | | Relatedness | 0.01 \pm 0.05 | 0.16 | 0.88 |
| | | | Density | 0.10 \pm 0.10 | 0.92 | 0.36 |
| | | | Grid-SU | 0.17 \pm 0.10 | 1.67 | 0.09 |
| | 412 | No. pups sired (<i>Male ARS</i>) | Familiarity | 0.18 \pm 0.09 | 2.04 | 0.04 |
| | | | Age | 0.68 \pm 0.14 | 4.75 | <0.001 |
| | | | Age² | -0.41 \pm 0.08 | -5.32 | <0.001 |
| | | | Relatedness | -0.12 \pm 0.08 | -1.47 | 0.14 |
| | | | Density | 0.04 \pm 0.12 | 0.37 | 0.71 |
| | | | Grid-SU | -0.07 \pm 0.19 | -0.38 | 0.70 |
| | 981 | No. pups recruited (<i>Female ARS</i>) | Familiarity | 0.06 \pm 0.05 | 1.38 | 0.17 |
| | | | Age | 0.08 \pm 0.05 | 1.42 | 0.16 |
| | | | Age² | -0.10 \pm 0.04 | -2.72 | 0.007 |
| | | | Relatedness | 0.03 \pm 0.04 | 0.63 | 0.53 |
| | | | Density | -0.37 \pm 0.13 | -2.78 | 0.005 |
| | | | Grid-SU | -0.06 \pm 0.08 | -0.78 | 0.43 |
| Senescent data | | | | | | |
| | 512 | Probability of survival | Familiarity | 0.45 \pm 0.11 | 4.00 | <0.001 |
| | | | Age | -0.36 \pm 0.10 | -3.42 | 0.001 |
| | | | Relatedness | 0.13 \pm 0.11 | 1.20 | 0.23 |
| | | | Density | 0.15 \pm 0.11 | 1.33 | 0.18 |
| | | | Grid-SU | 0.14 \pm 0.21 | 0.68 | 0.49 |
| | 78 | No. pups sired (<i>Male ARS</i>) | Familiarity | 0.39 \pm 0.15 | 2.67 | 0.008 |
| | | | Age | -0.39 \pm 0.19 | -2.01 | 0.04 |
| | | | Relatedness | 0.05 \pm 0.14 | 0.37 | 0.72 |
| | | | Density | 0.11 \pm 0.19 | 0.60 | 0.55 |
| | | | Grid-SU | 0.26 \pm 0.32 | 0.82 | 0.41 |
| | 268 | No. pups recruited (<i>Female ARS</i>) | Familiarity | 0.23 \pm 0.09 | 2.52 | 0.01 |
| | | | Age | -0.29 \pm 0.10 | -2.79 | 0.005 |
| | | | Relatedness | 0.06 \pm 0.08 | 0.79 | 0.43 |

| | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Density | -0.38 ± 0.17 | -2.20 | 0.03 |
| Grid-SU | -0.32 ± 0.17 | -1.85 | 0.07 |

301

302

303 **Table 2. Fixed effects from models assessing effects of familiarity on (i) the farthest**
 304 **distance that males traveled to mate, (ii) the number of pups sired inside the**
 305 **neighbourhood, and (iii) the number of pups sired outside the neighbourhood (N = 199**
 306 **observations over 129 males).** Regression coefficients are standardized and significant effects
 307 are indicated in bold. See also Table S2 for random effects.

| Response | Fixed Effect | Parameter ± SE | Test-statistic | <i>P</i> |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Distance of farthest mate | Familiarity | 19.93 ± 8.83 | 2.26 | 0.03 |
| | Relatedness | 6.91 ± 6.82 | 1.01 | 0.31 |
| | Age | -4.67 ± 9.56 | -0.49 | 0.63 |
| | Density | -24.86 ± 7.49 | -3.32 | 0.001 |
| No. pups sired inside | Familiarity | 0.12 ± 0.10 | 1.24 | 0.21 |
| | Relatedness | 0.01 ± 0.07 | 0.18 | 0.85 |
| | Age | 0.03 ± 0.11 | 0.24 | 0.81 |
| | Density | 0.27 ± 0.12 | 2.32 | 0.02 |
| No. pups sired outside | Familiarity | 0.39 ± 0.10 | 3.78 | <0.001 |
| | Relatedness | -0.003 ± 0.09 | -0.04 | 0.97 |
| | Age | -0.09 ± 0.12 | -0.77 | 0.44 |
| | Density | -0.25 ± 0.09 | -2.66 | 0.008 |

310 **STAR Methods**

311 **Resource Availability**

312 *Lead Contact*

313 Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and will be
314 fulfilled by the Lead Contact, Erin Siracusa (erinsiracusa@gmail.com).

315 *Materials Availability*

316 This study did not generate new unique reagents.

317 *Data and Code Availability*

318 Data are available from the Figshare Repository (<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.8813564>).

319

320 **Experimental Model and Subject Details**

321 We studied a wild population of North American red squirrels located in the southwest Yukon,
322 Canada (61° N, 138° W). This population has been followed since 1987 on two 40-ha study grids
323 separated by the Alaska Highway ('Kloo' and 'Sulphur'). We monitored squirrels annually from
324 March to August and used a combination of live-trapping and behavioural observations to assess
325 territory ownership, track reproduction and survival, and determine offspring recruitment [17,25].
326 We trapped squirrels using Tomahawk live-traps (Tomahawk Live Trap Co., Tomahawk,
327 Wisconsin, USA) baited with peanut butter. During their single-day oestrous, female red
328 squirrels mate with multiple males and produce multiply-sired litters [38], with an average of
329 three pups per litter [39]. We monitored the reproductive statuses and parturition dates of
330 females through palpation, mass changes, and evidence of lactation. After parturition, we used
331 radio telemetry and/or behavioural observations to follow females to their nests. We fitted pups
332 with unique alphanumeric metal ear tags (Monel #1; National Band and Tag, Newport, KY,
333 USA) at 25 days old, allowing us to follow individuals throughout their lifetimes.

334 ***Ethical guidelines***

335 This study required trapping individuals using Tomahawk live traps to determine territory
336 ownership and assess reproductive status. Traps were checked every 60-90 min and squirrels
337 were never left in a trap for longer than 120 min. We also entered the natal nest when pups were
338 1-2 days old and 25 days old to collect DNA, measure pup growth, and tag individuals. We
339 returned the pups to the natal nest immediately after processing to minimize time spent away
340 from the dam. These procedures had no detectable negative effects on the survival or welfare of
341 the study animals. This research was approved by the University of Guelph Animal Care
342 Committee (AUP number 1807).

343

344 **Method Details**

345 ***Measuring familiarity***

346 We completed a full census of the population twice annually in May and August and determined
347 territory ownership using the aforementioned methods. Both male and female red squirrels
348 defend exclusive territories year round, which are centered around a larder hoard of food
349 resources called a ‘midden’ [13]. We defined each squirrel’s social neighbourhood to be all
350 conspecifics whose middens (i.e. the center of the territory) were within a 130 m radius of the
351 focal squirrel’s midden. One hundred and thirty meters is the farthest distance that red squirrel
352 territorial vocalizations (‘rattles’) are known to be detectable to the human ear [40], and is
353 similar to the distance at which red squirrels have been demonstrated to be most responsive to
354 changes in local density (150 m) [41]. This suggests that 130 m is a reasonable measure of the
355 distance at which squirrels can receive and respond to information about their social environment.
356 We measured the pairwise familiarity between the territory owner and each neighbour as the

357 number of days that both individuals had occupied their current territories within 130 m of each
358 other. We then averaged all pairwise measures of familiarity to obtain a measure of each
359 individual's average familiarity with its neighbours. For all analyses we used average familiarity
360 values calculated in May, as this aligned most closely with the reproductive season. The timing of
361 our semi-annual censuses meant that we could only update each squirrel's familiarity with its
362 neighbours twice per year. Therefore, pairwise familiarities could increase from one year to the
363 next in increments of either 273 days (new neighbour in August survived until May), or 365 days
364 (neighbour survived from previous May until current May). Average familiarity, however, could
365 take on many possible values because pairwise familiarities were averaged across all neighbours.

366 *Measuring relatedness*

367 We temporarily removed juveniles from their natal nest immediately following parturition to
368 weigh, sex, and take ear tissue samples. Observing pups in the natal nest also allowed us to
369 assign maternity with certainty. Starting in 2003, we determined paternity by genotyping all
370 individuals at 16 microsatellite loci [42] and assigned paternity with 99% confidence using
371 CERVUS 3.0 [43]. Genotyping error based on known mother-offspring pairs was 2%. Additional
372 details on the genetic methods can be found in Lane et al. (2008). Using the established
373 multigenerational pedigree, we calculated the coefficient of relatedness between the territory
374 owner and each neighbour. We averaged all pairwise measures of relatedness to provide a
375 measure of the average relatedness between each squirrel and all of its neighbours.

376 *Fitness measures*

377 For individuals alive between 1994 and 2015, we measured annual survival as the probability of
378 surviving to the following year ($N = 2346$ records over 1009 individuals). Given that long-term
379 monitoring of individuals in this population first began in 1987, we excluded data prior to 1994

380 to ensure accurate measurement of familiarity between neighbours. Our ability to successfully
381 redetect adults in the population each year is estimated to be 1.0 [44].

382 We measured female annual reproductive success (ARS) as the number of pups recruited
383 each year (i.e. surviving overwinter). We included data from 450 breeding females between 1994
384 and 2015 ($N = 981$ records). All females with a known parturition date were considered to have
385 bred; all other non-breeding females were excluded from analysis. Most non-breeding females
386 were yearlings that were too young to breed. Since red squirrel males do not contribute to the
387 raising of pups and the male's social environment is, therefore, unlikely to affect pup recruitment,
388 we defined male ARS as the number of pups sired each year. We used data from 207 males
389 between 2003 and 2014 ($N = 412$ records). We excluded male reproductive success outside of
390 this timeframe because paternity data was not available prior to 2003 and after 2014. For all
391 analyses we only used data for adults (≥ 1 year old) whose age could be assigned with certainty
392 (i.e. individuals tagged in nest as juveniles).

393 It is possible that our ability to accurately assess recruitment is somewhat confounded by
394 dispersal beyond the borders of our study grids [45]. On average, juveniles typically disperse less
395 than 100 m [17,46], and estimates of juvenile survival do not differ between the center and edge
396 of our study grids, which might be expected if dispersing juveniles were mistakenly considered
397 to have died [25]. However, 37% of our population is comprised of immigrants from outside our
398 study grids [45], which suggests that some juvenile recruitment outside the study area is likely to
399 have been missed by our methods.

400

401 **Quantification and Statistical Analysis**

402 *Annual survival and ARS*

403 To assess the effects of familiarity on ARS and survival, we used generalized linear mixed
404 effects models (GLMMs) with a BOBYQA optimizer. We used a binomial distribution (logit-
405 link) to assess probability of annual survival and a Poisson distribution (log-link) for male and
406 female ARS. For all models we fitted average familiarity, average relatedness, a linear and
407 quadratic term for age, and grid-wide density as continuous predictors and included study grid as
408 a categorical fixed effect (Table 1). For the survival models we checked for an effect of sex, but
409 sex was not significant and so was not considered further. We included a random effect of
410 squirrel ID and year to account for repeated measures of individuals and temporal variation in
411 resource availability, respectively (Table S1). To account for inherent spatial structure in our
412 data, we grouped squirrels into 150 m squares (within each year) based on their known spatial
413 locations and included this ‘spatial ID’ as a random effect in all of our models. Our results
414 remained unchanged even when this spatial grouping term was defined to be a 75 m or 300 m
415 square (see Table S3). Fitting separate spatial autocorrelation terms for each year would have
416 been ideal, however, it was not possible to obtain convergence from our data using this method.
417 To account for the fact that familiarity and age are strongly correlated in early, but not later, life
418 (Figure S1), we also fit models for just the senescent period (≥ 4 years old). Models for the
419 senescent period included the same covariates as the full models described above, but only
420 included a linear effect of age. Finally, we conducted an additional analysis to test for spatial
421 autocorrelation by calculating Moran’s I (ape package version 5.1) [47] for each study grid and
422 year (Table S4). We removed the year/grid combinations with positive spatial autocorrelation
423 from our data and reran the analyses above (Table S5).

424 *Mechanisms underlying male reproductive success*

425 We conducted a post-hoc analysis to reveal potential mechanisms by which familiarity with

426 neighbours might lead to increased male reproductive success. We had two hypotheses: 1) that
427 familiarity with neighbours leads to increased energetic resources, allowing males to travel
428 farther to mate or 2) that familiarity with females provides males with more mating opportunities
429 within the males' social neighbourhood. To test hypothesis one, we assessed whether familiarity
430 with neighbours affected the farthest distance that a male traveled to mate using a linear mixed
431 effect model (LMM) with average familiarity, average relatedness, age, and grid density as
432 continuous fixed effects and squirrel ID and year as random effects (Table 2, S2). To test
433 hypothesis two, we measured whether average familiarity affected the number of pups that a
434 male sired inside or outside his neighbourhood. We fitted both these models using a Poisson
435 GLMM with the same fixed and random effects structure as above (Table 2, S2).

436 ***Force of selection***

437 If the fitness benefits of stable social relationships were sufficiently widespread in the red
438 squirrel system then an increase in the mean number of reproductive opportunities later in life
439 associated with social familiarity would lead to a less rapid decline in the force of natural
440 selection with age. This would delay the arrival of the 'wall of death', a spike in mortality caused
441 by the accumulation of deleterious alleles, leading to the evolution of slower rates of aging [31].
442 We conducted a post-hoc analysis to explore this possibility in red squirrels by creating a
443 'simulated' population where social interactions were excluded from the calculation of age-
444 specific survival and fecundity (Figure S2). To do this, we fitted the same models as above,
445 except that we included both breeding and non-breeding females and the response variable for
446 females was now number of pups born rather than number recruited. For the first set of models
447 we included age, a quadratic term for age, density and grid as fixed effects, as well as squirrel ID
448 and year as random effects. We extracted the parameter estimates for age in each of these models

449 and used those parameters to estimate age-specific fecundity and survival for females and males
450 separately. This represented our ‘observed’ population, and provided us with the estimates of
451 age-specific fecundity and survival as observed and as potentially confounded by social
452 familiarity among squirrels. We then measured what the effects of age would have been had
453 there not been variation in familiarity by including familiarity as a continuous predictor in the
454 same models described above, and thus statistically controlling for its effects. Our parameter
455 estimates for age now represented the effects of age in the absence of social effects. We again
456 used these parameters to estimate age-specific fecundity and survival for both sexes. We
457 calculated force of selection separately for males and females in our ‘observed’ population and
458 ‘simulated’ population (where the benefits of social relationships were statistically excluded) by
459 using the following formula [48]:

460

$$S(x) = \sum_{y=x+1} e^{-ry} l(y)m(y)$$

461

462 Here $S(x)$ represents the force of selection against a deleterious allele in the population, where r
463 is the intrinsic rate of increase, $l(y)$ and $m(y)$ are the survivorship and fecundity functions and y
464 is used to sum up the net expected reproduction over all ages after age x .

465 ***Data analysis***

466 We conducted statistical analyses using R version 3.4.1 [49] and fitted models using the lme4
467 package (version 1.1-13) [50]. We obtained P values for the LMMs using the package lmerTest
468 (version 3.0-1) [51]. For all models, we checked for significant non-linearities between the
469 predictor and response variables by fitting generalized additive models. For GLMMs we checked
470 for overdispersion by assessing whether the sum of squared Pearson residuals approximated a

471 Chi-squared distribution with $N-P$ degrees of freedom [52]. Of the 1009 squirrels used in this
472 analysis 12 individuals were not in the pedigree, meaning there were 25 neighbourhoods for
473 which we could not calculate relatedness with neighbours. We assigned these neighbourhoods
474 the mean average neighbourhood relatedness ($r = 0.05$). (Results remained the same even when
475 these 25 neighbourhoods were removed from the analysis). To facilitate direct comparison of
476 effect sizes [53] we standardized all continuous predictors to a mean of zero and unit variance.
477 We estimated all effect sizes by using first and third quartile familiarity values while holding all
478 other variables constant at their mean and using ‘Kloo’ as the study grid. We present all means \pm
479 SE, unless otherwise stated, and consider all differences statistically significant at $\alpha < 0.05$.

480

481

482 References:

- 483 [1] Hamilton WD. (1964). The genetical evolution of social behaviour. I. *Journal of*
484 *Theoretical Biology*. 7, 1–16. doi:10.1016/0022-5193(64)90038-4.
- 485 [2] Clutton-Brock T. (2002). Breeding Together: Kin Selection and Mutualism in
486 Cooperative Vertebrates. *Science*. 296, 69–72. doi:10.1126/science.296.5565.69.
- 487 [3] Cameron EZ, Setsaas TH, Linklater WL. (2009). Social bonds between unrelated
488 females increase reproductive success in feral horses. *PNAS*. 106, 13850–3.
489 doi:10.1073/pnas.0900639106.
- 490 [4] Schino G, Aureli F. (2010). The relative roles of kinship and reciprocity in explaining
491 primate altruism. *Ecology Letters*. 13, 45–50. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01396.x.
- 492 [5] Carter GG, Wilkinson GS. (2013). Food sharing in vampire bats: reciprocal help predicts
493 donations more than relatedness or harassment. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
494 *Biological Sciences*. 280, 20122573–8. doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.2573.
- 495 [6] Bebbington K, Kingma SA, Fairfield EA, Dugdale HL, Komdeur J, Spurgin LG,
496 Richardson DS. (2017). Kinship and familiarity mitigate costs of social conflict between
497 Seychelles warbler neighbors. *PNAS*. 46, 201704350–15. doi:10.1073/pnas.1704350114.
- 498 [7] Silk JB. (2003). Social Bonds of Female Baboons Enhance Infant Survival. *Science*. 302,
499 1231–4. doi:10.1126/science.1088580.
- 500 [8] Vander Wal E, Festa-Bianchet M, Reale D, Coltman D, Pelletier F. (2015). Sex-based
501 differences in the adaptive value of social behavior contrasted against morphology and
502 environment. *Ecology*. 96, 631–41.
- 503 [9] Viblanc VA, Arnaud CM, Dobson FS, Murie JO. (2010). Kin selection in Columbian
504 ground squirrels (*Urocitellus columbianus*): littermate kin provide individual fitness
505 benefits. *Proc Biol Sci*. 277, 989–94. doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.1960.
- 506 [10] Grabowska-Zhang AM, Wilkin TA, Sheldon BC. (2012). Effects of neighbor familiarity
507 on reproductive success in the great tit (*Parus major*). *Behavioral Ecology*. 23, 322–33.
508 doi:10.1093/beheco/arr189.
- 509 [11] Fisher J. (1954). Evolution and bird sociality. In: Huxley J, Hardy AC, Ford EB, editors.
510 *Evolution as a Process*, London, U.K. pp. 71–83.
- 511 [12] Temeles E. (1994). The role of neighbours in territorial systems: when are they'dear
512 enemies'? *Animal Behaviour*. 47, 339–50.
- 513 [13] Smith CC. (1968). The Adaptive Nature of Social Organization in the Genus of Three
514 Squirrels *Tamiasciurus*. *Ecological Monographs*. 38, 31–64. doi:10.2307/1948536.
- 515 [14] LaMontagne JM, Williams CT, Donald JL, Humphries MM, McAdam AG, Boutin S.
516 (2013). Linking intraspecific variation in territory size, cone supply, and survival of
517 North American red squirrels. *Journal of Mammalogy*. 94, 1048–58. doi:10.1644/12-
518 MAMM-A-245.1.
- 519 [15] Siracusa E, Morandini M, Boutin S, Humphries MM, Dantzer B, Lane JE, McAdam AG.
520 Red squirrel territorial vocalizations deter intrusions by conspecific rivals. (2017).
521 *Behaviour*. 154, 1259–73. doi:10.1163/1568539X-00003467.
- 522 [16] Wilson DR, Goble AR, Boutin S, Humphries MM, Coltman DW, Gorrell JC, Shonfield
523 J, McAdam AG. (2015). Red squirrels use territorial vocalizations for kin discrimination.
524 *Animal Behaviour*. 107, 79–85. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2015.06.011.
- 525 [17] Berteaux D, Boutin S. (2000). Breeding dispersal in female North American red
526 squirrels. *Ecology*. 81, 1311–26. doi:10.1890/0012-

- 527 9658(2000)081[1311:BDIFNA]2.0.CO;2.
- 528 [18] Williams CT, Gorrell JC, Lane JE, McAdam AG, Humphries MM, Boutin S. (2013).
529 Communal nesting in an “asocial” mammal: social thermoregulation among spatially
530 dispersed kin. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol.* 67, 757–63. doi:10.1007/s00265-013-1499-4.
- 531 [19] Gorrell JC, McAdam AG, Coltman DW, Humphries MM, Boutin S. (2010). Adopting
532 kin enhances inclusive fitness in asocial red squirrels. *Nature Communications.* 1, 1–4.
533 doi:10.1038/ncomms1022.
- 534 [20] Larsen KW, Boutin S. (1995). Exploring territory quality in the North American red
535 squirrel through removal experiments. *Canadian Journal of Zoology.* 73, 1115–22.
536 doi:10.1139/z95-133.
- 537 [21] Siracusa E, Boutin S, Humphries MM, Gorrell JC, Coltman DW, Dantzer B, Lane JE,
538 McAdam AG. (2017). Familiarity with neighbours affects intrusion risk in territorial red
539 squirrels. *Animal Behaviour.* 133, 11–20. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2017.08.024.
- 540 [22] Siracusa ER, Wilson DR, Studd EK, Boutin S, Humphries MM, Dantzer B, Lane JE,
541 McAdam AG. (2019). North American red squirrels mitigate costs of territory defence
542 through social plasticity. *Animal Behaviour.* 151, 29–42.
543 doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2019.02.014.
- 544 [23] Snyder-Mackler N, Burger JR, Gaydosh L, Belsky DW, Noppert GA, Campos FA,
545 Bartolomucci A, Yang YC, Aiello AE, O’Rand A, et al. (2020). Social determinants of
546 health and survival in humans and other animals. *Science.* 368, eaax9553–14.
547 doi:10.1126/science.aax9553.
- 548 [24] Descamps S, Boutin S, Berteaux D, Gaillard J-M. (2008). Age-specific variation in
549 survival, reproductive success and offspring quality in red squirrels: evidence of
550 senescence. *Oikos.* 117, 1406–16. doi:10.1111/j.0030-1299.2008.16545.x.
- 551 [25] McAdam A, Boutin S, Sykes A, Humphries M. (2007). Life histories of female red
552 squirrels and their contributions to population growth and lifetime fitness. *Ecoscience.*
553 14, 362–9.
- 554 [26] Lane JE, Boutin S, Speakman JR, Humphries MM. (2010). Energetic costs of male
555 reproduction in a scramble competition mating system. *Journal of Animal Ecology.* 79,
556 27–34. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2009.01592.x.
- 557 [27] Lane JE, Boutin S, Gunn MR, Coltman DW. (2009). Sexually selected behaviour: red
558 squirrel males search for reproductive success. *Journal of Animal Ecology.* 78, 296–304.
559 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01502.x.
- 560 [28] Kerr T, Boutin S, LaMontagne J, McAdam A, Humphries M. (2007). Persistent maternal
561 effects on juvenile survival in North American red squirrels. *Biology Letters.* 3, 289–91.
- 562 [29] Dantzer B, Newman AEM, Boonstra R, Palme R, Boutin S, Humphries MM, McAdam
563 AG. (2013). Density triggers maternal hormones that increase adaptive offspring growth
564 in a wild mammal. *Science.* 340, 1215–7. doi:10.1126/science.1235765.
- 565 [30] Westrick SE, Taylor RW, Boutin S, Lane JE, McAdam AG, Dantzer B. (2020).
566 Attentive red squirrel mothers have faster growing pups and higher lifetime reproductive
567 success. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology.* 74, 1–13. doi:10.1007/s00265-020-
568 02856-7.
- 569 [31] Hamilton WD. (1966). The moulding of senescence by natural selection. *Journal of*
570 *Theoretical Biology.* 12, 12–45. doi:10.1016/0022-5193(66)90184-6.
- 571 [32] Donald JL, Boutin S. (2011). Intraspecific cache pilferage by larder-hoarding red
572 squirrels (*Tamiasciurus hudsonicus*). *Journal of Mammalogy.* 92, 1013–20.

- 573 doi:10.1644/10-MAMM-A-340.1.
- 574 [33] Fisher DN, Boutin S, Dantzer B, Humphries MM, Lane JE, McAdam AG. (2017).
575 Multilevel and sex-specific selection on competitive traits in North American red
576 squirrels. *Evolution*. 71, 1841–54. doi:10.1111/evo.13270.
- 577 [34] Getty T. (1987). Dear enemies and the prisoner's dilemma: why should territorial
578 neighbors form defensive coalitions? *Integrative and Comparative Biology*. 27, 327–36.
579 doi:10.1093/icb/27.2.327.
- 580 [35] Hendrix JG, Fisher DN, Martinig AR, Boutin S, Dantzer B, Lane JE, McAdam AG.
581 (2020). Territory acquisition mediates the influence of predators and climate on juvenile
582 red squirrel survival. *Journal of Animal Ecology*. 89, 1408–18. doi:10.1111/1365-
583 2656.13209.
- 584 [36] Beletsky LD, Orians GH. (1989). Familiar neighbors enhance breeding success in birds.
585 *PNAS*. 86, 7933–6. doi:10.1073/pnas.86.20.7933.
- 586 [37] Beecher MD, Akcay C, Campbell SE. (2020). Birdsong learning is mutually beneficial
587 for tutee and tutor in song sparrows. *Animal Behaviour*. 166, 281–8.
588 doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2020.05.015.
- 589 [38] Lane J, Boutin S, Gunn M, Slate J, Coltman D. (2008). Female multiple mating and
590 paternity in free-ranging North American red squirrels. *Animal Behaviour*. 75, 1927–37.
- 591 [39] Humphries M, Boutin S. (2000). The determinants of optimal litter size in free-ranging
592 red squirrels. *Ecology*. 81, 2867–77.
- 593 [40] Smith CC. (1978). Structure and Function of the Vocalizations of Tree Squirrels
594 (*Tamiasciurus*). *Journal of Mammalogy*. 59, 793–808. doi:10.2307/1380144.
- 595 [41] Dantzer B, Boutin S, Humphries MM, McAdam AG. (2012). Behavioral responses of
596 territorial red squirrels to natural and experimental variation in population density.
597 *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology*. 66, 865–78. doi:10.1007/s00265-012-1335-2.
- 598 [42] Gunn MR, Dawson DA, Leviston A, Hartnup K, Davis CS, Strobeck C, Slate J, Coltman
599 DW. (2005). Isolation of 18 polymorphic microsatellite loci from the North American
600 red squirrel, *Tamiasciurus hudsonicus* (Sciuridae, Rodentia), and their cross-utility in
601 other species. *Mol Ecol Notes*. 5, 650–3. doi:10.1111/j.1471-8286.2005.01022.x.
- 602 [43] Kalinowski ST, Taper ML, Marshall TC. (2007). Revising how the computer program
603 cervus accommodates genotyping error increases success in paternity assignment.
604 *Molecular Ecology*. 6, 1099–106. doi:10.1111/j.1365-294X.2007.03089.x.
- 605 [44] Descamps S, Boutin S, McAdam AG, Berteaux D, Gaillard JM. (2009). Survival costs
606 of reproduction vary with age in North American red squirrels. *Proceedings of the Royal
607 Society B: Biological Sciences*. 276, 1129–35. doi:10.1098/rspb.2008.1401.
- 608 [45] Martinig AR, McAdam AG, Dantzer B, Lane JE, Coltman DW, Boutin S. (2020). The
609 new kid on the block: immigrant males win big whereas females pay fitness cost after
610 dispersal. *Ecology Letters*. 23, 430–8. doi:10.1111/ele.13436.
- 611 [46] Cooper EB, Taylor RW, Kelley AD, Martinig AR, Boutin S, Humphries MM, Dantzer B,
612 Lane JE, McAdam AG. (2017). Personality is correlated with natal dispersal in North
613 American red squirrels (*Tamiasciurus hudsonicus*). *Behaviour*. 154, 939–61.
614 doi:10.1163/1568539X-00003450.
- 615 [47] Paradis E, Schliep K. (2019). ape 5.0: an environment for modern phylogenetics and
616 evolutionary analyses in R. *Bioinformatics*. 35, 526–8.
617 doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bty633.
- 618 [48] Rose MR, Rauser CL, Benford G, Matos M, Mueller LD. (2007). Hamilton's forces of

- 619 natural selection after forty years. *Evolution*. 61, 1265–76. doi:10.1111/j.1558-
620 5646.2007.00120.x.
- 621 [49] R Core Team. (2017). R: A language and environment for statistical computing .
622 <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 623 [50] Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker BM, Walker S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models
624 using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 67, 1–48. doi:doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01.
- 625 [51] Kuznetsova A, Brockhoff PB, Christensen RHB. (2017). lmerTestPackage: Tests in
626 Linear Mixed Effects Models. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 82, 1–26.
627 doi:10.18637/jss.v082.i13.
- 628 [52] Bolker BM, Brooks ME, Clark CJ, Geange SW, Poulsen JR, Stevens MHH, White JSS.
629 (2009) Generalized linear mixed models: a practical guide for ecology and evolution.
630 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*. 24, 127–35. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2008.10.008.
- 631 [53] Schielzeth H. (2010). Simple means to improve the interpretability of regression
632 coefficients. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*. 1, 103–13. doi:10.1111/j.2041-
633 210X.2010.00012.x.
- 634