Evolutionary genetic integration of behavioural and endocrine

components of the stress response

T.M. Houslay*[1,2], R.L. Earley[3], S.J. White[1,4], W. Lammers[1], A.J. Grimmer[1], L.M.

Travers[1,5], E.L. Johnson[3,6], A.J. Young[1] and A.J. Wilson[1]

* Corresponding author: houslay@gmail.com

[1] Centre for Ecology and Conservation, University of Exeter (Penryn Campus),

Cornwall, TR10 9FE, UK.

[2] Current address: Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, Downing

Street, Cambridge, CB2 3EJ, UK.

[3] Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alabama, Biology Building

211-213, Box 870344, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487, USA.

[4] Current address: Department of Ecology and Genetics, Center for Evolutionary

Biology, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden.[CHECK THIS]

[5] Current address: School of Biological Sciences, University of East Anglia,

Norwich, Norfolk, NR4 7TJ, UK.

[6] Current address: Southern Research, 2000 Ninth Avenue South, Birmingham,

AL 35205, USA.

Abstract

The vertebrate stress response comprises a suite of behavioural and physiological traits that must be functionally integrated to ensure organisms cope adaptively with acute stressors. The expectation that natural selection has favoured functional integration leads to a prediction of genetic integration: genetic variation in the stress response should include covariation between its component behavioural and physiological traits. Despite the implications of such genetic integration for our understanding of human and animal health, as well as evolutionary responses to natural and anthropogenic stressors, formal quantitative genetic tests of this prediction are lacking. Here we demonstrate that Trinidadian guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*) show genetic variation in a suite of behavioural and physiological components of the acute stress response, and that these are indeed integrated into a single major axis of genetic variation. This axis appears to reflect continuous variation in the magnitude of integrated stress responsiveness, rather than variation in 'coping style' (a verbal model that postulates equal levels of stress responsiveness will manifest differently across individuals). The genetic integration we find here could either facilitate or constrain evolutionary responses to selection, depending upon the extent to which the direction of selection aligns with this single major axis of genetic covariation among stress response traits. Such integration also suggests that, while stress-related disease typically arises from physiological components of the stress response, selection on the genetically correlated behavioural responses to stress could offer a viable non-invasive route to the genetic improvement of health and welfare in captive animal populations.

Introduction

Stress responses comprise suites of physiological and behavioural traits that enable individuals to cope with adverse conditions (Romero 2004; Øverli *et al.* 2007; McEwen & Wingfield 2010; Taborsky *et al.* 2020). Some individuals are likely better at coping with adverse conditions than others, and understanding the role played by underlying genetic variation could have important implications for managing stress-related disease in captive populations and predicting the evolutionary responses of free-living populations to both natural and anthropogenic stressors (Barton & Iwama 1991; Koolhaas *et al.* 1999; McEwen & Wingfield 2003; Romero 2004; Koolhaas 2008). For instance, if among-individual differences in stress response traits are a product of genetic variation (Koolhaas *et al.* 1999, 2007), then they may be a viable target for artificial selection strategies (Mignon-Grasteau *et al.* 2005). This could be used to reduce stress-related welfare issues in captive populations (e.g. in livestock; Broom & Johnson 1993; von Borell 1995; Möstl & Palme 2002). In free-living populations, variation in stress response traits is expected to cause fitness variation under stressful conditions (Wingfield 2003; Koolhaas 2008). Thus, exposure to stressors could lead to evolutionary changes in the distributions of traits that contribute to a population's long-term resilience in the face of natural (e.g. predation risk; Clinchy, Sheriff & Zanette 2013) and/or anthropogenic (Tarlow & Blumstein 2007; Busch & Hayward 2009; Angelier & Wingfield 2012) challenges. However, as the evolutionary response of any trait to selection is determined in large part by its genetic variation, our ability to predict – and potentially harness – evolutionary changes in the stress response is currently hampered by limited understanding of the underlying genetics.

Natural selection does not act on single traits in isolation, but rather on multivariate phenotypes (Lande & Arnold 1983; Blows 2007). This is likely to be an important consideration for understanding the evolution of the stress response. For instance, while glucocorticoid (GC) levels are frequently used to measure the stress

response (McEwen & Wingfield 2003; Korte *et al.* 2005), an individual's first line of

defence against acute environmental challenges will typically be behavioural (Moberg

2000). This may include risk avoidance strategies as well as the widely known 'fight-or-

flight' responses. Subsequent GC release then serves to mediate physiological (and

further behavioural) responses (Wingfield *et al.* 1998; Wingfield & Kitaysky 2002).

Natural selection is therefore expected to favour combinations of behavioural and

physiological stress response traits that act synergistically to maintain fitness under

stressful conditions (Koolhaas *et al.* 1999; Øverli *et al.* 2007). Since evolutionary theory

predicts that correlational selection will shape the structure of multivariate quantitative

genetic variance (as represented by the genetic covariance matrix **G**; Blows 2007), we

should expect genetic – as well as phenotypic – integration of behavioural and

physiological stress response traits (McGlothlin & Ketterson 2008; Ketterson, Atwell &

McGlothlin 2009; Cox, McGlothlin & Bonier 2016). However, there exists relatively little

supporting empirical work for this prediction.

The most compelling evidence for genetic integration of behavioural and

physiological stress response traits to date comes from artificial selection experiments

on domestic animal populations (e.g., rainbow trout (Pottinger and Carrick, 1999),

Japanese quail (Jones, Satterlee & Ryder 1994), house mice*,* Veenema *et al.* 2003b). For

example, lines of rainbow trout selected for stress-induced plasma cortisol levels

(Pottinger and Carrick, 1999) experienced correlated evolutionary changes in behaviour

(Øverli, Winberg & Pottinger 2005). In a rare study of a wild-type population (albeit

under captive conditions) species, cortisol levels were found to evolve in response to

selection on behavioural 'personality' in great tits (*Parus major*; Carere *et al.* 2003). In

these examples, the correlated responses of behavioural and physiological stress

response traits to selection are consistent with some degree of genetic integration of

these behavioural and physiological traits. However, the extent and 'structure' of this

integration remains unclear, and some results were inconsistent with a hypothesised

simple axis of genetic (co)variation among behavioural and physiological components of

the stress response. For example, in the trout study, the 'low-cortisol response' selected

lines actually showed a higher metabolic stress response under confinement (suggestive

of opposing responses to selection by different physiological components of the stress

response; Trenzado, Carrick & Pottinger 2003). Surprisingly (given the correlated

selection response), in the great tit study cortisol levels were found to be phenotypically

unrelated to behavioural 'boldness' (the trait selected on) under standardised testing

(Thomson *et al.* 2011).

While selection experiments illustrate that genetic integration of behaviour and

physiology can occur, estimation of the genetic variance-covariance matrix (**G**) through

quantitative genetic modelling provides a complementary strategy that also allows

investigation of exactly how (multivariate) genetic variation is structured within

populations. In the context of the stress response, this should provide insights into both

how selection has acted in the past (Ketterson *et al.* 2009), and whether responses to

future selection are likely to be constrained (Blows & Walsh 2009; Walsh & Blows

2009). The former follows from the fact that strong correlational selection should lead

to integration of traits in **G** over the long term, a phenomenon explored most commonly

for suites of morphological traits (following, e.g., Cheverud 1982), but that is equally

applicable to any aspect of phenotype (see, e.g., Hine, Chenoweth & Blows 2004; Hunt *et*

al. 2007; Oswald, Singer & Robison 2013 for examples pertaining to behavioural

evolution and mate choice). The latter follows from the fact that the direction (in

multivariate trait space) and magnitude of a response to contemporary selection is

limited by the amount of variance in **G** alignment with the vector of (directional)

selection β (Blows & Walsh 2009; Walsh & Blows 2009).

Here we estimate **G** for behavioural and physiological components of the acute

stress response in Trinidadian guppies (*Poecilia reticulata*). This enables us to

determine not only (i) whether these components are genetically integrated into a

single major axis of genetic (co)variation, but also (ii) whether the structure and

orientation of this axis suggests variation in overall stress responsiveness and/or

'coping style' (explained further below; Koolhaas *et al.* 2010; Boulton *et al.* 2015). We

use fish from a captive colony of guppies derived from wild ancestors sampled from the

Aripo River, Trinidad in 2008 and subsequently maintained at high population size

(with no deliberate inbreeding or selection). We have validated the use of standardised

'open field trials' (OFTs) for testing (acute) behavioural stress responses in this species

(Houslay *et al.* 2018), and demonstrated significant additive genetic (co)variance

underpinning variation in risk-taking, exploratory, and 'flight' type components of the

behavioural stress response using this testing paradigm (White & Wilson 2018; White,

Houslay & Wilson 2018). We have also demonstrated, using a non-invasive waterborne

hormone sampling method, that individuals differ significantly in their GC (specifically,

free circulating cortisol) response to an acute stressor (handling, coupled to short term

isolation and confinement; Houslay *et al.* 2019) and that, on average, this physiological

response declines with repeated stressor exposure (consistent with habituation).

Nothing is known about the genetic basis of variation in these physiological traits, or

about their integration (phenotypically or genetically) with behavioural components of

the stress response.

First, we combine OFT results with complementary 'emergence trials' (ET) and

'shoaling trials' (ST) to characterise among-individual and genetic variation in the

behavioural stress response. Second, we characterise the physiological stress response

and its rate of habituation by assaying GC levels following first and third exposure to a

handling and confinement stressor (see methods). Utilising repeated behavioural and

physiological testing of individual fish within a known pedigree structure, we are able to

estimate the repeatable (among-individual) component of phenotypic (co)variance in

these stress response traits, and then determine the additive genetic contribution to this

(**G**; the genetic variance-covariance matrix for this suite of stress response traits). We

predict that individual traits will be heritable and that **G** will contain strong genetic

correlation structure between behavioural and physiological components of the stress

response consistent with genetic integration. We also predict that **G** will be dominated

by a single major axis of genetic variation in multivariate trait space, but are more

circumspect about how that might look. The 'stress coping style' model (Koolhaas *et al.*

1999) predicts variation in the type of response to stress. Simplistically, as originally

proposed this verbal model posits that individuals (or genotypes) perceive equal

degrees of stress but differ in how this manifests phenotypically: genotypes at one end

of the axis having 'reactive' behavioural phenotype (e.g., freezing behaviour) coupled to

lower GC levels, while the 'proactive' end is characterised by more active 'fight or flight'

behaviour coupled to higher GC levels. However, previous analyses of this population

suggest variation may be more in the stress responsiveness than coping style (Houslay

et al. 2018; Prentice *et al.* 2020; White, Pascall & Wilson 2020). That is to say, some

individuals (or genotypes) perceive the trial as a more severe stimulus and exhibit more

characteristic stress behaviours (e.g., flight and/or freezing, thigmotaxis) while others

show more typical 'unstressed' behavioural profiles (e.g., exploration of the arena). In

this scenario we predict high GC levels to co-occur with characteristic stress behaviours.

Results

In total we obtained (multivariate) behavioural data from 7,637 trials (3,812 OFTs,

1,548 ETs and 1,039 STs) on 1,518 individual fish. The number of individuals

phenotyped (OFTs = 1,487, ETs = 806, STs = 532) and the mean number of observations

per fish (OFTs = 2.6, ETs = 1.9, STs = 2.0) varied across the behavioural data types. All

fish were contained within a genetic pedigree structure comprising maternal full-

sibships nested within paternal half-sibships. This structure was produced via multiple

round of breeding work and has a maximum depth of 5 'generations'. Some of the OFT

data have already been used in studies of the evolutionary genetics of personality

(White & Wilson 2018; White *et al.* 2018), but here we extend that dataset and use it in

conjunction with other behavioural and physiological measures for different purposes.

We also obtained 1,238 waterborne assays of cortisol levels for 629 fish (almost all from

the final generation). The handling and confinement stressor applied for this assay was

performed 3 times (at 48h intervals) for all fish tested, but the holding water sample

was only processed for GC content at two time points (the first and last confinement,

subsequently $Cortisol_1$ and $Cortisol_3$). Full details of husbandry, phenotyping and

analysis are provided in Materials and Methods.

Genetic variance in behavioural components of the stress response

Behavioural data were extracted from OFTs, ETs and STs using video tracking of fish (as

described in White, Kells & Wilson 2016; Houslay *et al.* 2018). Time to emerge from the

shelter ('*emergence time*') was extracted from ETs and natural log (ln) transformed for

analysis, while *shoaling tendency* was calculated from STs as the time spent in the third

of the tank closest to a same-sex shoal (which was visible but physically separated)

minus the time spent in the third of the tank farthest from the shoal. The OFT, ET and ST

testing paradigms are all considered to assay behavioural components of the stress

response in the broad sense, as each test starts with the capture and transfer of the focal

fish into a novel, brightly lit, arena away from their home tank and familiar tank mates.

Three traits were defined from the OFT and measured by videotracking for 4m 30s after

an initial 30 second acclimation period on transfer into arena. *Track length* (distance

swum), *area covered* (as a proportion of the arena floor area), and *time in the middle*

(i.e., in the central area of the open field arena away from the tank walls, which is

assumed to be perceived as riskier; e.g., Houslay *et al.* 2018) were recorded. Note low

values of *time in the middle* imply thigmotaxis (i.e., tendency to avoid exposure to

potential threats by hugging walls). All three of these OFT traits are repeatable and

heritable in this population (White *et al.* 2016, 2018; Houslay *et al.* 2018; White &

Wilson 2018). However, the absence of a strong positive correlation between *track*

length and *area covered* (Fig 1A) is notable and potentially biologically informative; if

fish moved randomly with respect to direction in the arena then *area covered* would

increase monotonically (to an asymptote at 100%) with *track length*. A possible

explanation is that a long *track length* can sometimes arise from a (putatively) less

stressed fish exploring the arena (fish 1 in Fig 1B) and sometimes a (putatively) more

stressed fish exhibiting a typical 'flight' response (Fish 4 in Fig 1B). These can be

discriminated based on whether, in a given trial, high track length is associated with

high *area covered* and *time in the middle* (exploration) or the converse (flight response).

To quantitatively discriminate between exploratory behaviour and flight

responses we derived a new trait, '*relative area covered*'. We used a simple simulation

procedure (see Methods) to predict *expected area covered* for any given *track length*

under a null 'random swim' within the arena (Fig 1C). *Relative area covered* is then

calculated as *observed area covered – expected area covered* given the *track length* (Fig

1D) and will be high for fish engaging in exploration, and low for an obvious 'flight'

response manifest as rapid swimming around the tank walls.

Pedigree-based 'animal models' (Wilson *et al.* 2009) were used to test for and

estimate additive genetic variation in each of the five behavioural traits while

controlling statistically for social housing group and non-genetic sources of among-

individual variance (as well as several fixed effects; see methods for full details). These

confirmed the presence of significant additive genetic variation for the *relative area*

covered trait, as well as for *track length* and *time in the middle* (as expected from

previous findings; White & Wilson 2018; White *et al.* 2018) as well as *emergence time*

(Table 1). With the exception of *shoaling tendency*, heritabilities (conditional on fixed

effects; see methods) are low to moderate (range of 8-17%; Table 1) but within the

expected range for behaviours (Stirling, Réale & Roff 2002). We detected no additive

genetic variance for *shoaling tendency* (Table 1), despite there being repeatable

differences among individuals; R = 0.19 ± 0.04; $\chi^2_{0,1}$ = 20.01, P < 0.001).

Genetic variance in physiological components of the stress response

Using a series of nested bivariate animal models, we tested for additive genetic variance

in cortisol levels (ln-transformed) following stressor exposure (handling and

confinement) and for genotype-by-environment interaction (GxE). In this context, the

environment (E) is the trial number in each fish's stress trial series (i.e. cortisol level

following stressor trial 1 or 3). Any GxE present can therefore be interpreted as genetic

variance for habituation to the stressor, given that the average cortisol level was lower

following exposure to the third stressor than the first (ln transformed ng/hr, mean ± SE;

$Cortisol_1$ = 8.50 ± 0.05, $Cortisol_3$ = 8.05 ± 0.06, Wald $F_{1,12.9}$ = 120.5, P < 0.001; see

methods for explanation of units). We first modelled $Cortisol_1$ and $Cortisol_3$ as distinct

response variables in a bivariate framework assuming no GxE (such that we constrain

$V_{A\text{-}Cortisol1}$ = $V_{A\text{-}Cortisol3}$ and the cross context additive genetic correlation $r_{A\text{-}Cortisol1,Cortisol3}$ =

1). This model revealed a significant additive genetic component to variation among

individuals in their cortisol levels following stressor exposure ($\chi^2_{0,1}$ = 6.58, P = 0.005).

Expanding the model to allow GxE (by estimating separate genetic variances for

$Cortisol_1$ and $Cortisol_3$ and allowing the cross-context genetic correlation to deviate

from +1) provides a significantly better fit to the data (χ^2_2 = 9.65, P = 0.008), meaning

GxE is present. This can be viewed as genetic variance for habituation to repeated

stressor exposure, or as a change in genetic variance for cortisol from the first to the

third sampling (Figure 2). These are two perspectives of the same phenomenon; a

reduction in additive genetic variance between the first stressor ($V_{A\text{-}Cortisol1}$ = 0.076 ±

0.028) and the third ($V_{A\text{-}Cortisol3}$ = 0.047 ± 0.029) arises because genotypes with higher

than average levels for $Cortisol_1$ habituate more rapidly (i.e. have more negative reaction

norm slopes). Note however that the rank order of the genotypes does not appreciably

change across the two contexts (i.e. genetic reaction norms show little crossing; Figure

2), so there is a strong positive cross-context genetic correlation ($r_{\text{A-Cortisol1,Cortisol3}} \pm$ SE =

0.74 ± 0.25).

In this model we also find that variance in cortisol explained by housing group

effects is similar across contexts ($V_{\text{Group-Cortisol1}}$ = 0.034 ± 0.013, $V_{\text{Group-Cortisol3}}$ = 0.045 ±

0.016), but that residual (unexplained) variance is greater after the third stressor

exposure ($V_{\text{R-Cortisol1}}$ = 0.166 ± 0.021, $V_{\text{R-Cortisol3}}$ = 0.229 ± 0.025). In combination, the

changes in both additive genetic and residual variance between the two contexts lead to

appreciably higher heritability for cortisol levels following the first stressor exposure

relative to the third ($h^2_{\text{Cortisol1}}$ = 0.275 ± 0.093, $h^2_{\text{Cortisol3}}$ = 0.146 ± 0.088).

Testing for genetic integration and identifying the major axis of genetic

(co)variance

There is strong evidence for phenotypic integration of *Cortisol* with behaviour at the

among-individual levels (see Table S5). To test for and characterise the hypothesised

genetic integration between behavioural and physiological components of the stress

response, we built a multivariate animal model to estimate **G**. We excluded *shoaling*

tendency given the absence of detectable genetic variance in the univariate model. We

also elected to treat cortisol as a single trait (allowing for a fixed effect of stressor

exposure number (1 vs 3) on the mean). Although the above analysis demonstrates GxE

for cortisol, the strong positive cross-context genetic correlation justifies collapsing

$Cortisol_1$ and $Cortisol_3$ into a single trait to maximise statistical power to detect any

genetic covariance with behaviour.

Our final model contained 5 response traits: *relative area covered*, *time in the*

middle and *track length*, (ln-transformed) *emergence time*, and (ln-transformed) *Cortisol*

(now treated as two repeats of a single trait). We standardised all (transformed) traits

to standard deviation units, to assist multivariate model fitting and to prevent

eigenvectors of **G** (see below) being dominated by traits with higher variance in

observed units. To simplify interpretation of **G** we also multiplied *emergence time* by -1

after transformation. Thus high values denote rapid emergence from the shelter.

The resultant estimate of **G** (Table 2) contains significant additive genetic

covariance structure overall (Likelihood Ratio Test of the full model vs. a reduced model

G that contains variances but not covariances: $\chi^2_{10} = 36.79$, P < 0.001). Strong genetic

covariance/correlation estimates, both positive and negative, were found for a number

of trait pairs and were deemed statistically significant (based on the bootstrapped 95%

confidence intervals not crossing zero). We find strong genetic covariance among all 3

OFT traits: *track length* shows significant negative genetic covariance with both *relative*

area covered and *time in the middle*, and *relative area covered* and *time in the middle*

show significant positive genetic covariance with one another. *Track length* also has a

significant positive genetic covariance with *–ln(emergence time)*. Ln-transformed

Cortisol shows significant negative genetic covariance with *time in the middle* (Figure 3).

Ln-transformed *Cortisol* also covaries negatively with both *relative area covered* and *–*

ln(emergence time), and positively with *track length*, although these covariances were

not significantly different from zero (based on 95% confidence interval).

Eigen decomposition of **G** provides a more holistic view of the genetic

covariance structure and the level of integration among traits. Here the major axis (first

principal component, PC1, with 95% confidence intervals from 5000 bootstrap

replicates) explains 57.8% (47.3%, 79.6%) of the genetic variance in multivariate

phenotype (PC2 = 25.7% [14.3, 37.6]; PC3 = 9.3% [4.7, 16.5]; PC4 = 5.6% [0, 9.2]; PC5 =

1.6% [0, 3.6]). All traits except *emergence time* load significantly on this axis (Figure 4).

Relative area covered and *time in the middle* load in one direction, while *track length* and

Cortisol load in the other direction. This structure is suggestive of a single major axis of

genetic variation in integrated stress response, where genotypes at one end of this axis

can be considered to have 'weaker' behavioural stress responses to the OFT assay (i.e.,

swim shorter distances, spend more time in the central area of the tank, and exhibit

exploratory swimming patterns that cover greater areas relative to their distance

swum) and 'weaker' physiological responses to stress (i.e., produce lower cortisol levels

in response to the stressor). Meanwhile, genotypes at the other end of this axis can be

considered to have 'stronger' behavioural responses to stress (i.e., swimming further,

while spending more time close to the tank edges, and covering less area relative to

their distance travelled in OFTs) and 'stronger' physiological responses to stress (i.e.,

produce higher cortisol levels in response to the stressor).

Discussion

In this study we sought to determine whether – and to what extent – there exists

genetic variation for, and integration between, behavioural and physiological

(endocrine) components of the stress response. Our results provide three main novel

insights. First, we find that genetic variation does underpin individual differences in

both behavioural and physiological components of the stress response. Second, we find

genetic covariance structure among these behavioural and physiological traits,

indicating that they are indeed genetically integrated. Thirdly, having identified the

structure of the major axis of **G** we suggest that it is more readily interpreted as an axis

of genetic variation in stress responsiveness than in stress coping style (although we

acknowledge the distinction may be somewhat subjective). Overall, by estimating the

genetic covariance structure among traits we find the first quantitative genetic support

to date for the hypothesis of evolutionary integration between behavioural and

endocrine components of the stress response.

We find heritable (co)variation in and among behaviours assayed in the open

field trial (OFT), including the derived trait *relative area covered*. The latter trait, derived

by considering an appropriate biological null model of the relationship between *track*

length and (absolute) *area covered* serves as a useful proxy for exploratory behaviour.

Here we demonstrate an axis of repeatable and heritable variation that spans from less

active but more exploratory swimming patterns (lower *track length* but higher *relative*

area covered and *time in the middle*) through to a 'flight' type response, characterised by

higher activity coupled to thigmotaxis and low exploration (higher *track length*, lower

relative area covered and *time in the middle*). Although the distinction is both subjective

and arguable, we interpret this axis as more consistent with variation in the magnitude

of stress responsiveness than in coping style. This is because, while low *track lengths*

could arise from stressed fish exhibiting 'reactive' freezing behaviour, we would not

necessarily expect it to be associated with high *time in the middle* (i.e. reduced

thigmotaxis). Given the wide use of OFTs in biomedical research (e.g., Rex *et al.* 1998;

von Horsten, Karl & Pabst 2003) as well as in animal behaviour, our phenotyping

approach may have broad applicability for discriminating between exploration and

stress/anxiety-related behaviours. At the slight risk of introducing semantic confusion,

we also note that the OFT paradigm is widely applied to studies of 'shy-bold' type

personality variation in fishes (Toms, Echevarria & Jouandot 2010) and other

vertebrates (Carter *et al.* 2013; Perals *et al.* 2017). The extent to which behavioural

differences deemed characteristic of a 'shy—bold' personality axis (commonly, if not

universally defined as repeatable variation in response to perceived risk; Wilson *et al.*

1994) should be viewed as equivalent to variance in behavioural stress responsiveness,

or coping style, is a matter of debate (see Boulton *et al.* 2015). We view these as

overlapping – if not necessarily identical – concepts, and suggest it will generally be

prudent to empirically assess the structure of OFT variation for any system rather than

assume a priori that it will match a preferred verbal model (see also White *et al.* 2016;

Houslay *et al.* 2018; White, Pascall & Wilson 2020).

We also find significant heritable variation in *emergence time*, although this is

not tightly integrated with OFT traits in **G** in the manner we had expected. Faster

emergence in typically interpreted as reflecting a lack of fear of the open arena (i.e.,

greater 'boldness'; see Burns 2008). In our study the qualitative pattern in **G** runs

counter to this, if we consider that boldness and behavioural stress responsiveness are

broadly analogous. Thus genotypes predisposed to shorter *emergence time* are

associated with greater *track length* and, albeit non-significantly, lower *relative area*

covered and *time in the middle* during OFT trials. That is, shorter *emergence time* is

associated with the putatively more stressed 'flight' end of the behavioural axis revealed

in the OFT. Our interpretation of this result is that at least some genotypes (and

individuals) likely perceive the shelter area as less safe than the open arena. This

possibility was also suggested by an earlier finding that some individual guppies

decrease (rather than increase) shelter use following simulated predation events

(Houslay *et al.* 2018). If general to other systems, unexpected results such as these may

have important consequences for interpretation of personality tests, and correlations

(or lack thereof) between behaviours assayed across test paradigms (Carter *et al.* 2013).

Tendency to shoal varies among individuals but is not detectably heritable.

Though not generally considered a stress-response trait *per se*, shoaling is an anti-

predator behaviour in guppies (Herbert-Read *et al.* 2017). We had therefore predicted

that heightened perception of risk in the open field might also be associated with

increased shoaling tendency. This was not the case at the among-individual level (Table

S5), while the absence of detectable genetic variance meant that we could not test this

prediction in **G**.

We find strong evidence of significant additive genetic variance in a key

physiological component of the stress response: waterborne cortisol concentrations

following exposure of the fish to a handling stressor. Our findings suggest that

previously detected differences among individuals in cortisol response to a stressor

(Houslay *et al.* 2019) are primarily attributable to genetic effects, with the estimated

heritability (h^2 = 0.26) being almost 75% of the individual–level repeatability (R = 0.35)

for ln-transformed *Cortisol*. In addition, by adopting a reaction norm approach to

modelling stress physiology, as recently advocated by ourselves (Houslay *et al.* 2019)

and others (e.g., Fürtbauer *et al.* 2015; Hau & Goymann 2015; Taff & Vitousek 2016), we

detect GxE reflecting genetic differences in the extent of habituation to the stressor over

repeated exposures. This result is potentially important since poor habituation of the

hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal/interrenal (HPA/I) response to repeated or ongoing

stressors can lead to well documented health problems in human and animal

populations (Segerstrom & Miller 2004; Koolhaas 2008; Romero, Dickens & Cyr 2009;

Mason 2010). Our detection of heritable variation in the degree of habituation to

stressors raises the possibility of developing targeted selection strategies to improve

welfare in captive populations (e.g., Frankham *et al.* 1986; Muir & Craig 1995; Oltenacu

& Algers 2009).

Our findings also highlight that there is greater additive genetic variance (and

heritability) for cortisol levels following the first exposure to the stressor than following

the third. This pattern, which occurs because genotypes that produce the highest

cortisol response at first exposure also show the most marked habituation, is consistent

with the idea of cryptic genetic variance (Paaby & Rockman 2014) being 'released' by

exposure to novel, and so potentially stressful, environments (Ledón-Rettig, Pfennig &

Crespi 2010; Ledón-Rettig *et al.* 2014; Berger *et al.* 2011). All else being equal, it also

means that selection on cortisol levels following stressor exposure should induce a

stronger evolutionary response in naïve relative to habituated fish. However, the strong

positive cross-environment correlation means that the ranking of genotypes with regard

to their cortisol responses is consistent across repeated stressor exposures. Thus

selection on the (average) GC response would result in a correlated evolutionary

response of habituation rate, and *vice versa*.

Considering all traits together, **G** shows evidence of genetic integration between

behavioural and endocrine components of the stress response. As noted with respect to

OFT behaviours, we consider that the major axis of **G** is best interpreted as genetic

variance in the magnitude of stress responsiveness. Accordingly, genotypes tending to

show (putatively) more stressed 'flight' type behaviour in the OFT (i.e. thigmotaxis, high

track length, low *relative area covered*) also produce higher levels of cortisol following

the handling and confinement stressor. The fact that the only significant bivariate

correlation including cortisol is with *time in the middle* (negative correlation) suggests

that thigmotaxis is a particularly strong indicator of high stress responsiveness. We note

that our interpretation that **G** is dominated by variation in the magnitude of stress

responsiveness does not mean the 'coping style' model has no merit. Indeed, a

subsequent 'two-tier' iteration of the coping style model proposed that variation in the

magnitude of the stress response (termed 'stress reactivity') could be viewed as a

second axis, distinct from variation in the 'type' (or style) of response (Koolhaas *et al.*

2010).

Here **G** certainly contains substantial variation not explained by its leading axis

and this may point towards interesting avenues for further study. For instance, while

relative area and *tracklength* are negatively correlated and both load significantly on the

major axis of **G**, there is also much variation in the former at low to moderate *track*

lengths (illustrated by e.g., fish 1 and 4 in Figure 1). It seems plausible, if speculative,

that this could be caused by a tendency of some individuals to show initial immobility

(i.e. freezing) in response to the stressor but then recover quickly and begin explorative

swimming. Others may show an initial flight response before relatively rapid recovery

to explorative swimming. Such differences, if present, would not be detectable by simple

principal components analysis of covariance structures based on whole trial data (as

here and, for example, Van Reenen *et al.* 2005). Rather this would require more detailed

modelling of within-trial behavioural dynamics.

The genetic integration of behaviour and physiology detected here is consistent

with the idea that correlational selection in the past has led to the coevolution of these

stress response components. Covariance structure in **G** will modify, and potentially

constrain, evolutionary responses to selection - whether natural or artificial. Here we

have no direct knowledge of how contemporary selection is acting in the wild. Nor do

we know whether it might be changing as a consequence of anthropogenic stressors.

Thus we cannot comment directly on how **G** will shape future evolution of the guppy

stress response beyond noting that selection on behaviour will cause correlated

evolution of endocrine physiology (and vice versa). Nonetheless, while it seems

reasonable to expect that current integration of stress response in natural populations

should be broadly adaptive, this seems less likely in captive populations (at least for

species without a long history of domestication and opportunity for adaptation to

artificial environments). We know that prolonged, chronic activation of stress response

pathways (notably the HPA(I) axis) frequently disrupts health and survival in captive

animals (Huether 1996; Boonstra 2013). It may be that more stress-responsive

genotypes are disadvantaged in novel artificial conditions (e.g., if acute stress

responsiveness positively predicts susceptibility to chronic stress). However, even if

true this would not imply high (acute) stress-responsiveness was also disadvantageous

in the wild. Since natural selection should purge alleles that are universally detrimental,

it seems more plausible that genetic variation along the major axis described here is

maintained by some form of selective trade-off (as widely hypothesised for maintenance

of personality variation; e.g., Stamps 2007; Wolf *et al.* 2007; Réale *et al.* 2010). For

instance, genotypes susceptible to harm under chronic stressor exposure will likely

persist in populations if they also confer advantages under an acute stress challenge. In

natural populations not only is exposure to acute stressors more common than to

chronic stressors, but also selection through chronic stress exposure may be conditional

on (and subsequent to) surviving acute challenges (such as predator attacks).

Conclusions and future directions

Here we find evidence for genetic variation in – and integration of – behavioural

and physiological (endocrine) components of the stress response. Overall we consider

the structure of **G** to be more consistent with a continuous axis of variation in acute

stress responsiveness than with the widely invoked 'reactive – proactive' model of

variation in stress coping style (Koolhaas *et al.* 2007). This interpretation rests largely

on the structure of behavioural variation revealed by the OFT, which is dominated by an

axis running from genotypes that are more stress responsive (rapid 'flight' behaviour

coupled to thigmotaxis) to those that show more exploratory behaviour expected from a

(putatively) unstressed fish. Endocrine traits align with this axis: genotypes exhibiting

'flight' behaviour show higher cortisol levels (and exhibit faster habituation of GC

physiology) when subject to repeated handling and confinement stressors.

Our results suggest that correlational selection in the past has likely shaped the

multivariate stress response, and that continued evolution of stress-related behaviour

will have consequences for glucocorticoid physiology and *vice versa*. Determining

contemporary selection on the stress response, and testing the possibility that genetic

variation is maintained by fitness trade-offs, is thus an obvious – if empirically

challenging – next step to understanding the functional importance of genetic variation

in wild populations. In a more applied context, integration of behavioural and endocrine

stress-response components at the genetic level has potential utility for genetic

improvement of managed populations. Specifically, it may be possible to identify non-

invasive, high throughput, behavioural biomarkers and target them in selection schemes

to reduce chronic activation of the HPA/I axis and its attendant deleterious effects.

Table 1: Estimated variance components, along with adjusted heritability, for each trait as estimated in a univariate model (± standard error). Chi-

square test statistics and p-values are provided for the pedigree term, testing for the presence of significant additive genetic variance (V_a).

Trait	V_a	V_{pe}	V_{group}	$V_{residual}$	h^2	$\chi^2_{0,1}$	P
Relative area covered	26.35 ± 9.37	72.42 ± 9.28	33.33 ± 6.86	205.22 ± 5.90	0.08 ± 0.03	20.7	<0.001
Time in the middle	588.48 ± 139.61	554.58 ± 109.57	203.29 ± 53.41	2070.06 ± 60.08	0.17 ± 0.04	53.7	<0.001
Track length	26832.64 ± 5925.25	32204.05 ± 4868.88	9956.4 ± 2626.41	93921.54 ± 2711.28	0.16 ± 0.03	86.3	<0.001
log Emergence time	0.12 ± 0.05	0.06 ± 0.06	0.05 ± 0.02	1.07 ± 0.05	0.09 ± 0.04	23.2	<0.001
Shoaling tendency	0 ± 0	2457.36 ± 570.96	708.87 ± 316.30	9900.95 ± 622.10	0 ± 0	0	0.5
log Cortisol	0.07 ± 0.02	0.02 ± 0.02	0.01 ± 0.01	0.15 ± 0.01	0.26 ± 0.08	22.0	<0.001

502   Table 2: Additive genetic covariance-correlation matrix (G) from the full multivariate animal model. Genetic variances provided on the shaded

503   diagonal, with genetic covariances below and genetic correlations above. 95% confidence intervals in parentheses are estimated from 5000

504   bootstrapped replicates. Where the confidence intervals for any estimate do not cross zero the estimate is considered statistically significant (at the

505   0.05 alpha level) and are shown in bold.

	Relative area covered	*Time in the middle*	*Track length*	-log *Emergence time*	log Cortisol
Relative area covered	**0.074 (0.029,0.122)**	**0.761 (0.549,0.955)**	**-0.506 (-0.758,-0.184)**	-0.503 (-1.394,0.256)	-0.414 (-1.035,0.225)
Time in the middle	**0.075 (0.031,0.124)**	**0.130 (0.062,0.191)**	**-0.554 (-0.774,-0.295)**	-0.117 (-0.791,0.531)	**-0.686 (-1.165,-0.220)**
Track length	**-0.048 (-0.086,-0.008)**	**-0.070 (-0.116,-0.022)**	**0.121 (0.067,0.171)**	0.559 (-0.026,1.256)	0.279 (-0.238,0.823)
-log *Emergence time*	-0.038 (-0.083,0.014)	-0.012 (-0.070,0.040)	**0.055 (0.001,0.106)**	**0.079 (0.011,0.149)**	-0.177 (-0.910,0.560)
log *Cortisol*	-0.038 (-0.091,0.011)	**-0.082 (-0.138,-0.021)**	0.032 (-0.026,0.085)	-0.017 (-0.073,0.038)	**0.111 (0.036,0.191)**

Figure 1: The lack of a strong positive relationship between observed *track length* and *area covered*

(panel A), is initially puzzling given expected autocorrelation and that both are used as positive

indicators of exploratory (or 'bold') behaviour. Inset examples of OFT tracks from 4 individuals (panel

B) shed light on this. Fish 1 and 2 appear to be exploring the tank, while 3 and 4 are engaging in

stereotypical 'flight' behaviour characterised by strong thigmotaxis (remaining close to tank walls)

and/or rapid movement along tank walls. As a consequence, individuals 2 and 3 have similar *area*

covered during the OFT, but very different *track lengths*. We simulated random movements to define

an expected null relationship between *area covered* and *track length* (panel C; dashed red line shows

the fourth order polynomial model fit; see Appendix A). The polynomial regression was then used to

predict the expected area covered under random movement for each trial's observed *track length*, and

the '*relative area covered*' was calculated as the observation minus this prediction. Panel D shows the

resultant *relative area covered* plotted against *track length* for all trials (dashed red line at *relative area*

covered = 0, shows where individuals of any *track length* are expected to lie if they move randomly

with respect to direction). From this it is apparent that fish 1 and 2 have high *relative area covered*,

while 3 and 4 do not.

Figure 2: Guppies habituate to the waterborne sampling procedure, as shown by a decline in average

log-transformed cortisol level (ng/hr) following stressor exposure between first and third exposures.

Black circles and associated bars denote predicted population means (± standard error) from mixed

model analysis. Grey lines depict the predicted genetic reaction norms across repeated stressor

exposure for each individual. Weak, but statistically significant GxE is manifest as variance in the

genetic reaction norm slopes (i.e. lack of parallelism) and results in a slight reduction of genetic

variance for cortisol at the third exposure relative to the first.

Figure 1: The additive genetic relationship between log-transformed cortisol (y-axis) and four

behaviours (a, *relative area covered*; b, *time in the middle*; c, *track length*; d, *-log emergence time*).

Points show (predicted) bivariate genetic deviations from the population means, plotted for those

individuals in the pedigree with cortisol data. In each case the black ellipse depicts the 'shape' of the

relationship as given by the point estimate of **G**. Specifically it encompasses the area expected to

contain 95% of the bivariate genetic distribution for the population. Grey ellipses denote the

corresponding areas defined from 5000 bootstrapped replicates of **G**, and so highlight the uncertainty

around these bivariate distributions.

Figure 2: Trait loadings from the first eigen vector (principal component) of **G**. This axis explains

57.8% of the genetic (co)variation found in the focal behavioural and physiological components of the

stress response in our guppy population. Points show trait loadings from the first eigen vector of our

estimate of G, with bars representing 95% confidence intervals on each loading (calculated from 5000

bootstrapped replicates of the model).

Materials and methods

Husbandry and breeding

We used fish taken from our captive population housed at the University of Exeter's Penryn campus, which is descended from wild fish collected in 2008 from the lower Aripo River in Trinidad. This population has been maintained at a population size of several thousand, and has undergone no deliberate selection or inbreeding. All fish are fed to satiation twice daily (0800 – 1000h and again at 1600 – 1800h) using commercial flake food and live *Artemia nauplii*. Water temperature is maintained at 23-24°C in well-aerated closed system tank stacks that undergo 25% water changes each week and with weekly tests for ammonia, nitrate and nitrite levels. Lighting is kept at a 12:12 light/dark cycle. The experiment described in this study was carried out in accordance with the UK Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 under licence from the Home Office (UK), and with local ethical approval from the University of Exeter.

To create our pedigreed sub-population, female fish were sampled haphazardly from the stock tanks and kept in female-only groups for 3 months. Isolation from male contact minimised the chance of females carrying viable sperm from previous matings. For the first generation of offspring, we used a group breeding design (as detailed in White and Wilson, 2018); briefly, females were tagged under anaesthetic (buffered MS222 solution) using visible implant elastomer (VIE) to allow individual identification. We then assigned groups of 4 females to 1 male in 15L breeding tanks (18.5cm x 37cm x 22cm), and inspected females daily for high gravidity (swollen abdomens and enlarged 'gravid spots'). Heavily gravid females were then isolated in 2.8L brood tanks to give birth (and were returned to the breeding tanks either after producing a brood or two weeks of isolation). Any offspring produced in the breeding tanks were excluded from the experiment as maternal identity could not be positively identified. For the following generations, after 3 months of isolation from males we moved females into individual 2.8L tanks, with 1 male then circulated among 3 females. Males were moved between females every 5-8 days. In this way, females did not have to be moved to brood tanks, and any offspring could be assigned to mothers definitively. In this setup, offspring were moved to a separate brood tank on the day of birth. Note that as the gestation period for guppies is approximately 1 month,

any brood produced by a female less than one month after exposure to their designated male was

recorded in the pedigree as having unknown paternity.

Within 24h of a female producing a brood we recorded her weight (g) and brood size. We kept

juvenile fish in full-sib family groups in 2.8L tanks before moving them to 15L 'growth' tanks at an

average age of 56 days. At an average age of 133 days (range 59-268) we tagged individuals and

placed them into mixed family groups of 16-20 adults (with an even mix of males and females), kept in

15L tanks. Note that variation in tagging age arose largely because groups were necessarily

established sequentially as sufficient individuals from multiple families reached a large enough size

that we deemed the procedure to be safe. Each adult group comprised a mix of fish from different

families, reducing the potential for common environment effects to upwardly bias our genetic

parameter estimation.

Overview of behavioural phenotyping

Behavioural phenotyping commenced at least one week after tagging. In all trials, we filmed

movement behaviour of individual fish using a Sunkwang video camera equipped with a 6-60mm

manual focus lens suspended over the tank. We used the tracking software Viewer II (BiObserve) to

extract behavioural data from each recording (detailed below). The tank was lit from below using a

light box, and screened with a cardboard casing to prevent external visual disturbance. After each

behavioural trial, the individual tested was weighed and then moved to a temporary 'holding tank'.

Once a full group (as described above) had been tested, all were moved from the holding tank back to

their home tank. We replaced the water in the testing and holding tanks between groups to reduce the

build-up of hormones or other chemicals. The first offspring generation experienced 4 repeat open

field trials (OFTs) over a 2-week period, with at least 48h between trials. Subsequent generations

experienced 4 repeat behavioural trials, alternating 2 OFTs with 2 emergence trials (ETs). For the final

2 generations, we extended the OFTs by including a shoaling trial (ST) at the end of each OFT.

Open field trials (OFT) followed the methodology described by White et al (2016). Briefly, we assessed

individual behaviour in a 20cm x 30cm tank, filled to a depth of 5cm with room-temperature water

from the main supply. We caught fish individually from their home tank, examined them quickly for

identification tags, then placed them immediately into the centre of the OFT tank. After allowing 30s

for acclimation, we filmed behaviour for 4m30s. Behaviours characterised from the tracking software

were *track length* (the total distance the fish moved during the trial; cm), *area covered* (the percentage

of 1cm x 1cm grid squares through which the fish moved during the trial; %), and *time in middle* (time

spent in a rectangular inner zone which was defined as being the same size as an outer area; seconds).

Shoaling trials (ST) were appended to a subset of OFTs, by positioning a small tank containing 10 stock

fish (of same sex as the test subject) next to one end of the OFT tank but with visual cues blocked by a

cardboard divider. At the end of the normal OFT, we removed this divider slowly, allowing the focal

animal to have visual contact with the shoal. We began recording the shoaling trial 30s after removing

the divider in order to limit any artefacts of slight disturbance. (Note that we used a further cardboard

casing around the shoaling tank to avoid any additional external visual stimulus). We then recorded

behaviour of the test fish for an additional 3 minutes. We characterised *shoaling tendency* via the

tracking software by subdividing the tank area into 3 equal-sized rectangular areas: one next to the

tank holding the group of same-sex fish, one farthest from this group, and the central area. We then

calculated *shoaling tendency* as the time spent in the 1/3 area closest to the same-sex group after

subtracting the time spent in the 1/3 area farthest away. The decision to use a single-sex shoal aimed

to reduce any effects of (potential) mate preference and/or avoidance, but also this necessitated

replicate arena setups allowing male and female individuals from each group to be tested in the

OFT/ST concurrently. We randomised which tank was used for each sex in each group and recorded

this information.

Emergence trials (ET) followed the methodology described by White *et al.* (2016). Briefly, we tested

individuals in a 20cm x 40cm tank, filled to a depth of 8cm with room-temperature water from the

main supply. A 10cm section of the tank length was walled off creating a shelter area (20cm x10cm),

the walls and floor of which were painted black. The focal fish was placed into the shelter area and

allowed to acclimate for 30s, at which point we opened a sliding door to allow access to the rest of the

tank, which was brightly lit from below and otherwise bare. *Time to emerge* (in seconds) was recorded

by the tracking software automatically as the fish exited the shelter area and emerged into the open

tank section. Trials were ended either at emergence or at 15 min if the fish had not emerged by that

point; in the case of non-emergence, fish were given the maximum value (i.e., 900s).

Derivation of 'relative area' from OFT trials

The '*area covered'* variable assayed in the OFT is calculated in BiObserve by dividing the arena (i.e., the

total area of the tank as viewed from the camera) into 1cm x 1cm grid squares. The path taken by the

fish during observation is then used to determine what proportion of these grid squares the fish

entered. However, we sought to derive a measure of '*relative area*' that describes whether a fish covers

a large, or small area relative to its observed *track length.*

To do this we simulated 'random swims' within the arena across the observed range of *track*

lengths. We first selected 40 OFT results at random from our total data set and extracted the

coordinates of the fish in each frame from the raw tracking file, creating a set of x and y movements

and their associated distances. As original coordinates were recorded in pixels we used the calibration

of the software to convert to cm units. We then use a 'random walk' algorithm to select a movement

(i.e., step size and direction) from this observed distribution at random, and calculate the new

coordinates. If the movement keeps the 'fish' within the bounds of the 'tank' (i.e., defined as a 20cm x

30cm arena), the movement is accepted and coordinates added to a movement matrix; if not, a new

movement is drawn from the distribution. If the movement is greater than 1cm in distance, we break

the movement into a number of smaller parts to be added to the matrix (such that we capture the

coordinates of grid squares through which the 'fish' moved along the way). Once the total distance of

the random walk reached or exceeded the *track length* set as the simulation objective, the path is

terminated and the area covered is calculated by counting the number of unique grid squares in the

matrix of coordinates and dividing by the total number possible.

After simulating random walks across 500 values of *track length* (using a vector of 100 values

evenly spaced across the range of true data, repeated 5 times), we modelled (simulated) area covered

as a fourth order polynomial function of *track length*. Using this regression model (which explained

97.8% of the variance in simulated data), we calculated the *relative area* for each actual OFT trial as

the observed area covered minus the area covered under a random swim, as predicted from our

regression model and the observed *track length*.

Waterborne hormone sampling

On completion of behavioural data collection, individuals entering the endocrine testing program were

left undisturbed for a minimum of two weeks. Waterborne hormone sampling was then conducted

over a 5-day period that included three handling and confinement stressor exposures with 48h

between each. We followed the method described by Houslay et al (2019) to obtain repeated non-

invasive GC measures of individuals using holding water samples from the first and third

confinements. Note that only two samples per fish were analysed because the financial and time costs

of doing three was deemed prohibitive. We nonetheless applied the stressor stimulus three times as

our prior study showed this was sufficient to produce a strong habituation response, i.e., a significant

decrease in water-borne cortisol over the three sampling periods (Houslay *et al.* 2019).

We collected samples between 1200 – 1400h to control for diel fluctuations in GC levels. For

each sample, we netted an entire group from their home tank quickly using a large net, transferring

them to 2 holding tanks (containing water from the home tank supply) for moving to an adjacent quiet

room (performed within 20s of the net first hitting the water). We then transferred fish to individual

Pyrex beakers containing 300ml of clean water from the main supply (which serves the main housing

units), which has been warmed to the appropriate temperature (mean = 24.1°C, range 23-24.9°C).

Beakers were placed within cardboard 'chambers' to prevent fish from seeing each other or

experiencing outside disturbance. One fish was transferred every 30s, alternating across holding

tanks, such that all fish were in their beakers within 10min of the initial netting. After 60 mins in the

beaker, each fish was removed by pouring its sample through a clean net into a second beaker, with

the fish then quickly checked to confirm ID and returned to the holding tank until the entire group

could be returned to its home tank.

We immediately filtered each water sample using Grade 1 filter paper (Whatman), then passed

them slowly through solid phase C18 extraction columns (Sep-Pak C18, 3cc, Waters) via high-purity

tubing (Tygon 2474, Saint Gobain) under vacuum pressure (Earley *et al.* 2006). Columns were primed

beforehand with 2 x 2ml HPLC-grade methanol followed by 2 x 2ml distilled water, and were washed

afterwards with a further 2 x 2ml distilled water to purge salts. We then covered both ends of each

column with film (Parafilm M, Bemis) and stored them at -20C for future analysis. We washed all

beakers, tubes and funnels with 99% ethanol and rinsed them with distilled water prior to each

sampling procedure. The remainder of the endocrine assay procedure involved elution, resuspension,

separation and quantification of free cortisol by enzyme immunoassay (EIA) using Cayman Chemicals,

Inc EIA kits. Detailed methods are exactly as described by Houslay et al (2019) and so not repeated

here (note that here we assayed the free fraction of cortisol only). To validate the cortisol kits, we

examined whether the kit standard curve was parallel to a serial dilution curve derived from pooled

guppy water-borne hormone extract. 20µl was taken from each of the male samples and pooled; 20µl

was taken from each of the female samples and combined into a separate pool. 400µl of the pools was

serially diluted from 1:1 to 1:128 and these samples were assayed alongside the kit standard curve on

two occasions (June and December 2017, marking the start and finish of sample processing). All

dilution curves were parallel to the standard curve (slope comparison test, Zar 1996, p.355; June,

male: $t_{12} = 0.029$, P = 0.97; June, female: : $t_{12} = 0.343$, P = 0.74; December, male: : $t_{12} = 0.119$, P = 0.91;

December, female: : $t_{12} = 0.224$, P = 0.83). The serial dilution curves also identified 1:32 as an

appropriate dilution to ensure that all samples fell on the linear phase of the standard curve. A total of

37 96-well plates were used and the pooled sample was included at the beginning and end of each

plate. Intra-assay coefficients of variation ranged from 0.12-19.83% with a median of 3.08%; the inter-

assay coefficient of variation was 19.22%. Cortisol is presented and modelled in (ln-transformed)

units of ng/hr to reflect the 1 hour sampling duration.

Statistical methods

All data handling and analysis was performed in R version 3.4.1 (R Core Team 2017). We used the

'tidyverse' set of packages for data handling and visualisation (Wickham 2017), and ASreml-R 3.0

(Butler 2009) for fitting linear mixed effects models (as described in full below). We also used 'nadiv'

for pedigree preparation and to estimate (approximate) standard errors on linear functions of

variance components as estimated from the mixed models (Wolak 2012). All models fitted assumed

(multivariate) Gaussian error structures, and we visually assessed residuals to verify this was

reasonable (after data transformation in some cases). To test for significance of among individual

and/or genetic (co)variance components, we fitted nested models with different random effects

structures and compared them using likelihood ratio tests (LRTs). We calculated χ^2_{nDF} as twice the

difference in model log likelihoods, with the number of degrees of freedom (n) equivalent to the

number of additional parameters in the more complex model. When testing a single random effect

(variance component), we assumed the difference to be asymptotically distributed as an equal mix of

χ^2_0 and χ^2_1 (denoted $\chi^2_{0,1}$; Self and Liang, 1987; Visscher, 2006).

For each OFT and ST behaviour in turn (*relative area, time in middle, track length, shoaling*

tendency, and *emergence time*), we used the random effects specification to partition phenotypic

variation (V_p, conditional on fixed effects as described below) into the effects of additive genetics (V_a),

permanent environment defined as the non-(additive) genetic component of among-individual

differences, V_{pe}), and housing group (V_{group}), as well as residual variation ($V_{residual}$). We natural log-

transformed *emergence time* prior to analysis to meet assumptions of residual normality and

homoscedasticity. For all behavioural traits, we included fixed effects of assay *repeat*, the *order within*

each group in which the fish was trialled (mean-centred continuous predictor), *temperature* (mean-

centred and scaled to standard deviation units), *time* (in minutes from midnight, mean-centred and

scaled to standard deviation units), *age* (mean-centred and scaled to standard deviation units), *sex*,

and the *generation* from the breeding population. For *shoaling tendency* only, we incorporated an

additional fixed effect of *setup* (as detailed above). We tested the significance of genetic variance for

each behaviour by LRT comparison of the corresponding full model to one in which the (additive)

genetic random effect was excluded.

Cortisol data were also natural log (ln) transformed for analysis. We formulated a bivariate

model to test for both additive genetic variation and genotype-by-environment interaction (GxE) in

cortisol levels across the two 'contexts' (i.e. samples retained for each individual at first and third

confinement, denoted $Cortisol_1$, $Cortisol_3$). Random effects were first used to partition phenotypic

(co)variance (conditional on fixed effects) into among-group and residual components. Fixed effects

included the context-specific means, and overall effects of the *order* in which the fish was caught from

each group for assay (mean-centred continuous predictor), *temperature* (mean-centred and scaled to

standard deviation units), *time of day* (mean-centred and scaled to standard deviation units), *age*

(mean-centred and scaled to standard deviation units), and *sex*. In addition, we included fixed

covariates of *body mass* (mean-centred and scaled to standard deviation units) and a *sex* by *body mass*

interaction (see Houslay *et al.* 2019 for rationale of controlling for body size effects on waterborne

hormone levels in this way). Note that modelled in this way each individual is sampled only once for

each context-specific cortisol trait so no random effect of individual identity is included. To test for

additive genetic variation (V_a) we compared this first bivariate model to a second formulation that also

included the (additive) genetic merit, but under the assumption that this is invariant with context

within an individual (such that $V_{a1}=V_{a3}$ and $r_{a1,3}=1$ and there is no GxE). We then test for the GxE by

comparing the second model to a third in which we allow GxE (i.e., the context-specific genetic

variances are free to differ and the cross-context genetic correlation can be <+1).

Lastly, we built a multivariate animal model to estimate **G** and to test the hypothesised genetic

integration among behavioural and physiological stress components. We retained only response traits

that harboured significant V_a as shown in univariate models, and so the final model comprised

response traits *relative area, time in middle, track length, emergence time* (log transformed)*, and

Cortisol (log transformed). We multiplied (transformed) *emergence time* by -1 to simplify

interpretation of estimated correlation structures (i.e., higher values for all behavioural traits then

represent nominally 'bolder' behaviours). We also scaled all (transformed) response variables to

standard deviation units. This was to facilitate model fitting, and also prevent scale effects

complicating interpretation of eigenvectors of **G**. Fixed and random effects were fitted on each trait as

specified for the univariate models. Note that one exception to this is that we elected to treat *Cortisol*

as a single repeated-measures trait here (with two repeats, one per context) such that a permanent

environment effect was now included. Fixed effects estimates are reported in the supplementary

information (Table S1).

We specified additive genetic (**G**), permanent environment (**PE**), group (**GROUP**), and residual

(**R**) covariance structures as unstructured matrices to be estimated. Note that **R** partitions

observation-level covariances (as opposed to individual-level in **PE**) that are not definable or

statistically identifiable if traits are not measured at the same time (i.e., all covariances relating to

emergence time or *Cortisol*). Where this was the case we constrained specific covariance terms in **R** to

equal zero. Estimates of **PE**, **GROUP** and **R** are provided in the supplementary information (Tables S2-

S4). We tested for overall additive genetic covariance among the traits by comparing this model

against a reduced one in which **G** was specified as a diagonal matrix (i.e., additive variances are

estimated but covariances are assumed to equal zero). To aid the interpretation of covariance terms

contained in **G,** we calculated the corresponding genetic correlations r_a from the full model. For any

pair of traits (x,y), $r_{a(x,y)} = COV_{a(x,y)} / (\sqrt{(V_{a(x)})} \times \sqrt{(V_{a(y)})})$. We also subjected our estimate of **G** to eigen

decomposition to determine the proportion of additive genetic variation captured by each principal

component and assess whether a single major axis of variation could indeed explain most of the

genetic variance in the multivariate phenotype (consistent with a simple proactive-reactive coping

style model). We estimated uncertainty on the trait loadings associated with each principal component

(eigenvector) using a parametric bootstrap approach as described by Boulton et al (2014).

For visualisation of bivariate relationships at the additive genetic level, we used the R package

'ellipse' (Murdoch & Chow 2018) to determine the coordinates of an ellipse representing the

approximate 95% confidence region of deviations based on the point estimate of **G**. We repeated this

procedure for the corresponding regions defined from 5000 bootstrapped values of **G** (i.e., to indicate

uncertainty arising from estimation of the genetic covariance structure itself). Best linear unbiased

predictors (BLUPs) are used for visualisation only, not for any statistical analysis (Houslay & Wilson

2017).

To test for associations between all traits (i.e., including *shoaling tendency*) at the among-

individual level, we also built a multivariate model as above with the addition of *shoaling tendency* and

without estimating additive genetic effects. The estimates of all among-individual (co)variances are

provided in the supplementary information (Table S5).

     SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Table S1: Fixed effects estimates from the full multivariate animal model.
Table S2: Permanent environment (co)variance matrix from the full multivariate animal
model.
Table S3: Group (co)variance matrix from the full multivariate animal model.
Table S4: Residual variance-correlation matrix from the full multivariate animal model.
Table S5: Among-individual (co)variance matrix from the multivariate model that excluded
genetic effects.
816

REFERENCES

Angelier, F. & Wingfield, J.C. (2012) Importance of the glucocorticoid stress response in a changing

world: Theory, hypotheses and perspectives. *General and Comparative Endocrinology*, **190**, 118–

128.

Barton, B.A. & Iwama, G.K. (1991) Physiological changes in fish from stress in aquaculture with

emphasis on the response and effects of corticosteroids. *Annual Review of Fish Diseases*, **1**, 3–26.

Berger, D., Bauerfeind, S.S., Blanckenhorn, W.U. & Schäfer, M.A. (2011) HIGH TEMPERATURES REVEAL

CRYPTIC GENETIC VARIATION IN A POLYMORPHIC FEMALE SPERM STORAGE ORGAN.

Evolution, **65**, 2830–2842.

Bijlsma, R. & Loeschcke, V. (2005) Environmental stress, adaptation and evolution: an overview.

Journal of evolutionary biology, **18**, 744–9.

Blows, M.W. (2007) A tale of two matrices: multivariate approaches in evolutionary biology. *Journal of*

evolutionary biology, **20**, 1–8.

Blows, M.W. & Walsh, B. (2009) Spherical cows grazing in Flatland: Constraints to selection and

adaptation. *Adaptation and Fitness in Animal Populations*, pp. 83–101. Springer, Dordrecht.

Boonstra, R. (2013) Reality as the leading cause of stress: Rethinking the impact of chronic stress in

nature. *Functional Ecology*, **27**, 11–23.

von Borell, E. (1995) Neuroendocrine integration of stress and significance of stress for the

performance of farm animals. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, **44**, 219–227.

Boulton, K., Couto, E., Grimmer, A.J., Earley, R.L., Canario, A.V.M., Wilson, A.J. & Walling, C.A. (2015)

How integrated are behavioral and endocrine stress response traits? A repeated measures

approach to testing the stress-coping style model. *Ecology and Evolution*, **5**, 618–633.

Boulton, K., Grimmer, A.J., Rosenthal, G.G., Walling, C.A. & Wilson, A.J. (2014) How stable are

personalities? A multivariate view of behavioural variation over long and short timescales in the

sheepshead swordtail, Xiphophorus birchmanni. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, **68**, 791–

803.

Broom, D.M. & Johnson, K.G. (1993) Assessing welfare: short-term responses. *Stress and Animal*

Welfare, pp. 87–110. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht.

Burns, J.G. (2008) The validity of three tests of temperament in guppies (Poecilia reticulata). *Journal of*

comparative psychology, **122**, 344–356.

Busch, D.S. & Hayward, L.S. (2009) Stress in a conservation context: A discussion of glucocorticoid

actions and how levels change with conservation-relevant variables. *Biological Conservation*, **142**,

2844–2853.

Butler, D. (2009) asreml: asreml() fits the linear mixed model.

Carere, C., Groothuis, T.G.G., Möstl, E., Daan, S. & Koolhaas, J.M. (2003) Fecal corticosteroids in a

territorial bird selected for different personalities: Daily rhythm and the response to social stress.

Hormones and Behavior, **43**, 540–548.

Carter, A.J., Feeney, W.E., Marshall, H.H., Cowlishaw, G. & Heinsohn, R. (2013) Animal personality: What

are behavioural ecologists measuring? *Biological Reviews*, **88**, 465–475.

Cheverud, J.M. (1982) Phenotypic, Genetic, and Environmental Morphological Integration in the

Cranium. *Evolution*, **36**, 499.

Clinchy, M., Sheriff, M.J. & Zanette, L.Y. (2013) Predator-induced stress and the ecology of fear.

Functional Ecology, **27**, 56–65.

Cox, R.M., McGlothlin, J.W. & Bonier, F. (2016) Hormones as Mediators of Phenotypic and Genetic

Integration: An Evolutionary Genetics Approach. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, **56**, 126–

137.

Earley, R.L., Edwards, J.T., Aseem, O., Felton, K., Blumer, L.S., Karom, M. & Grober, M.S. (2006) Social

interactions tune aggression and stress responsiveness in a territorial cichlid fish (Archocentrus

nigrofasciatus). *Physiology and Behavior*, **88**, 353–363.

Frankham, R., Hemmer, H., Ryder, O.A., Cothran, E.G., Soulé, M.E., Murray, N.D. & Snyder, M. (1986)

Selection in captive populations. *Zoo Biology*, **5**, 127–138.

Fürtbauer, I., Pond, A., Heistermann, M. & King, A.J. (2015) Personality, plasticity and predation:

linking endocrine and behavioural reaction norms in stickleback fish. *Functional Ecology*, n/a-

n/a.

Hau, M. & Goymann, W. (2015) Endocrine mechanisms, behavioral phenotypes and plasticity: known

relationships and open questions. *Frontiers in Zoology*, **12**, S7.

Herbert-Read, J.E., Rosén, E., Szorkovszky, A., Ioannou, C.C., Rogell, B., Perna, A., Ramnarine, I.W.,

Kotrschal, A., Kolm, N., Krause, J. & Sumpter, D.J.T. (2017) How predation shapes the social

interaction rules of shoaling fish. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **284**,

20171126.

Hine, E., Chenoweth, S.F. & Blows, M.W. (2004) Multivariate quantitative genetics and the lek paradox:

genetic variance in male sexually selected traits of Drosophila serrata under field conditions.

Evolution, **58**, 2754–62.

von Horsten, S., Karl, T. & Pabst, R. (2003) Behavioral phenotyping of mice in pharmacological and

toxicological research. *Experimental and Toxicologic Pathology*, **55**, 69–83.

Houslay, T.M., Earley, R.L., Young, A.J. & Wilson, A.J. (2019) Habituation and individual variation in the

endocrine stress response in the Trinidadian guppy (Poecilia reticulata). *General and*

Comparative Endocrinology, **270**, 113–122.

Houslay, T.M., Vierbuchen, M., Grimmer, A.J., Young, A.J. & Wilson, A.J. (2018) Testing the stability of

behavioural coping style across stress contexts in the Trinidadian guppy. *Functional Ecology*, **32**,

424–438.

Houslay, T.M. & Wilson, A.J. (2017) Avoiding the misuse of BLUP in behavioural ecology. *Behavioral*

Ecology, **00**, 1–5.

Huether, G. (1996) The central adaptation syndrome: Psychosocial stress as a trigger for adaptive

modification of brain structure and brain function. *Progress in Neurobiology*, **48**, 569–612.

Hunt, J., Blows, M.W., Zajitschek, F., Jennions, M.D. & Brooks, R.C. (2007) Reconciling strong stabilizing

selection with the maintenance of genetic variation in a natural population of black field crickets

(Teleogryllus commodus). *Genetics*, **177**, 875–80.

Jones, R.B., Satterlee, D.G. & Ryder, F.H. (1994) Fear of Humans in Japanese-Quail Selected for Low or

High Adrenocortical-Response. *Physiology & Behavior*, **56**, 379–383.

Ketterson, E.D., Atwell, J.W. & McGlothlin, J.W. (2009) Phenotypic integration and independence:

Hormones, performance, and response to environmental change. *Integrative and Comparative*

Biology, **49**, 365–379.

Koolhaas, J.M. (2008) Coping style and immunity in animals: Making sense of individual variation.

Brain, Behavior, and Immunity, **22**, 662–667.

Koolhaas, J.M., de Boer, S.F., Buwalda, B. & Van Reenen, K. (2007) Individual variation in coping with

stress: A multidimensional approach of ultimate and proximate mechanisms. *Brain, Behavior and*

Evolution, **70**, 218–226.

Koolhaas, J.M., de Boer, S.F., Coppens, C.M. & Buwalda, B. (2010) Neuroendocrinology of coping styles:

Towards understanding the biology of individual variation. *Frontiers in Neuroendocrinology*, **31**,

307–321.

Koolhaas, J.M., Korte, S.M., De Boer, S.F., Van Der Vegt, B.J., Van Reenen, C.G., Hopster, H., De Jong, I.C.,

Ruis, M.A.W. & Blokhuis, H.J. (1999) Coping styles in animals: Current status in behavior and

stress- physiology. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, **23**, 925–935.

Korte, S.M., Koolhaas, J.M., Wingfield, J.C. & McEwen, B.S. (2005) The Darwinian concept of stress:

Benefits of allostasis and costs of allostatic load and the trade-offs in health and disease.

Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, **29**, 3–38.

Lande, R. & Arnold, S.J. (1983) The measurement of selection on correlated characters. *Evolution*, **37**,

1210–1226.

Ledón-Rettig, C.C., Pfennig, D.W., Chunco, A.J. & Dworkin, I. (2014) Cryptic genetic variation in natural

populations: a predictive framework. *Integrative and comparative biology*, **54**, 783–793.

Ledón-Rettig, C.C., Pfennig, D.W. & Crespi, E.J. (2010) Diet and hormonal manipulation reveal cryptic

genetic variation: Implications for the evolution of novel feeding strategies. *Proceedings of the*

Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, **277**, 3569–3578.

Mason, G.J. (2010) Species differences in responses to captivity: Stress, welfare and the comparative

method. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **25**, 713–721.

McEwen, B.S. & Wingfield, J.C. (2003) The concept of allostasis in biology and biomedicine. *Hormones*

and Behavior, **43**, 2–15.

McEwen, B.S. & Wingfield, J.C. (2010) What is in a name? Integrating homeostasis, allostasis and stress.

Hormones and Behavior, **57**, 105–111.

McGlothlin, J.W. & Ketterson, E.D. (2008) Hormone-mediated suites as adaptations and evolutionary

constraints. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological sciences*,

363, 1611–1620.

Mignon-Grasteau, S., Boissy, A., Bouix, J., Faure, J.M., Fisher, A.D., Hinch, G.N., Jensen, P., Le Neindre, P.,

Mormède, P., Prunet, P., Vandeputte, M. & Beaumont, C. (2005) Genetics of adaptation and

domestication in livestock. *Livestock Production Science*, **93**, 3–14.

Moberg, G.P. (2000) Biological response to stress: implications for animal welfare. *The biology of*

animal stress: basic principles and implications for animal welfare, pp. 1–21.

Möstl, E. & Palme, R. (2002) Hormones as indicator of stress. *Domestic animal and endocrinology*, **23**,

67–74.

Muir, W.M. & Craig, J. V. (1998) Improving animal well-being through genetic selection. *Poultry Science*,

77, 1781–1788.

Murdoch, D. & Chow, E.D. (2018) ellipse: Functions for Drawing Ellipses and Ellipse-like Confidence

Regions.

Oltenacu, P.A. & Algers, B. (2009) Selection for Increased Production and the Welfare of Dairy Cows:

Are New Breeding Goals Needed? *AMBIO: A Journal of the Human Environment*, **34**, 311–315.

Oswald, M.E., Singer, M. & Robison, B.D. (2013) The Quantitative Genetic Architecture of the Bold-Shy

Continuum in Zebrafish, Danio rerio. *PLoS ONE*, **8**, 1–10.

Øverli, Ø., Sørensen, C., Pulman, K.G.T., Pottinger, T.G., Korzan, W., Summers, C.H. & Nilsson, G.E. (2007)

Evolutionary background for stress-coping styles: Relationships between physiological,

behavioral, and cognitive traits in non-mammalian vertebrates. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral*

Reviews, **31**, 396–412.

Øverli, Ø., Winberg, S. & Pottinger, T.G. (2005) Behavioral and Neuroendocrine Correlates of Selection

for Stress Responsiveness in Rainbow Trout—a Review. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, **45**,

463–474.

Paaby, A.B. & Rockman, M. V. (2014) Cryptic genetic variation: Evolution's hidden substrate. *Nature*

Reviews Genetics, **15**, 247–258.

Perals, D., Griffin, A.S., Bartomeus, I. & Sol, D. (2017) Revisiting the open-field test: what does it really

tell us about animal personality? *Animal Behaviour*, **123**, 69–79.

Pottinger, T.G. & Carrick, T.R. (1999) Modification of the plasma cortisol response to stress in rainbow

trout by selective breeding. *General and Comparative Endocrinology*, **116**, 122–132.

Prentice, P.M., Houslay, T.M., Martin, J.G.A. & Wilson, A.J. (2020) Genetic variance for behavioural

'predictability' of stress response. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 1–11.

R Core Team. (2017) R: A language and environment for statistical computing.

Réale, D., Garant, D., Humphries, M.M., Bergeron, P., Careau, V. & Montiglio, P.-O. (2010) Personality

and the emergence of the pace-of-life syndrome concept at the population level. *Philosophical*

transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological sciences, **365**, 4051–4063.

Van Reenen, C.G., O'Connell, N.E., Van der Werf, J.T.N., Korte, S.M., Hopster, H., Jones, R.B. & Blokhuis,

H.J. (2005) Responses of calves to acute stress: Individual consistency and relations between

behavioral and physiological measures. *Physiology & Behavior*, **85**, 557–570.

Rex, A., Voigt, J.P., Voits, M. & Fink, H. (1998) Pharmacological evaluation of a modified open-field test

sensitive to anxiolytic drugs. *Pharmacology Biochemistry and Behavior*, **59**, 677–683.

Romero, L.M. (2004) Physiological stress in ecology: Lessons from biomedical research. *Trends in*

Ecology and Evolution, **19**, 249–255.

Romero, L.M., Dickens, M.J. & Cyr, N.E. (2009) The reactive scope model - A new model integrating

homeostasis, allostasis, and stress. *Hormones and Behavior*, **55**, 375–389.

Segerstrom, S.C. & Miller, G.E. (2004) Psychological stress and the human immune system: a meta-

analytic study of 30 years of inquiry. *Psychological bulletin*, **130**, 601–30.

Self, S.G. & Liang, K. (1987) Asymptotic properties of maximum likelihood estimators and likelihood

ratio tests under nonstandard conditions. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, **82**, 605–610.

Stamps, J.A. (2007) Growth-mortality tradeoffs and "personality traits" in animals. *Ecology Letters*, **10**,

355–363.

Stirling, D.G., Réale, D. & Roff, D.A. (2002) Selection, structure and the heritability of behaviour. *Journal*

of Evolutionary Biology, **15**, 277–289.

Taborsky, B., English, S., Fawcett, T.W., Kuijper, B., Leimar, O., McNamara, J.M., Ruuskanen, S. & Sandi,

C. (2020) Towards an Evolutionary Theory of Stress Responses. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*,

1–10.

Taff, C.C. & Vitousek, M.N. (2016) Endocrine Flexibility: Optimizing Phenotypes in a Dynamic World?

Trends in Ecology and Evolution, **31**, 476–488.

Tarlow, E.M. & Blumstein, D.T. (2007) Evaluating methods to quantify anthropogenic stressors on wild

animals. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, **102**, 429–451.

Thomson, J.S., Watts, P.C., Pottinger, T.G. & Sneddon, L.U. (2011) Physiological and genetic correlates of

boldness: Characterising the mechanisms of behavioural variation in rainbow trout,

Oncorhynchus mykiss. *Hormones and Behavior*, **59**, 67–74.

Toms, C.N., Echevarria, D.J. & Jouandot, D.J. (2010) A Methodology Review of Personality-Related

Studies in Fish: Focus on the Shy-Bold Axis of Behaviour. *Berkeley Planning Journal*, **26**, 12.

Trenzado, C.E., Carrick, T.R. & Pottinger, T.G. (2003) Divergence of endocrine and metabolic responses

to stress in two rainbow trout lines selected for differing cortisol responsiveness to stress.

General and Comparative Endocrinology, **133**, 332–340.

Veenema, A.H., Meijer, O.C., De Kloet, E.R., Koolhaas, J.M. & Bohus, B.G. (2003) Differences in basal and

stress-induced HPA regulation of wild house mice selected for high and low aggression.

Hormones and Behavior, **43**, 197–204.

Visscher, P.M. (2006) A Note on the Asymptotic Distribution of Likelihood Ratio Tests to Test Variance

Components. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, **9**, 490–495.

Walsh, B. & Blows, M.W. (2009) Abundant Genetic Variation + Strong Selection = Multivariate Genetic

Constraints: A Geometric View of Adaptation. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and*

Systematics, **40**, 41–59.

White, S.J., Houslay, T.M. & Wilson, A.J. (2018) Evolutionary genetics of personality in the Trinidadian

guppy II: sexual dimorphism and genotype-by-sex interactions. *Heredity*.

White, S.J., Kells, T.J. & Wilson, A.J. (2016) Metabolism, personality and pace of life in the Trinidadian

guppy, Poecilia reticulata. *Behaviour*, **153**, 1517–1543.

White, S.J., Pascall, D.J. & Wilson, A.J. (2020) Towards a comparative approach to the structure of

animal personality variation. *Behavioral Ecology*, **31**, 340–351.

White, S.J. & Wilson, A.J. (2018) Evolutionary genetics of personality in the Trinidadian guppy I:

maternal and additive genetic effects across ontogeny. *Heredity*.

Wickham, H. (2017) tidyverse: Easily Install and Load "Tidyverse" Packages.

Wilson, D.S., Clark, A.B., Coleman, K. & Dearstyne, T. (1994) Shyness and boldness in humans and other

animals. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **9**, 442–446.

Wilson, A.J., Réale, D., Clements, M.N., Morrissey, M.M., Postma, E., Walling, C.A., Kruuk, L.E.B. & Nussey,

D.H. (2009) An ecologist's guide to the animal model. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **79**, 13–26.

Wingfield, J.C. (2003) Control of behavioural strategies for capricious environments. *Animal Behaviour*,

66, 807–816.

Wingfield, J.C. & Kitaysky, A.S. (2002) Endocrine responses to unpredictable environmental events:

Stress or anti-stress hormones? *Integr Comp Biol*, **42**, 600–609.

Wingfield, J.C., Maney, D.L., Breuner, C.W., Jacobs, J.D., Lynn, S., Ramenofsky, M. & Richardson, R.D.

(1998) Ecological Bases of Hormone-Behavior Interactions: The "Emergency Life History Stage."

American Zoologist, **38**, 191–206.

Wolak, M.E. (2012) Nadiv: An R package to create relatedness matrices for estimating non-additive

genetic variances in animal models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **3**, 792–796.

Wolf, M., van Doorn, G.S., Leimar, O. & Weissing, F.J. (2007) Life-history trade-offs favour the evolution

of animal personalities. *Nature*, **447**, 581–4.

Zar, J.H. (1996) *Biostatistical Analysis*. Prentice-Hall International, Inc., London.

1030