The neural basis of tadpole transport in poison frogs

Eva K. Fischer[1#], Alexandre Benoit-Roland[2#], Nora A. Moskowitz[1], Elicio E. Tapia[3], Kyle

Summers[4], Luis A. Coloma[3], Lauren A. O'Connell[1]*

[1] Department of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, California, United States of America

[2] Center for Systems Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, United States of

America

[3] Centro Jambatu de Investigación y Conservación de Anfibios, Fundación Otonga, Quito,

Ecuador

[4] Department of Biology, East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina, United States of

America

[#] These authors contributed equally to this work

Running Title: Mechanisms of parental care in poison frogs

Word count: 5,286 (including references)

Key words: parental care, poison frog, phosphoTRAP, preoptic area, hippocampus, galanin

*To whom correspondence should be addressed:

Lauren A. O'Connell

Department of Biology

Stanford University

371 Serra Mall

Stanford, CA 94305

loconnel@stanford.edu

Abstract

Parental care has evolved repeatedly and independently across animals. While the

ecological and evolutionary significance of parental behavior is well recognized, underlying

mechanisms remain poorly understood. We took advantage of behavioral diversity across closely

related species of South American poison frogs (Family Dendrobatidae) to identify neural

correlates of parental behavior shared across sexes and species. We characterized differences

in neural induction, gene expression in active neurons, and activity of specific neuronal types in

three species with distinct parental care patterns: male uniparental, female uniparental, and

biparental. We identified the medial pallium and preoptic area as core brain regions associated

with parental care, independent of sex and species. Identification of neurons active during

parental care confirms a role for neuropeptides associated with parental care in other vertebrates

as well as identifying novel candidates. Our work highlights the potential for comparative,

mechanistic studies to build a more complete understanding of how shared principles and

species-specific diversity govern parental care and other social behavior.

Background

Parental care is an important adaptation that allows exploitation of novel habitats, influences fitness and survival of parents and offspring, and serves as an evolutionary precursor to other affiliative behavior [1,2]. Specialized parental care strategies have evolved repeatedly and independently across animals, yet the mechanisms underlying parental behavior and its evolution remain poorly understood. The neural mechanisms promoting parental care in females are best understood in mammals [3]; however, female uniparental care evolved at the base of the mammalian lineage and therefore provides limited clues to the evolutionary origins of parenting behavior. Moreover, studies of male parental care come mostly from biparental systems [4,5] in which parental behavior cannot easily be dissociated from pair bonding. What is needed to further understand the mechanisms underlying parental behavior and its evolution are comparative studies across closely-related species that vary in parental care strategies.

Parental care can be conceptualized as a complex set of inter-related behaviors controlled by brain regions involved in the integration of sensory, social, motivational, and cognitive aspects of care [6]. Across vertebrates, these functions are largely performed by the social decision-making network (SDMN; [7]), a highly interconnected group of evolutionarily ancient and functionally conserved brain regions. Although studies on the neural mechanisms of parental behavior are sparse outside mammals, and particularly lacking in amphibians and reptiles, the SDMN provides an ideal starting point for this work as network nodes and connectivity are well understood, highly conserved, and behaviorally important ligand/receptor complexes have been extensively studied.

Dendrobatid poison frogs show remarkable diversity in parental care across closely related species, including male uniparental care, female uniparental care, and biparental care. Parental care in poison frogs involves egg attendance during embryo development, generally followed by transportation of tadpoles "piggyback" to pools of water upon hatching [8–10]. In some species, mothers regularly return to nourish growing tadpoles with unfertilized, trophic eggs until

metamorphosis [9–11]. Importantly, both male and female care occur with and without pair

bonding in this clade [12], allowing the dissociation of pair bonding from parental care. The

diversity of behavioral care strategies between closely-related poison frog species affords a

unique opportunity to identify physiological, neural, and molecular contributions to parental care

and its evolution.

In the current study, we take advantage of three closely related focal species with distinct

care patterns: *Dendrobates tinctorius* (male uniparental care), *Ranitomeya imitator* (biparental

care), and *Oophaga sylvatica* (female uniparental). By comparing neural activity in parental frogs

as well as their non-caregiving partners, we identify core brain regions active during tadpole

transport independent of sex, species, and pair-bonding. To identify neuronal types mediating

tadpole transport, we characterize gene expression and activity patterns specifically in

behaviorally relevant neurons within core brain regions. Our experiments are the first to explore

neural and molecular mechanisms of parental care in amphibians and demonstrate the utility of

mechanistic studies in closely related, behaviorally distinct species in identifying core neural

correlates of parental behavior.

Methods

Laboratory sample collection

Dendrobates tinctorius and *Ranitomeya imitator* frogs were housed in breeding pairs in

the laboratory, allowing us to identify both parental individuals and their non-caregiving partners.

To control for effects of experience, all pairs successfully reared at least one clutch from egg-

laying through tadpole transport prior to the experiment. For the non-parental group, we collected

frog pairs between parental bouts when they were not caring for eggs or tadpoles, collecting

individuals of both the caregiving sex (non-transport; n=10 *D. tinctorius*, n=7 *R. imitator*) and their

opposite sex partners (non-transport partner; n=9 *D. tinctorius*, n=8 *R. imitator*). For the tadpole

transport group, when we found transporting frogs, we collected both the tadpole transporting

individual (tadpole transporter; n=13 *D. tinctorius*, n=7 *R. imitator*) and its opposite sex, non-

transporting partner (transport partner; n=11 *D. tinctorius*, n=6 *R. imitator*). All brain tissue was

collected in an identical manner: frogs were captured, anesthetized with benzocaine gel, weighed

and measured, and euthanized by rapid decapitation. This entire process took less than 5

minutes. All procedures were approved by the Harvard University Animal Care and Use

Committee (protocol no. 12-10-1).

Field sample collection

Oophaga sylvatica (Puerto Quito-Santo Domingo population) were collected in field

enclosures in Ecuador in April and May of 2016. We collected non-parental control females (N=8)

from enclosures containing only mature females to ensure that frogs were not currently caring for

eggs or tadpoles. We collected tadpole transporting females (N=5) from enclosures containing

multiple males and females and therefore could not identify their non-caregiving male partners.

Frogs were captured, anesthetized with benzocaine gel, weighed and measured, and euthanized

by rapid decapitation. Procedures were approved by the Harvard University Animal Care and Use

Committee (protocol no. 15-03-239) and all samples were collected and imported in accordance

with Ecuadorian and US Law (collection permits: 005-15-IC-FAU-DNB/MA and 007-2016-IC-

FAU-DNB/MA; CITES export permit 16EC000007/VS issued by the Ministerio de Ambiente de

Ecuador).

Immunohistochemistry

Whole brains were placed into 4% paraformaldehyde at 4°C overnight and then

transferred to a 30% sucrose solution for cryoprotection. Once dehydrated, brains were

embedded in Tissue-Tek® O.C.T. Compound (Electron Microscopy Sciences, Hatfield, PA, USA),

rapidly frozen, and stored at -80°C until cryosectioning. We sectioned brains into four coronal

series at 14μm, allowed slides to dry completely, and stored slides at -80°C.

To assess the level of neural activity across brain regions, we used an antibody for

phosphorylated ribosomes (pS6; phospho-S6 Ser235/236; Cell Signaling, Danvers, MA, USA)

and followed standard immunohistochemical procedures for 3',3'-diaminobenzadine (DAB)

antibody staining (as in [13]). To ask whether neural activity was higher specifically in galanin

neurons, we combined the pS6 antibody with a custom-made galanin antibody (peptide

sequence: CGWTLNSAGYLLGPHAVDNHRSFNDKHGLA; Pocono Rabbit Farm & Laboratory,

Inc, Canadensis, PA, USA) and followed standard immunohistochemical procedures for

fluorescent double antibody labeling (as in [4]). Detailed methodological descriptions are in

Supplemental Materials.

Microscopy and cell counts

Stained brain sections were photographed on a Leica DMRE connected to a QImaging

Retiga 2000R camera at 20X magnification. We quantified labeled cells from photographs using

FIJI image analysis software [14]. Brain regions were identified using a custom dendrobatid frog

brain atlas (Supplemental Materials). We measured the area of candidate brain regions and

counted all labeled cells in a single hemisphere for each brain region across multiple sections.

We quantified cell number in the nucleus accumbens, the basolateral nucleus of the stria

terminalis, the habenula, the lateral septum, the magnocellular preoptic area, the medial pallium

(homolog of the mammalian hippocampus), the anterior preoptic area, the suprachiasmatic

nucleus, the striatum, the posterior tuberculum (homolog of the mammalian midbrain dopamine

cells representing the ventral tegmental area and substantia nigra), the ventral hypothalamus,

and the ventral pallium.

Fluorescently stained brain sections were photographed at 20X magnification on a Leica

DM4B compound microscope attached to a fluorescent light source. Each section was visualized

at three wavelengths (594nm, 488nm, 358nm) and images were pseudo-colored to reflect these

spectra. We used DAPI nuclear staining to identify brain regions as above and then quantified the

number of galanin positive cells, pS6 positive cells, and co-labeled cells from photographs of the

preoptic area using FIJI image analysis software [14]. We combined counts for all preoptic area

sub-regions due to the low overall number of galanin-positive neurons and because this more

closely reflected the neuroanatomical resolution of tissue punches used in phophoTRAP (see

below).

Statistical analyses of cell counts

We analyzed the relationship between parental behavior and pS6 neural activity to identify

brain regions whose activity differed during tadpole transport independent of sexes and species

(i.e. core parental care brain regions). We used generalized linear mixed models with a negative

binomial distribution appropriate for count data with unequal variances to test for differences in

pS6 positive cell number. For laboratory animals, behavioral group (tadpole transport vs non-

parental), sex, brain region, and their interactions were included as main effects predicting the

number of pS6-positive cells. For field sampled *O. sylvatica*, sex was omitted from the model as

we could not identify non-caregiving partners and collected only females. Individual was included

as a random effect, brain region area as a covariate to control for body size differences between

frogs, known size differences between brain regions, and rostral to caudal size/shape variation

within brain regions. We explored main effects of group, sex, and regional differences in further

detail using *post hoc* comparisons Tukey adjusted for multiple hypothesis testing.

We tested for differences in the number and activity of galanin neurons using generalized

linear mixed models. To compare the number of galanin neurons, we included behavioral group

(tadpole transport vs non-parental), sex, and their interactions as main effects predicting the

number of galanin positive cells using a negative binomial distribution appropriate for count data

with unequal variances. To analyze activity differences in preoptic area galanin neurons, we

included behavioral group, sex, and their interactions as main effects predicting the proportion of

pS6 positive galanin (i.e. co-labeled) cells using a binomial distribution. All analyses were

performed separately for each species using SAS Statistical Software (SAS 9.4; SAS Institute for

Advanced Analytics).

PhosphoTRAP library construction & sequencing

176   We collected *D. tinctorius* males that were found transporting tadpoles to males that

currently had tadpoles present in the leaf litter but had not yet transported them. Males were

sacrificed as described above (N=9 per group). Brains were removed, embedded in Tissue-Tek®

O.C.T. Compound, frozen on dry ice, and stored at -80°C for no more than 1 month. Once all

animals had been collected, brains were sectioned at 100 µm on a cryostat and thaw mounted

on SuperFrost Plus slides. A 0.96 mm tissue micro punch tool was used to isolate the medial

pallium and rostral hypothalamus (anterior, medial, and magnocellular preoptic area and

suprachiasmatic nucleus). To provide enough starting material for PhosphoTRAP, brain regions

from three individuals were combined into a single sample, for a total of three biological replicates

per group. PhosphoTRAP libraries for total (TOT) and immunoprecipitated (IP) RNA from each

sample were constructed following [15] (details in Supplemental Materials). Libraries were then

pooled in equimolar amounts and sequenced on an Illumina HiSeq 2500.

PhosphoTRAP analysis

190   To analyze phosphoTRAP data we first quantified gene expression by mapping

sequenced reads back to a brain tissue specific *D. tinctorius* transcriptome (Fischer & O'Connell,

unpublished) and estimated their abundance using Kallisto [16]. As gene expression is known to

differ across brain regions [17], we performed all subsequent analysis steps separately for the Mp

and POA. Analysis methods are described in detail in the Supplemental Materials. Briefly, we

normalized read counts using DESeq2 [18] and quantified transcript enrichment/depletion in

active neurons as a log-fold difference between transcript counts from immunoprecipitated (IP)

and total (TOT) mRNA for each sample. We then calculated differential fold enrichment between

parental and non-parental individuals by dividing mean log-fold expression values from the two

behavioral groups. We refer to this final metric as the log-fold difference ratio between tadpole

transport and non-transport behavioral groups.

Our primary objective was to utilize phosphoTRAP data to identify Mp and POA cell types

whose activity differed between tadpole transport and non-parental individuals. To this end, we

restricted further analysis to a subset of 158 transcripts representing cell types with known roles

in parental care (Table S1). We identified transcripts as significantly enriched/depleted based on

a combination of log-fold enrichment thresholds (>4) and permutation testing (Supplemental

Materials). Permutation testing and visualization were done using R Statistical Software (version

3.5.0; the R Foundation for Statistical Computing).

Results

Neural induction during tadpole transport

We compared neural activity patterns in tadpole transporters and their non-transporting

partners across three closely related poison frog species with distinct parental care strategies

(Fig. 1A). Differences in neural activity depended on behavioral group, sex, and brain region (Fig.

1B; Table 1) and associations between behavioral group and neural induction were brain region

specific (Table 1; group*region: *D. tinctorius*: $F_{1,2515}=5.00$, p<0.0001; *R. imitator*: $F_{12,557}=6.85$,

p<0.0001; *O. sylvatica*: $F_{12,557}=5.53$, p<0.0001). We found overall differences between the

transporting and non-transporting sex in male uniparental *D. tinctorius* (sex*group*region:

$F_{1,2515}=3.89$, p<0.0001) but not biparental *R. imitator* (Table 1; Fig. 1B). Indeed, *post hoc* analyses

of region-specific differences revealed greater similarity between sexes in biparental and

monogamous *R. imitator* than male uniparental *D. tinctorius* (Fig. 1B,C; Table S2).

Comparing neural activity patterns associated with parental care across species allowed

us to identify brain regions important in parental care independent of sex and species (i.e. core

parental care brain regions). We observed parallel increases in neural activity in tadpole

transporting individuals in two core brain regions across all species: the preoptic area (POA) and

the medial pallium (Mp; homolog of the mammalian hippocampus. In the POA, patterns differed

by subdivision, with female-specific effects in the magnocellular POA and male-specific effects in

the anterior POA (Fig. 1C). We also observed increased neural activity in the Mp of the non-

caregiving partners of tadpole-transporters (Fig. 1C).

Gene expression in behaviorally relevant neurons

Following identification of core brain regions active during tadpole transport across

species and sexes, we sought to identify behaviorally relevant neuronal types within these

regions. We found 25 transcripts with significant log-fold expression enrichment/depletion in the

POA and 32 transcripts with significant log-fold expression enrichment/depletion in the Mp, seven

of which were overlapping between brain regions (Fig. 2; Table S3). Of the overlapping

transcripts, four had log-fold expression differences in the same direction (galanin, prolactin

receptor, neuropeptide Y receptor 2, brain specific angiogenesis inhibitor associated protein 2)

and three had log-fold expression differences in opposite directions (aquaporin 4, dopamine

receptor 1B, leptin receptor) between brain regions (Fig. 2).

Galanin neuron number and activity

Recent demonstrations of the importance of galanin in mediating parental care in mice

[19,20] and the enrichment of galanin transcripts in neurons active during tadpole transport led

us to ask whether activity differences specifically in POA galanin neurons were associated with

parental care. Parental *R. imitator* had significantly more galanin neurons than did non-parental

R. imitator, independent of sex (behavioral group: $F_{1,404}$=4.58, p=0.0329), but there were no

differences in galanin neuron number in *D. tinctorius* or *O. sylvatica* (Fig. S2). Both *D. tinctorius*

and *R. imitator* showed differences in galanin neuron activity associated with parental care, but

not in the same manner: in *D. tinctorius* the proportion of active galanin neurons was greater in

the female partners of non-transport males than any other group (sex*behavioral group:

$F_{1,40}$=12.73, p=0.0010; Fig. 3). In contrast, in *R. imitator* the proportion of active galanin neurons

was greater during tadpole transport in both males and females (behavioral group: $F_{1,26}$=8.15,

p=0.0083; Fig. 3). We observed no differences in the proportion of active galanin neurons

between tadpole-transporting and non-transporting *O. sylvatica* females.

Discussion

Parental care requires the coordination of hormonal, neural, and molecular changes, many

of which remain poorly understood. We took advantage of shared parental behavior across three

poison frog species with distinct parental care strategies, combining lab and field data to

disentangle sex- and species- specific mechanisms from core neural mechanisms at the levels of

brain regions, gene expression, and neuron type. We identified the medial pallium and preoptic

area as core brain regions associated with parental care and demonstrated expression changes

in genes associated with parental care in other vertebrates. Mechanistic studies in closely related,

behaviorally variable poison frogs offer a unique opportunity to distinguish shared principles and

neural diversity in the mechanisms mediating the maintenance and evolution of parental care.

Core brain regions for parental care

By comparing patterns of neural activity across closely related species with distinct

parental care strategies, we were able to identify core brain regions in which increased neural

induction during parental care was sex and species independent. We observed increased neural

induction in the medial pallium (Mp) and one or more subdivisions of the preoptic area (POA)

during parental care in all focal species. The POA's widespread connections with other brain

regions and high density of neuromodulators make it ideally positioned to modulate complex

social behavior, including parental care. Although data outside mammals is sparse, POA activity

is associated with parental behavior across vertebrates, including mammals [3], birds [3,21], fish

[22], and now frogs. In brief, the POA appears to be a core node in parental care circuitry across

vertebrates. Importantly, parental care has evolved independently across these clades, indicating

convergence across behavioral and neural levels.

In contrast with the POA, the Mp is not commonly associated with parental care. Although

the precise function of the hippocampus and its non-mammalian homologs remains an area of

active research, this brain region is classically implicated in memory, and specifically spatial

memory [23,24]. Poison frogs inhabit complex rain forest environments in which tadpole

deposition sites are a limited resource of variable quality. Behavioral studies in poison frogs

document spatial learning abilities [25] and demonstrate the importance of spatial memory for

navigating back to high-quality tadpole deposition pools [26] and for relocating offspring in egg

provisioning species [27]. Increased neural induction in the Mp during tadpole transport is

therefore in line with the unique ecological and evolutionary pressures associated with parental

care in poison frogs. Indeed, spatial cognition is an important, but rarely examined, component of

parental care [28,29], and comparisons of hippocampal involvement in parental care across

species may yield interesting results given the functional conservation of this structure across

vertebrates [30].

Shared parental care circuitry across sexes

The strength of our comparative design is highlighted by identification of inter-specific

neural activity patterns between sexes. Neural activity during tadpole transport differed between

males and females in uniparental *D. tinctorius*, but not biparental *R. imitator*. Females are not

directly involved in tadpole transport in either species; however, biparental *R. imitator* females

provide parental care in the form of egg attendance prior to tadpole transport and tadpole

provisioning following transport [12,30,31]. Thus, similar patterns of neural activity in male and

female biparental *R. imitator* could arise either because both sexes are in a "parental state" that

modulates long-term circuit activity or because even indirect involvement in tadpole transport

activates parental circuitry (i.e. female frogs have to know where their tadpoles are transported in

order to return to feed them). In either case, similarities in neural activity patterns associated with

parental care across sexes suggest that parental care circuitry is conserved across sexes.

In addition to broad sex similarities in *R. imitator*, we also observed increased neural

activity in the Mp of non-caregiving *D. tinctorius* females. While they are not the typically

caregiving sex, females of *D. tinctorius* and related species will occasionally perform tadpole

transport [32,33]. This behavioral flexibility demonstrates that parental circuits are present and

can be activated under certain circumstances in females, and we suggest an increase in Mp

neural activity is related to females' monitoring of their partners' behavior and ability to perform

tadpole transport in the absence of their male partners. In other words, females may monitor male

behavior in order to assess when and if they need to take over parental behaviors to ensure the

survival of their offspring. The diversity of behavioral care strategies between species combined

with this behavioral flexibility within species in poison frogs affords a unique opportunity to further

disentangle the evolution of sex-specific parental care circuits in future.

Expression variation in behaviorally relevant neurons

Using *D. tinctorius* males, we characterized gene expression differences specifically in

neurons active within the POA and Mp during parental care, focusing our analyses on genes

previously identified as markers of neuronal types involved in parental care [34]. Of particular

interest in the POA were increased expression of the vasopressin 1b receptor, a gonadotropin-

releasing hormone receptor, and a number of stress response related genes (Urocortin-3, CART,

CRF binding protein). Links between vasopressin and parental care have been demonstrated in

rodents [35,36] and vasopressin and gonadotropin releasing hormone may also influence parental

care indirectly through their regulation of other molecules with known roles in parental care (e.g.

oxytocin, prolactin) [3]. Stress hormones are known to increase in response to the behavioral and

metabolic demands of parental care [37,38] providing a link between parental behavior and the

observed upregulation of stress-related signaling pathways.

Notable in the Mp were increased expression of vasopressin and androgen receptor

transcripts. As described above, vasopressin signaling is widely implicated in parental care, and

has been specifically linked to space use and behavioral and life-history trade-offs in parental

prairie voles [28,29]. Space use and navigational abilities differ between males and females in

many species, and it has been proposed that greater navigational abilities in males are a side

effect of increased androgen signaling [39]. Increased androgen signaling during parental care in

poison frogs could facilitate the heightened spatial cognition important during tadpole transport.

Increasing signaling via region specific receptor expression overcomes the lower testosterone

levels typically observed in parental males [40].

In addition to changes specific to either the POA or Mp, we observed a number of

transcripts with significant expression differences in both regions. Among them were dopamine

and prolactin receptors, and a number of molecules and receptors most commonly implicated in

feeding behavior (galanin, leptin receptor, NPY receptor). Dopamine and prolactin play known

roles in parental care [40–42], while other shared transcripts (and some of those unique to a single

brain region) are traditionally associated with feeding behavior. There is growing recognition that

molecules traditionally classified as feeding-related play important roles in mediating social

behavior, providing exciting opportunities to explore the repeated targeting of feeding related

mechanisms in the convergent evolution of parental care [43].

Galanin and parental care

Initially described in relation to feeding behavior, recent work uncovered a role for POA

galanin neurons in driving parental care in both male and female mice [19,20]. We found a positive

association between parental care and galanin neuron number and activity in biparental *R.*

imitator, but not in male uniparental *D. tinctorius,* nor female uniparental *O. sylvatica*. Indeed, the

only significant difference outside *R. imitator*, was a relative increase in galanin neuron activity in

the female partners of non-transporting male *D. tinctorius*, and we note that the percent of active

galanin neurons was overall low in all species.

While recent work demonstrates a sex-independent, behavior-specific link between

galanin neuron activity and parental care [19,20], the earliest work on POA galanin in rodents

showed that microinjection of galanin into the POA of male rats facilitated copulatory behavior

[44], and work in fish similarly suggests an association between male courtship behavior and

galanin signaling [45,46]. Thus, species in which the role of galanin in social behavior has been

explored vary in parental care strategy: rats are female uniparental, only some male mice exhibit

male care, and fish include both male uniparental and female uniparental species. Together with

our findings across frog species with distinct care patterns, these observations suggest that the

role of galanin signaling in parental care may be mediated – both acutely and evolutionarily – by

life history differences related to parental care, interactions among partners, and male courtship

strategy. In brief, galanin appears to have been repeatedly evolutionarily co-opted to modulate

social behavior, but the type(s) of social behavior influenced by galanin signaling are complex,

mediated by the behavioral variation and evolution history, and providing fertile ground for future

comparative research.

Conclusions

Our findings lay the foundation for exciting work using poison frogs as a model to explore

neural and molecular mechanisms of parental care, sex-specific behavioral patterns, and the

integration of social and environmental cues to coordinate complex social behavior. We identified

core brain regions associated with tadpole transport across dendrobatid poison frogs with distinct

care strategies. Moreover, we confirmed a role in amphibians for hormones and neuropeptides

associated with parental care in other vertebrates. While increased POA activity was associated

with parental care across species, activity specifically of galanin neurons differed between

species, suggesting that shared brain regions may nonetheless rely on unique neuronal types to

mediate similar behavior. Comparative studies in closely related, but behaviorally distinct, species

provide opportunities to build a more holistic understanding of how shared principles and species-

specific diversity govern parental care.

Acknowledgements

We thank the O'Connell Lab frog caretakers for help with animal care, Lola Guarderas

(Wikiri) and Manuel Morales-Mite (Centro Jambatu) for field work support, and Julie Butler, Hans

Hofmann and the members of the O'Connell Lab for comments on previous versions of the

manuscript.

Funding

We gratefully acknowledge support from a Harvard University Bauer Fellowship, the

International Society for Neuroethology Konishi Research Award, and the Graduate Women in

Science Adele Lewis Grant Fellowship to LAO, and a postdoctoral fellowship (NSF-1608997) to

EKF. LAC and EET were supported by Wikiri and the Saint Louis Zoo to Centro Jambatu.

Data availability

Cell counts, read counts from phosphoTRAP, R code for phosphoTRAP analysis, and the

D. tinctorius brain atlas are available as Supplemental Materials associated with the manuscript.

Raw sequencing reads will be made available through the NCBI SRA repository upon publication.

Authors' contributions

LAO conceived of the study; LAO, KS and LAC designed and coordinated the study; EKF,

ABR, NAM, and EET collected samples; EKF and LAO performed molecular work and data

analysis; EKF and LAO wrote the manuscript with input from all authors; All authors gave final

approval for publication and agree to be held accountable for the work performed therein.

References

1.   Clutton-Brock TH. 1991 *The Evolution of Parental Care*. Princeton University Press.

2.   Royle NJ, Smiseth PT, Kölliker M. 2012 *The Evolution of Parental Care*. Oxford University
Press.

3.   Numan M, Insel TR. 2006 *The Neurobiology of Parental Behavior*. Springer Science &
Business Media.

4.   O'Connell LA, Matthews BJ, Hofmann HA. 2012 Isotocin regulates paternal care in a
monogamous cichlid fish. *Hormones and Behavior*. **61**, 725–733.
(doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2012.03.009)

5.   Kirkpatrick B, Kim JW, Insel TR. 1994 Limbic system fos expression associated with
paternal behavior. *Brain Res.* **658**, 112–118.

6.   Pereira M, Ferreira A. 2016 Neuroanatomical and neurochemical basis of parenting:
Dynamic coordination of motivational, affective and cognitive processes. *Hormones and*
Behavior. **77**, 72–85. (doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2015.08.005)

7.   O'Connell LA, Hofmann HA. 2012 Evolution of a Vertebrate Social Decision-Making
Network. *Science*. **336**, 1154–1157. (doi:10.1126/science.1218889)

8.   Brown JL, Morales V, Summers K. 2010 A key ecological trait drove the evolution of
biparental care and monogamy in an amphibian. *Am. Nat.* **175**, 436–446.

9.   Pröhl H, Hödl W. 1999 Parental investment, potential reproductive rates, and mating
system in the strawberry dart-poison frog, *Dendrobates pumilio*. *Behavioral Ecology and*
Sociobiology. **46**, 215–220. (doi:10.1007/s002650050612)

10. Weygoldt P. 2009 Evolution of parental care in dart poison frogs (Amphibia: Anura:

Dendrobatidae). *Journal of Zoological Systematics and Evolutionary Research*. **25**, 51–67.

(doi:10.1111/j.1439-0469.1987.tb00913.x)

11. Summers K, Earn DJD. 1999 The cost of polygyny and the evolution of female care in

poison frogs. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*. **66**, 515–538. (doi:10.1111/j.1095-

8312.1999.tb01924.x)

12. Summers K, Tumulty J. 2014 Parental Care, Sexual Selection, and Mating Systems in

Neotropical Poison Frogs. *Sexual Selection*. 289–320. (doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-416028-

6.00011-6)

13. Fischer EK, Westrick SE, Hartsough L, Hoke KL. 2018 Differences in neural activity, but not

behavior, across social contexts in guppies, *Poecilia reticulata*. *Behavioral Ecology and

Sociobiology*. **72**. (doi:10.1007/s00265-018-2548-9)

14. Schindelin J *et al.* 2012 Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image analysis. *Nat.

Methods* **9**, 676–682.

15. Knight ZA, Tan K, Birsoy K, Schmidt S, Garrison JL, Wysocki RW, Emiliano A, Ekstrand MI,

Friedman JM. 2012 Molecular profiling of activated neurons by phosphorylated ribosome

capture. *Cell* **151**, 1126–1137.

16. Bray NL, Pimentel H, Melsted P, Pachter L. 2016 Near-optimal probabilistic RNA-seq

quantification. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **34**, 525–527.

17. Lein ES *et al.* 2007 Genome-wide atlas of gene expression in the adult mouse brain.

Nature **445**, 168–176.

18. Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. 2014 Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for

RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol.* **15**, 550.

19. Wu Z, Autry AE, Bergan JF, Watabe-Uchida M, Dulac CG. 2014 Galanin neurons in the
medial preoptic area govern parental behaviour. *Nature* **509**, 325–330.

20. Kohl J *et al.* 2018 Functional circuit architecture underlying parental behaviour. *Nature* **556**,
326–331.

21. Ruscio MG, Adkins-Regan E. 2004 Immediate early gene expression associated with
induction of brooding behavior in Japanese quail. *Horm. Behav.* **46**, 19–29.

22. Demski LS, Knigge KM. 1971 The telencephalon and hypothalamus of the bluegill
(Lepomis macrochirus): evoked feeding, aggressive and reproductive behavior with
representative frontal sections. *J. Comp. Neurol.* **143**, 1–16.

23. Rodríguez F, López JC, Vargas JP, Gómez Y, Broglio C, Salas C. 2002 Conservation of
spatial memory function in the pallial forebrain of reptiles and ray-finned fishes. *J. Neurosci.*
22, 2894–2903.

24. Thompson RF. 1986 The neurobiology of learning and memory. *Science* **233**, 941–947.

25. Liu Y, Day LB, Summers K, Burmeister SS. (*in press*) A cognitive map in a poison frog. *J.*
Expt. Biol.

26. Pašukonis A, Ringler M, Brandl HB, Mangione R, Ringler E, Hödl W. 2013 The Homing
Frog: High Homing Performance in a Territorial Dendrobatid Frog (Dendrobatidae).
Ethology **119**, 762–768.

27. Stynoski JL. 2009 Discrimination of offspring by indirect recognition in an egg-feeding
dendrobatid frog, *Oophaga pumilio*. *Animal Behaviour*. **78**, 1351–1356.
(doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2009.09.002)

28. Okhovat M, Berrio A, Wallace G, Ophir AG, Phelps SM. 2015 Sexual fidelity trade-offs

promote regulatory variation in the prairie vole brain. *Science* **350**, 1371–1374.

29. Ophir AG, Wolff JO, Phelps SM. 2008 Variation in neural V1aR predicts sexual fidelity and

space use among male prairie voles in semi-natural settings. *PNAS* **105**, 1249–1254.

30. Butler AB. 2017 Of Horse-Caterpillars and Homologies: Evolution of the Hippocampus and

Its Name. *Brain Behav. Evol.* **90**, 7–14.

31. Brown JL, Morales V, Summers K. 2008 Divergence in parental care, habitat selection and

larval life history between two species of Peruvian poison frogs: an experimental analysis.

J. Evol. Biol. **21**, 1534–1543.

32. Ringler E, Pašukonis A, Hödl W, Ringler M. 2013 Tadpole transport logistics in a

Neotropical poison frog: indications for strategic planning and adaptive plasticity in anuran

parental care. *Front. Zool.* **10**, 67.

33. Tumulty J, Morales V, Summers K. 2014 The biparental care hypothesis for the evolution of

monogamy: experimental evidence in an amphibian. *Behavioral Ecology*. **25**, 262–270.

(doi:10.1093/beheco/art116)

34. Moffitt JR *et al.* 2018 Molecular, spatial, and functional single-cell profiling of the

hypothalamic preoptic region. *Science* **362**. (doi:10.1126/science.aau5324)

35. Bester-Meredith JK, Marler CA. 2003 Vasopressin and the transmission of paternal

behavior across generations in mated, cross-fostered Peromyscus mice. *Behav. Neurosci.*

117, 455–463.

36. Rilling JK, Mascaro JS. 2017 The neurobiology of fatherhood. *Curr Opin Psychol* **15**, 26–

32.

37. Jeffrey JD, Cooke SJ, Gilmour KM. 2014 Regulation of hypothalamic-pituitary-interrenal

axis function in male smallmouth bass (*Micropterus dolomieu*) during parental care. *Gen.*

Comp. Endocrinol. **204**, 195–202.

38. O'Connor CM, Gilmour KM, Arlinghaus R, Van Der Kraak G, Cooke SJ. 2009 Stress and

Parental Care in a Wild Teleost Fish: Insights from Exogenous Supraphysiological Cortisol

Implants. *Physiological and Biochemical Zoology.* **82**, 709–719. (doi:10.1086/605914)

39. Clint EK, Sober E, Garland T Jr, Rhodes JS. 2012 Male superiority in spatial navigation:

adaptation or side effect? *Q. Rev. Biol.* **87**, 289–313.

40. Adkins-Regan E. 2013 Hormones and Animal Social Behavior. Princeton University Press.

41. Angelier F, Wingfield JC, Tartu S, Chastel O. 2016 Does prolactin mediate parental and

life-history decisions in response to environmental conditions in birds? A review. *Horm.*

Behav. **77**, 18–29.

42. Schradin C, Anzenberger G. 1999 Prolactin, the Hormone of Paternity. *News Physiol. Sci.*

14, 223–231.

43. Fischer EK, O'Connell LA. 2017 Modification of feeding circuits in the evolution of social

behavior. *The Journal of Experimental Biology.* **220**, 92–102. (doi:10.1242/jeb.143859)

44. Bloch GJ, Butler PC, Kohlert JG, Bloch DA. 1993 Microinjection of galanin into the medial

preoptic nucleus facilitates copulatory behavior in the male rat. *Physiol. Behav.* **54**, 615–

624.

45. Partridge CG, MacManes MD, Knapp R, Neff BD. 2016 Brain Transcriptional Profiles of

Male Alternative Reproductive Tactics and Females in Bluegill Sunfish. *PLoS One* **11**,

e0167509.

46. Tripp JA, Feng NY, Bass AH. 2018 Behavioural tactic predicts preoptic-hypothalamic gene

expression more strongly than developmental morph in fish with alternative reproductive

tactics. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* **285**. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2017.2742)

Tables & Figures

Table 1. Summary of main statistical effects for neural induction differences.

		df	F value	p value
R. imitator	group	1,1731	13.83	0.0002
	sex	1,1731	0.64	0.4242
	region	12,1731	87.48	<0.0001
	sex*group	1,1731	1.25	0.2630
	group*region	12,1731	6.85	<0.0001
	sex*region	12,1731	2.69	0.0013
	sex*group*region	12,1731	1.45	0.1344
D. tinctorius	group	1,2519	9.73	0.0018
	sex	1,2519	1.36	0.2443
	region	12,2519	80.15	<0.0001
	sex*group	1,2519	1.76	0.1844
	group*region	12,2519	5.00	<0.0001
	sex*region	12,2519	3.39	<0.0001
	sex*group*region	12,2519	3.89	<0.0001
O. sylvatica	group	1,557	1.02	0.3126
	region	12,557	9.40	<0.0001
	group*region	12,557	5.53	<0.0001

Figure 1. Patterns of neural induction associated with parental care. (A) Overview of experimental design. Our comparative approach allowed us to identify brain regions important in parental care independent of sex and species. **(B)** Overview of brain regions showing differences in neural activity between parental and non-parental individuals (shaded) for tadpole transporting sex and their non-transporting partners. Small symbols indicate the sex of transporting and non-transporting partner individuals. Comparing across species, we identified Mp and POA as active during tadpole transport regardless of sex and species (i.e. as core parental care brain regions). **(C)** Detailed results for core brain regions. Letters above the box plots indicate significant group differences ($p < 0.05$). Representative micrographs of pS6 staining (brown) with cresyl violet nuclear stain (purple) from the mPOA are shown at top right. Abbreviations: BST = basolateral nucleus of the stria terminalis, H = habenula, Ls = lateral septum, Mp = medial pallium (homolog of the mammalian hippocampus), NAcc = nucleus accumbens, aPOA = anterior preoptic area, mPOA = magnocellular preoptic area, SC = the suprachiasmatic nucleus, Str = striatum, TP = posterior tuberculum, VH = ventral hypothalamus, VP = ventral pallium.

541
Figure 2. Gene expression in behaviorally relevant neurons. We identified significant expression differences in neurons active during parental care in the preoptic area (POA) and medial pallium (Mp) of tadpole transporting versus non-parental *D. tinctorius* males. We found some unique and some shared transcripts differentially expressed across brain regions (i.e. distribution of blue dots between plots). Those transcripts with significant expression enrichment or expression depletion in tadpole transporting males as compared to control males are highlighted in blue, and the seven transcripts overlapping between brain regions are labeled. The same candidate transcripts are plotted in the same order along the x-axis for both brain regions.

550
551
552 **Figure 3. Preoptic area galanin neuron activity.** Parental *R. imitator* had a greater proportion
553 of active galanin neurons, as did the female partners of non-parental *D. tinctorius*. Representative
554 micrograph: magenta = galanin positive neurons (arrows), green = pS6 positive neurons, white =
555 co-localization indicating active galanin neurons (circles).