1 Evolution of reduced mate-harming tendency of males in *Drosophila melanogaster* populations selected 2 for faster life history

3

4 Tanya Verma¹,

5 Anuska Mohapatra¹,

6 Harish Kumar Senapati¹,

7 Rakesh Kumar Muni²,

8 Purbasha Dasgupta¹

9 Bodhisatta Nandy^{1*}

10

11 ¹Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Berhampur, Odisha, India

12 ²Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh, India.

13 *Corresponding author, email address: nandy@iiserbpr.ac.in, ORCID iD: 0000-0002-9588-0316

14

15 **Authors Contribution:**

16 Bodhisatta Nandy and Tanya Verma conceptualized the study, designed the experiments, and wrote the
17 manuscript. Tanya Verma, Harish Kumar Senapati, Anuska Mohapatra, Rakesh Kumar Muni executed the
18 experiments. Tanya Verma, Purbasha Dasgupta and Bodhisatta Nandy analysed and interpreted the results.

19

20 **Acknowledgements:**

21 The study was financially supported by a research grant from Department of Science and Technology, Govt. of
22 India (INSPIRE Faculty award, Grant no. DST/INSPIRE/04/2013/000520). We thank Subhasish Halder for help
23 in the experiments and data analysis. We thank Anish Koner and Rabisankar Pal for help in experimental
24 observations. We thank Syed Zeeshan Ali for his valuable comments on a previous version of this manuscript
25 and on the analyses. TV thanks Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Berhampur for financial
26 support in the form of Junior and Senior Research Fellowship. PD thanks Council for Scientific and Industrial
27 Research, Government of India for financial support in the form of Junior and Senior Research Fellowship. AM
28 thanks Department of Science and Technology, Govt. of India for financial support in the form of INSPIRE
29 SHE scholarship.

30

31 Abstract

32 Detrimental effect of males on female, often termed mate-harm, is a hallmark of sexual conflict. Allowed to
 33 evolve unchecked, mate harming traits are predicted to bring down average fitness of a population, unless
 34 mitigated by the evolution of resistance in females. In addition, life history may also modulate sexual conflict,
 35 but the mechanism is not clearly understood. Here we investigated the evolution of mate-harm in a set of
 36 experimentally evolved laboratory populations of *Drosophila melanogaster* wherein a faster aging has evolved
 37 in response to >1000 generations of selection for faster development and early reproduction. We quantified
 38 mortality and fecundity of Oregon R females held with evolved (ACO) and ancestral males (CO) to show that
 39 the evolved males are significantly less detrimental to their mates. We compared our results from the ACO
 40 males with that from a phenocopied version of the ancestral regime (CCO) to show that only part of the
 41 observed difference in mate-harm can be attributed to the evolved difference in body size. We further show that
 42 the reduction in mate harming ability evolved despite an increase in courtship activity, especially early in life.
 43 We discuss the causative role of an evolved reproductive schedule and altered breeding ecology.

44

45 **Keywords:** Sexual antagonism, Faster aging, Life history traits, Courtship behaviour, Sexual selection.

46

47

48 Introduction

49 In many sexually reproducing species, the traits that maximize Darwinian fitness in males, may cause
 50 detrimental side-effects to their mates resulting in sexual conflict (Parker 1979; Johnstone and Keller 2000;
 51 Chapman et al. 2003; Arnqvist and Rowe 2005; Parker 2006; Queller and Strassmann 2018). Herein, both sexes
 52 are selected to evolve sex specific traits often resulting in antagonistic co-evolution between the sexes (Parker
 53 1979; Rice 1992; Civetta and Singh 1995; Rice 1996; Arnqvist and Rowe 2002, 2005; Rönn et al. 2007), which
 54 is expected to lead to the evolution of costly male competitive traits, which are sexually antagonistic (SA) as
 55 well. Theories of sexual conflict (SC) explicitly predict the evolution of mate-harming ability in males (Jiang et
 56 al. 2011; Nandy et al. 2013b) and the resulting evolution of female resistance (Wigby and Chapman 2004;
 57 Nandy et al. 2013a; Dougherty et al. 2017; Chapman 2018; Rostant et al. 2020). However, in absence of female
 58 counter evolution in response to the evolution of increasingly competitive (and hence, harmful) males, SC can
 59 lead to the extinction of a population/species, an outcome dubbed as the “tragedy of commons” (Le Galliard et
 60 al. 2005; Rankin and Kokko 2006; Rankin et al. 2007). Populations subjected to SC can avert this debilitating
 61 outcome by evolving female resistance (Holland and Rice 1999; Wigby and Chapman 2004; Friberg 2005;
 62 Rankin et al. 2011; Dougherty et al. 2017; Snow et al. 2019). There is a second way in which a population can
 63 avert the tragedy of commons. The cost of the SA traits, and their genetic and phenotypic correlations with other
 64 life history traits (Wedell et al. 2006; Bonduriansky et al. 2008; Adler and Bonduriansky 2014; Lemaître et al.
 65 2020) can, in theory, limit the evolution of such traits. Life history itself can constrain the evolution of SA traits
 66 by putting restrictions on the mating system and breeding ecology. Empirical tests of such predictions are too
 67 few to draw any generalized conclusion.

68
 69 SC often involves males coercing or manipulating females to mate at a sub-optimally high rate (Koene 2012).
 70 Males, in such cases, use morphological and/or behavioural traits such as, persistent courtship, extravagant
 71 display, traumatic insemination, and even deception (Arnqvist and Rowe 2005). In addition to the physical toll,
 72 a physiological/chemical harassment may also be imposed on the females by the seminal fluid proteins
 73 transferred by the males in many species (Poiani 2006). For example, in bumblebee (*Bombus terrestris*),
 74 grasshoppers (*Gomphocerus rufus*), and fruit flies (*Drosophila melanogaster*) accessory gland proteins/peptides
 75 transferred by males during copulation are known to reduce female mating receptivity, increase egg production
 76 immediately after mating and reduce lifespan (Chapman et al. 1995; Wolfner 1997; Hartmann and Loher 1999;
 77 Baer et al. 2000; Wolfner 2002). Though detrimental to the females, these traits are thought to be male

78 adaptations to competition for mating and/or fertilization. However, they are often costly to express and bear.
 79 For example, synthesis of a functional ejaculate imposes a non-trivial energetic cost on the males (Dewsbury
 80 1982; Andersson 1994; Arnqvist and Rowe 2005). Cordts and Partridge (1996) found that increased courtship
 81 reduces longevity in male *Drosophila melanogaster*. Clutton-Brock and Langley (1997) showed that males pay
 82 longevity cost due to mating and courtship activity in tsetse flies (*Glossina morsitans morsitans*). Evidently, the
 83 cost is also expressed as increased mortality rate due to physical wear and tear (Clutton-Brock and Langley
 84 1997; Stutt and Siva-Jothy 2001; Tatar et al. 2006), increased susceptibility to pathogenic infections
 85 (Jennions and Petrie 2000; Arnqvist and Rowe 2005; Rönn et al. 2007), and/or environmental stresses
 86 (García-Roa et al. 2019; Vincent et al. 2020), increased risk of predation (Magnhagen 1991). Several other
 87 studies have also shown that investment in manipulative or defensive traits may come at the cost of survival
 88 (Promislow 1992; Pitnick et al. 2001; Adler and Bonduriansky 2011, 2014; Duxbury et al. 2017).
 89
 90 Much of the above-mentioned cost is expressed in the form of trade-offs between SA traits and other life history
 91 traits (Bonduriansky et al. 2008). Allocation of resources in somatic maintenance has been conjectured to
 92 constrain the potential for the reproductive traits, including those involved in SC (Partridge and Farquhar 1981;
 93 Stearns 1989; Cordts and Partridge 1996; Clutton-Brock and Langley 1997). This would imply that populations
 94 having longer lifespan and slower rate of aging, may not be able to increase investment in SA traits even if there
 95 is selection favouring SA traits (Rose and Charlesworth 1981; Ernsting and Isaaks 1991; Kirkwood and Rose
 96 1991; Service 1993; Tatar et al. 1993; Kotiaho 2001; Hunt et al. 2004). Similarly, populations with faster aging
 97 and shortened lifespan due to reduced investment in somatic maintenance are expected to have the potential to
 98 invest more in SA traits, especially when there is ample selection for male competitive ability. Though, variation
 99 in lifespan and aging rate among males appears to reflect variation in reproductive investment (Alcock 1996;
 100 Cordts and Partridge 1996; Clutton-Brock and Langley 1997; Prowse and Partridge 1997; Hunt et al. 2004;
 101 Bonduriansky and Brassil 2005), whether such correlation can also be extended to SA male traits is not clear.
 102
 103 Apart from the trade-offs, life history itself can modulate the extent of SC in a population by (a) constraining the
 104 breeding ecology, and (b) modulating the degree to which the sexes interact (Parker 2006; Wedell et al. 2006;
 105 Long et al. 2010). In sexual species, reproductive schedule may constrain the breeding ecology. For example, a
 106 semelparous species with only one breeding season may effectively be monogamous and hence, experience
 107 reduced sexual conflict (Montrose et al. 2004; Clutton-Brock 2017; Griffith 2019). Long, Pischedda et al. (2010)

showed that even in *Drosophila* laboratory populations, which are effectively semelparous, timing of mating from the semelparous breeding window, could significantly alter the sexually antagonistic outcomes in females. As sexual antagonism depends on the physical interaction between the sexes, factors that affect male-female encounter rate are expected to be important determinants of the intensity of SC in a population. This has been explicitly shown in the experimental microcosm systems of *D. melanogaster*, where complexity of the physical environment and access to refuge were found to bring down SC (Byrne et al. 2008; Yun et al. 2017). More recently, García-Roa, Chirinos et al. (2019) showed that in *Drosophila melanogaster* the intensity of SC to decline at elevated temperature by reducing coercive male interaction on females, such as, persistent courtship and mating attempt. The importance of intersexual interaction in SC has been beautifully demonstrated in the natural populations and mesocosm system of damselflies of the genus *Calopteryx*. (Gomez-Llano et al. 2018) have shown that male induced harassment in *C. splendens* was reduced by the presence of heterospecific males of the species *C. virgo*, simply because survival of heterospecific males reduced the male-female interaction in *C. splendens*. Animals with prolonged breeding life should have greater scope of intersexual interactions and hence, higher scope of SC. Importantly, cost of mating, often an indication of sexual antagonism and the amount of resource allocation in reproductive and sexual traits, may be a function of the breeding system. In mammals, males under polygamous mating system on an average pay higher cost of competition than under monogamous mating system whereas for females it is similar under both types of mating systems. Bonduriansky (2014) showed that change in background mortality rate, resulting from increased predation pressure, could result in a short-term relaxation of SC. Population with low female life expectancy, increased mate harm by males is expected to bring down the average fitness of the population, resulting in a situation resembling the hitherto reported “tragedy of commons” (Rankin and Kokko 2006). Under such scenario selection, can in principle, favour males that induce less harm to females. Therefore, there are myriad ways in which life history, i.e., scheduling of reproduction and mortality throughout the life of an animal, can affect SC in a population.

Here, we investigated the evolution of SA male traits in a set of experimentally evolved populations of *D. melanogaster* having substantially faster pre-adult development and reduced lifespan compared to their ancestors due to selection for faster development and early reproduction for over 1000 generations. These populations – ACO₁₋₅, have been extensively investigated for a range of life history traits since early 1990’s. The ACO flies, both males as well as females, are known to have >18% reduced mean lifespan (Chippindale et al. 1997) compared to the ancestral CO flies. In effect, ACO life history has been selected for a “live fast-die

138 young” strategy (see Methods section for details). We therefore argue that the ACO-CO system is an ideal
 139 system to investigate the problem developed in the previous paragraphs. In addition to being a well-documented
 140 system of populations where divergence of life history traits is well ascertained. Burke et al. (2010) also
 141 established the genomic basis of much of these reported divergences. In the present study, we investigated the
 142 divergence between ACO and CO with respect to the mate-harming ability and related components of
 143 reproductive behaviour in males. We specifically asked – do males of the ACO populations differ from the
 144 ancestral males in terms of their mate harming ability? A reasonable assumption is that the faster aging ACO
 145 males should have the ability to invest more in competitive traits, especially early in life because the ACO
 146 regime imposes selection for early life fitness components. There is substantial scope of sexual selection in this
 147 regime. Therefore, with significant reduction in female life expectancy and increased scope of early life
 148 scramble competition among males for mating success, how did ACO populations escaped tragedy of
 149 commons? In order to investigate these two fundamental questions, we measured the extent of mate-harm
 150 imposed on the females by the experimentally evolved males. We further investigated qualitative and
 151 quantitative differences in courtship behaviour of the ACO and CO males. We used standard laboratory line
 152 Oregon R females as a common background. Importantly, we compared all the measured traits across the
 153 evolved and ancestral populations at five different age-points to assess the importance of evolution of the age-
 154 specific expression of the SA traits under altered life history.

155

156 **Methods**

157 As mentioned above, the investigation reported here used ten laboratory populations of *Drosophila*
 158 *melanogaster* – five ACO populations and their matched ancestral CO populations. These populations were
 159 kindly provided to us by Prof. Michael R. Rose of University of California, Irvine, USA. They were maintained
 160 for 20 (CO) and 80 (ACO) generations in our laboratory before starting the experiment. The details of
 161 population history can be found in (Chippindale et al. 1997). A brief description is provided in Figure S1 in the
 162 supplementary information. On November 1991, selection for accelerated development were initiated on five
 163 replicate populations – CO₁₋₅ (subscript refers to replicate identity, (Rose et al. 1992). These populations are
 164 maintained on a four-week discrete generation cycle, under 24-hours light, 25 °C (± 1), ~80% relative humidity
 165 on standard banana-jaggery-yeast medium. Larval density is controlled at ~70 per 8ml medium in each culture
 166 vial. 40 such vials constitute a population. On day 12 following egg culture, adults from all 40 vials are
 167 transferred to a population cage. The CO flies take about 9-10 days to complete pre-adult development and

therefore, by day 12 virtually all surviving flies finish development and are in adult stage. A population cage is supplied with banana food on a petri dish. From day 14 of the generation cycle, an old food plate is replaced with a fresh one every alternate day until day 24. On day 26, food plate smeared with live-yeast paste (paste made with water) is produced in the cage, replacing the old food. Approximately 48 hours following this, i.e., on day 28, oviposition substrate (two pieces of banana food) is given inside the cage and a window of 18 hours is allowed for oviposition. Eggs are collected from these ovipositions substrates, and cultured in fresh food vials to start the next generation. The derived ACO populations employed a selection paradigm that involved strong selection for faster pre-adult development (Chippindale et al. 1997) in addition to a much reduced, viz., approximately 24 hours of adult life. Briefly, the ACO populations are maintained under a 9-day discrete generation cycle. The pre-adult development takes about 7-8 days, following which the adult flies are transferred to a population cage. This cage is provided with standard banana food pieces presented as oviposition substrate seeded with *ad-lib* amount of live-yeast paste. Eggs are collected following 24 hours of introducing the flies into the cage, to start the next generation. All other components of the ecology of the ACO regime are identical to those of the CO regime. The ACO populations had passed through >1200 generations by the time the following experiments were conducted.

183

184 Generation of experimental flies:

All experiments described here were done following the standard paradigm of experimental evolution assays in which both ACO and CO populations were passed through one generation of standard rearing, included a 14-day rearing schedule for CO's and 13-day rearing schedule for ACO's, to equalize the non-genetic parental effects. All experimental flies were reared at a density of 70 eggs per 8ml medium in a vial under the standard population maintenance regime described above. In all assays, to account for the difference in development time between ACO and CO flies (Chippindale et al. 1997), ACO eggs were collected two days following the collection of the CO eggs. This roughly synchronized the emergence of adult flies. Hereon, age of the adult flies refers to post-eclosion age, in days, unless mentioned otherwise.

193

We adopted an experimental design in which all male traits including the extent of sexually antagonistic effect of the experimental males was assessed against a common female background. Females from the standard *D. melanogaster* line Oregon R were used for this purpose. Eggs were collected from Oregon R line and females

197 were raised in the same manner as that followed for the CO and ACO males stated above, including the larval
198 density of 70 per 8 ml food in a vial. All experimental females were age-matched with the experimental males.
199
200 Past selection has resulted in a considerable reduction in the body size of the ACO flies in both sexes
201 (Passananti and Matos 2004; Burke et al. 2010), also see body weight data in the results section. Since smaller
202 males are known to be less harming to their mates (Pitnick and García-González 2002; Friberg and Arnqvist
203 2003), the difference in body size between ACO and CO males was a confounding factor in our mate-harm
204 assay. We adopted a conservative strategy by introducing an additional treatment in our mate-harm assay. In this
205 treatment, we used smaller CO males having comparable body size as ACO males (hereafter referred to as
206 phenocopied CO males, or CCO males). The phenocopied CO males were generated by growing them at the
207 larval density of 240 per 3ml food in a standard vial. All the assays mentioned in later sections except courtship
208 frequency and components of courtship behaviour were conducted using males belonging to three regimes –
209 ACO, CO and CCO. The dry body weight at eclosion of the CCO males were not identical to that of the ACO
210 males (see dry body weight results below). However, both ACO and CCO males were found to be smaller
211 compared to the ancestral CO males by a comparable degree, approximately 50-54% lighter than the CO males.
212 To put it simply, the evolved ACO males in our experiments were compared with the ancestral males as well as
213 ancestral males which were phenocopied for smaller body size. We argue that if the difference in a trait between
214 ACO and CO regimes is qualitatively identical to that observed between the CCO and CO regimes, the ACO-
215 CO difference can be majorly attributed to the evolved body size difference. For example, if both ACO and
216 CCO males induce reduced mate harm to the experimental females compared to that induced by the CO males,
217 the evolved difference in the ACO males' harming ability can be attributed to the smaller body size.
218
219 All the adult flies used in the experiments mentioned below were collected as virgins. At the onset of eclosion
220 (emergence from pupal shell), virgin males and females were collected within 4-6 hours of eclosion. Flies were
221 held in groups of 10 individuals per vial with ample food until the assay setup with alternate day food-change.
222 All adult collections were done under light CO₂ anaesthesia. The design and details of the individual assays are
223 mentioned below. A generalized experimental plan is depicted in Fig.1.
224
225 Assay Setup:

When adult flies were 1-2 days old, the assay vials were set up by combining males and females in food vials. Each of these vials, therefore, had ten males and ten females. 2 sets of vials (each set has 10 vials) were set up for a given population. The vials were left undisturbed for one hour and the flies were allowed to mate. Mating was visually observed. No video recording was done. Vials where all ten females did not successfully copulate were removed, leaving the final number of vials at this stage at 18-20 for each population. The entire set of these vials were divided into two subsets – (a) Single Exposure (SE: 8-10 vials) and (b) Continuous Exposure (CE: 8-10 vials) treatments. In the SE set, after completion of the first round of mating, sexes were separated under light CO₂ anaesthesia, and females were retained in the same vial while the males were discarded. The CE set of vials was retained without separating the sexes. CE flies was also exposed to light CO₂ anaesthesia to equalize the handling across the two sets. The SE and CE vials were maintained, with alternate day food-change, for twenty days. In these twenty days, mortality, fecundity and behaviour components were recorded (see below). Throughout the experiment, except sorting of sexes, all other fly handling including combination of sexes and transfer of flies from spent vial to fresh food vials were done without anaesthesia.

239

240 Fecundity and mortality in test females:

Female mortality was recorded daily for the all twenty days of the assay. Dead flies were removed from the vials by aspiration. Fecundity was recorded in approximately five day intervals, on day 1, 5, 10, 15 and 20. On each of these days, flies (only females for SE and both sexes for CE set) from a vial were transferred to a fresh food-vial (hereafter, fecundity vial) and allowed to lay eggs for a duration of ~24 hours after which they were transferred again into a fresh food-vial to continue the assay (except day 20 count). The fecundity vials were then frozen immediately to stop further development. The eggs were later counted under a microscope. Per capita fecundity (PCF) on a given assay-day was calculated for a vial by dividing the total number of eggs in that vial by the number of females alive at the start of that day. PCF values were taken as the unit of analysis. For the analysis of the mortality data, proportion of females (i.e., out of a total ten in a vial) that were recorded dead at the end of the 20-day period in a vial, i.e., cumulative female mortality, was taken as the unit of analysis.

251

252 Courtship frequency:

Courtship frequency (CF) was measured as the average number of courtship bouts a male was found to perform per unit time. The CE vials were used to measure CF, and hence, Oregon R females were used as a common female background against which CF of ACO and CO males were measured. Since body size is not known to

systematically affect CF, CCO males were excluded from this assay. CF observations were done on day 2, 6, 11, 16 and 20 following mating set-up. During an observation, a given vial was measured four times in the following manner. A randomly picked male was observed for 15 seconds – during these fifteen seconds the number of bouts of independent courtship (see later) events were counted. This was repeated four times for a vial. These four counts constituted one observation for that vial. An average for one such observation was calculated by dividing the total count by four, yielding an observation value (C_i). The observation on a given vial was repeated every 90 minutes on a given assay day (i.e., day-2, 6, 11, 16 and 20) for four times ($n_c = 4$). This resulted in four C_i values. Mean courtship frequency (CF) was calculated for a replicate vial using the following function:

$$CF = \frac{\sum C_i}{n_c}$$

The observations were manual and did not involve any video recording. As the ACO and CO flies are visibly different, blind-folded observation did not have any utility and hence, was not adopted. Observers were well-trained to spot any of the following components of courtship behaviour: oriented toward female, following/chasing female, wing vibration, genitalia licking and attempted copulation (von Schilcher and Dow 1977). Performance of any of these behavioural components is counted as one bout of courtship. During the observation, ‘two independent bouts of courtship’ is defined as the courtship performed to two different females by the same male or behaviour belonging to two separate courtship sequence.

Pattern of courtship behaviour in ACO and CO males:

To investigate the qualitative difference in courtship behaviour ACO and CO regimes, we observed and quantified different components of courtship ritual in males in a separate trial. Courtship behaviour in male *D. melanogaster* is characterised by a complex series of discrete courtship components. In this assay, we quantified the frequencies of the five discrete components of courtship – (1) oriented toward female, (2) following/chasing female, (3) wing vibration, (4) genitalia licking, (5) attempted copulation (Ruedi and Hughes 2008). In addition to these five courtship components, males usually show three additional behavioural states – motionless (m), randomly moving (rm), copulation (c), which are not part of the courtship ritual. The observation vials were set up by introducing a 1-2 day old virgin male (either ACO or CO) and a 3-4 day old virgin Oregon R female in a fresh food vial without using anaesthesia. We started courtship observation after approximately 90 minutes from the initial introduction of the pair to the observation vial. This duration is usually sufficient for all females to undergo a single copulation. During observation, the behavioural state of the male in an observation vial was

recorded by instantaneous scans. A given male was observed every 30 seconds for 30 minutes, resulting in a total of 60 observations for a male. This assay was done for all ten populations, i.e., all five replicate population pairs (ACO₁₋₅ and corresponding CO replicate populations). In each population, 60 males were observed. Multiple trained observers (co-authors and volunteers) carried out the observations manually. However, for a given male all 60 observations were carried out by a single observer. Vials were randomly assigned among the observers to minimize observer bias in the data. Courtship component frequency (CCF: proportional contribution of a given component to the courtship behaviour in a treatment) was calculated by using the following definition:

$$CCF = \frac{(total\ count\ of\ a\ component)}{(total\ number\ of\ observations) - (total\ count\ of\ m, rm, c)}$$

Thus, the assay resulted in 60 CCF values for each of the five courtship components, for a population. These values were used as the unit of analysis.

Statistical analysis:

Cumulative female mortality data were analysed using three-factor mixed model Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) where Male regime (levels: CO, ACO and CCO) and male exposure type (levels: SE and CE) were modelled as fixed factors, and block (level: 1-5) was modelled as a random factor. Dry body weight, and CCF were analysed using two-factor mixed model ANOVA, with Male regime and block modelled as fixed and random factors respectively. As female mortality and CCF data were calculated as proportion values, analysis was performed following arcsine square root transformation (Sokal and Rohlf 1995; Zar 1999). All multiple comparisons were done using Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD). All these analyses were done using Statistica (Tibco Software Inc., version 13.3).

Fecundity (i.e., Per Capita Fecundity, PCF) data was analysed in two ways. First, PCF pooled across the five age classes, i.e., cumulative fecundity was analysed using three-factor mixed model ANOVA with male regime and exposure type (i.e., SE or CE) were modelled as fixed factors, and block was treated as a random factor. Secondly, to assess the effect of continued exposure to males on female fecundity, age-specific PCF was analysed only for the CE set. Initial analysis indicated significant block-to-block variation (see Results section and supplementary information, Table S3). Hence, each block was separately analysed using a linear mixed-effect model in R version 3.6.1 using lme4 package (R Development Core Team, 2019) (Bates et al. 2015) and lmerTest (Kuznetsova et al. 2017). In the model, PCF was modelled as response variable; male regime, age,

and their two-way interactions as fixed factors; Vial id (replicate vial identity) as a random factor. Following model was used for analysis:

316

PCF~Male regime + age +Male regime:age + (1|Vial id)

318

To analyse the effect of male regime and age on courtship frequency, CF (Courtship Frequency) was also analysed using lmerTest and lme4 package in R. CF was modelled as response variable with male regime, age and their two-way interaction as fixed factors and block including all its interactions as random factor. Vial id (replicate vial identity) nested within block was fitted as a random factor. Analysis indicated that block and its interactions were not significant contributors to the overall variance. Detailed analysis with random effects is provided in supplementary information (Table S6). The following Linear-mixed model was used to analyse CF:

325

CF ~ Male regime + age + Male regime:age + (1|Block/Vial id) + (1|Block:Male regime) + (1|Block:age) + (1|Block:Male regime:age)

328

Post-hoc analysis was done using Tukey's HSD using emmeans package (Lenth 2018).

330

331 **Results:**

Both the fixed factors, i.e., regime and male exposure type, were found to have significant effects on cumulative female mortality (Table 1). In addition, the effect of the male regime × male exposure type interaction was also found to be significant (Table 1). Tukey's HSD indicated that under SE condition, the differences in cumulative female mortality across the three male regimes were not statistically significant. The recorded mortality under SE was generally low (cumulative mortality <10%). Under CE condition, however, it was substantially higher, especially when the females were held with CO males (>24% higher compared to either ACO or CCO males, Fig. 2a). The difference between ACO and CCO treatments was not significant. As the analysis indicated a significant effect of male regime × male-exposure type × block three-way interaction (Table 1), the results from each block were analysed separately using two-factor ANOVA (male regime and male-exposure type as fixed factors). The detailed outcome of these analyses can be found in the supplementary material (Table S5). Briefly, block 3 failed to show any effect of the regime, results from all other blocks were qualitatively identical.

343

344 Dry body weight of males (ACO, CCO and CO) were measured at eclosion. We found significant effect of
345 regime ($p < 0.001$, Table 1). Pairwise comparisons using Tukey's HSD showed that both ACOs and CCOs are
346 significantly smaller than COs (weight in mg, mean $\pm$ standard error of mean, ACO: 0.162 ± 0.003 ; CO: 0.271
347 ± 0.004 ; CCO: 0.131 ± 0.005). Qualitatively the pattern of dry body weight was similar in all the blocks, but we
348 found significant interaction of regime $\times$ block. Hence, summary table of each block is provided in
349 supplementary information (Table S1, Fig. S2).

351 Results of the three-factor mixed model ANOVA revealed significant effects of male regime, male exposure
352 type, and male regime $\times$ male exposure type interaction on cumulative fecundity (Table 1). Multiple
353 comparisons using Tukey's HSD indicated that under single mating exposure (i.e., SE), the three regime did not
354 differ significantly from each other. Under CE condition, females held with ACO males were found to have
355 $\sim 13.65\%$ higher cumulative PCF compared to the females held with CO males. Cumulative PCF of females held
356 with CCO males were statistically not different from that of the females held with CO males (Fig. 2b). Results of
357 the linear mixed model analysis on age-specific PCF of the females in the CE set were more complex (see
358 supplementary information). While in each block significant effects of male regime, age and male regime $\times$ age
359 interaction were detected, there was little consistent trend across blocks (Table S4). However, in at least three of
360 the five age points, females held with ACO males showed a significantly higher PCF compared to the other two
361 treatments, particularly at later age points (Fig. S3).

363 Linear mixed model analysis on the courtship frequency (i.e., CF) results showed significant effects of male
364 regime, age, and regime $\times$ age interaction (Table 2). Tukey's HSD results showed that courtship frequency of
365 ACO males is significantly higher, particularly at early age classes than the CO males (Fig. 3a). Two factor
366 mixed model ANOVA performed on the CCF results indicated an interesting effect of male regime. Male
367 regime was not found to have a significant effect on four of the five courtship components (Table 3). However,
368 we found a significant male regime effect on attempt-to-copulation ($p = 0.029$), where ACOs showed $\sim 15\%$
369 higher copulation attempts compared to COs (Fig. 3b, Table 3).

371 Discussion

372 Our results showed that ACO males are clearly far less harassing compared to the ancestral CO males. The
373 females held with ACO males showed significantly less mortality and higher fecundity during the assay period.

374 Interestingly, ACO males were found to be more active in courtship, especially early in life. This age-specific
375 pattern of change in courtship activity is consistent with the theory of selection for early life fitness components
376 in the ACO males. Despite several previous investigations linking courtship activity to the level of mate-harm
377 caused by *D. melanogaster* males, ACO males were found to be substantially less harming, in spite of having
378 higher courtship activity.

379

380 Though faster aging ACO males are expected to have the potential to invest a greater proportion of their
381 resources in competitive (and hence, sexually antagonistic) traits, their impact on female mortality and fecundity
382 was quite contrary to this prediction. One potential explanation of this observation is that the ACO males are
383 substantially smaller and are hence, less harming - measured in terms of the mates' survival rate and
384 reproductive output. Such an effect of body size on harming ability of the males in this system has been
385 previously shown (Pitnick and García-González 2002). Our results, however, suggest a more complex picture.
386 Based on the ACO vs. CCO comparison, we could attribute only the mortality effect to the reduced size of the
387 ACO males. However, the fecundity effect of the ACO males was quite unique. Average cumulative fecundity
388 of females held with the ACO males was found to be significantly higher than that with CO males. However, no
389 significant difference was found between cumulative fecundity of females held with CO and CCO males. Thus,
390 it is reasonable to deduce that the difference in reproductive output of the experimental females held with ACO
391 males and those held with CO males was unlikely to be an outcome of the size difference between the males
392 from the two regimes. Thus, either due to reduction in size or due to changes in traits unrelated to size, or both,
393 ACO males are significantly less harming to their mates.

394

395 *D. melanogaster* males are known to physically coerce females through persistent courtship (Fowler and
396 Partridge 1989). Multiple lines of evidence have also shown the correlation between the degree of mate-harm
397 and intensity of courtship behavior (Nandy et al. 2013b; MacPherson et al. 2018). For example, Nandy et al.
398 (2013b) experimentally evolved a set of populations under male biased operational sex ratio that resulted in
399 increased harming ability in males, along with increased courtship frequency. MacPherson et al. (2018) showed
400 that females seemed to avoid mate harm when they were held in complex holding chambers with ample hiding
401 opportunities, possibly by escaping direct exposure to persistent courtship. Different components of courtship
402 behaviour have been found to have ample genetic variation both in natural and laboratory populations of
403 *Drosophila* (Markow and Hanson 1981; Gromko 1987; Ritchie and Gleason 1995; Colegrave et al. 2000; Snook

et al. 2005; Dai et al. 2008). There has been ample evidence suggesting evolvability of courtship behaviour in *D. melanogaster* (Bedhomme et al. 2008; Nandy et al. 2013b). However, how evolution of courtship behaviour can contribute to the evolution of mate harming ability of the males is not clear. The fact that ACO males, in our study, were found to be less harming despite being more active in courting females, is a direct challenge to the conventional wisdom that draws a one-on-one connection between courtship and physical component of mate harm. Not only ACO males courted females more frequently, they also attempted copulation more often - a component of courtship that appears to be more coercive. Hence, our results indicate that the relationship between courtship behaviour and mate harm is more complex than previously anticipated.

In addition to persistent courtship, seminal fluid proteins (Sfp) transferred to females during copulation have been shown to bring down female survival rate (Chapman et al. 1995; Wigby and Chapman 2005; Wigby et al. 2020). Changes in Sfp content of the ejaculate can potentially explain reduction in harming ability of the ACO males. At this point we do not have data on Sfp to directly test this hypothesis. However, in a separate assay, we observed that copulation between an ACO male and a female from the corresponding population is significantly shorter compared to that between a pair from a CO population (see SI for more details, Fig. S4 and Table S7, mean CD in minutes $\pm$ SEM, ACO: 16.15 ± 0.657 ; CO: 20.32 ± 0.623). Variation in copulation duration has been correlated with variation in the amount of Sfp transferred (Singh and Singh 2004; Friberg 2006; Bretman et al. 2009; Bretman et al. 2010). In principle, reduction in post-copulatory sexual selection can bring about changes in Sfp and/or copulatory traits in ACOs. Monogamy and female biased operational sex ratio have already been shown to lead to reduction in both harming ability and investment in certain attributes of seminal fluid content including Sfp (Holland and Rice 1999; Wigby and Chapman 2004; Crudgington et al. 2005; Linklater et al. 2007). However, it is unrealistic to suggest that our ACO populations have a monogamous breeding system and hence, post-copulatory sexual selection is absent. Our observations suggest that females in ACO populations undergo remating quite regularly (Fig. S5). However, the breeding ecology of this regime is vastly different from the ancestral regime. In contrast to the ancestral CO regime, where breeding life is approximately 19 days of adult life, ACO flies get 24-36 hours to reproduce after becoming adults. In this incredibly short breeding life, males are selected to be reproductively active and invest heavily on competitive traits that maximize mating success. Our courtship frequency results support this hypothesis. However, given that there is strong last male sperm precedence in this species (Manier et al. 2010) and ample female remating, the exact nature and intensity of post-copulatory sexual selection is not clear.

434

435 In an independent investigation on a similar set of experimentally evolved populations, (Mital et al. 2021a;
436 Mital et al. 2021b) found that the intensity of sexual selection and the degree of sexual antagonism to be lower
437 in populations selected for faster development and very early reproduction. The parallel between our results and
438 those of (Mital et al. 2021a; Mital et al. 2021b) is somewhat expected, and is a robust proof in support of our
439 theory. However, even more interesting is the difference. Whereas (Mital et al. 2021a) could almost entirely
440 assign the reduction in sexual antagonism in their FEJ populations to the reduction in body size, our results
441 point to a different explanation. Comparison of the FEJ and the ACO regime is interesting. In ACO regime, due
442 to a fixed egg-to-adult development time window of eight days, selection for faster pre-adult development has
443 not been strong for the last several hundred generations. However, FEJ regime has a strong directional selection
444 for faster development. As a result, flies under the FEJ regime have probably evolved a more extreme reduction
445 in size, amounting to resource deprivation that did not allow the evolution of male competitive traits, including
446 courtship (Mital et al. 2021a). In addition, whereas the FEJ regime practically ensures life-long monogamy, we
447 observed substantial amount of promiscuity in ACO flies. Hence, it is possible that ACO males were
448 specifically selected for traits that maximize mating and fertilization success in such a way that reduces
449 incidental mate-harm. Such results clearly show the importance of an incredibly nuanced breeding ecology of
450 animals, and its connection to life history.

451

452 Theories have long predicted a connection between life history and sexual conflict. Most often, the trade-offs
453 between costly SA traits and one or more life history trait(s), most notably somatic maintenance, has taken the
454 centre stage in such discussions (Bonduriansky et al. 2008; Maklakov and Lummaa 2013; Hooper et al. 2017).
455 However, if the aim is to understand and predict the evolutionary outcome of changes in life history on SA
456 traits, perhaps a more important question is, how a given alteration in life history affects the breeding system,
457 and by extension, the ecology of sexual selection. The secondary outcomes in that case can affect a wider range
458 of sexually antagonistic traits, potentially independent of trade-offs. Our results on the reduced mate harming
459 ability in ACO males is evidence in support of this thesis.

460

461 Rankin and Kokko (2006, 2007) very explicitly showed a seemingly obvious outcome of SC, viz., population
462 extinction due to unchecked evolution of sexually antagonistic male traits. This was previously ignored by most
463 sexual conflict investigations. Perhaps, the ignorance is expected as SC is almost always viewed as an arms'

464 race and hence, counter adaptation in females is fundamental to the theory. In line with such a reasoning, many
465 empirical investigations have reported strong female counter adaptation to mate harm imposed by male (Wigby
466 and Chapman 2004; Nandy et al. 2014). As we have argued above, life history can also be a potent constraint on
467 the evolution of mate harm. However, there is little literature on this subject. To the best of our knowledge, the
468 present study on the ACO males is one of the very few empirical evidence of evolutionary reduction in mate-
469 harming ability. The results presented here should be of general importance in explaining the variation in the
470 intensity of sexual antagonism across species.

471

472 **References**

- 473 Adler MI, Bonduriansky R (2011) The dissimilar costs of love and war: Age-specific mortality as a function of
474 the operational sex ratio. *J. Evol. Biol* 24:1169-1177. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2011.02250.x>
- 475 Adler MI, Bonduriansky R (2014) Sexual conflict, life span, and aging. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.*
476 6:a017566. <https://doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a017566>
- 477 Alcock J (1996) Male size and survival: the effects of male combat and bird predation in Dawson's burrowing
478 bees, *Amegilla dawsoni*. *Ecol. Entomol.* 21:309-316. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2311.1996.00007.x>
- 479 Andersson M (1994) Sexual selection, vol 72. Princeton University Press
- 480 Arnqvist G, Rowe L (2002) Antagonistic coevolution between the sexes in a group of insects. *Nature* 415:787-
481 789. <https://doi.org/10.1038/415787a>
- 482 Arnqvist G, Rowe L (2005) Sexual conflict, vol 31. Princeton University Press
- 483 Baer B, Maile R, Schmid-Hempel P, Morgan ED, Jones GR (2000) Chemistry of a mating plug in bumblebees.
484 *J. Chem. Ecol.* 26:1869-1875. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1005596707591>
- 485 Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S (2014) Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *arXiv preprint*
486 *arXiv:1406.5823*
- 487 Bedhomme S, Prasad NG, Jiang P-P, Chippindale AK (2008) Reproductive behaviour evolves rapidly when
488 intralocus sexual conflict is removed. *PLoS One* 3:e2187. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0002187>
- 489 Bonduriansky R (2014) The ecology of sexual conflict: background mortality can modulate the effects of male
490 manipulation on female fitness. *Evolution* 68:595-604. <https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.12272>
- 491 Bonduriansky R, Brassil C (2005) Reproductive ageing and sexual selection on male body size in a wild
492 population of antler flies (*Protophiophila litigata*). *J. Evol. Biol* 18:1332-1340. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2005.00957.x)
493 [9101.2005.00957.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2005.00957.x)

494 Bonduriansky R, Maklakov A, Zajitschek F, Brooks R (2008) Sexual selection, sexual conflict and the evolution
495 of ageing and life span. *Funct. Ecol* 22:443-453. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1101%2Fcshperspect.a017566>

496 Bretman A, Fricke C, Chapman T (2009) Plastic responses of male *Drosophila melanogaster* to the level of
497 sperm competition increase male reproductive fitness. *Proc. Royal Soc. B* 276:1705-1711.
498 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.1878>

499 Bretman A, Fricke C, Hetherington P, Stone R, Chapman T (2010) Exposure to rivals and plastic responses to
500 sperm competition in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Behav. Ecol* 21:317-321. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arp189>

501 Burke MK, Dunham JP, Shahrestani P, Thornton KR, Rose MR, Long AD (2010) Genome-wide analysis of a
502 long-term evolution experiment with *Drosophila*. *Nature* 467:587-590. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep39281>

503 Byrne PG, Rice GR, Rice WR (2008) Effect of a refuge from persistent male courtship in the *Drosophila*
504 laboratory environment. *Am. Zool* 48:e1-e1. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icn001>

505 Chapman T (2018) Sexual conflict: mechanisms and emerging themes in resistance biology. *The Am. Zool.*
506 192:217-229. <https://doi.org/10.1086/698169>

507 Chapman T, Arnqvist G, Bangham J, Rowe L (2003) Sexual conflict. *Trends Ecol. Evol* 18:41-47.
508 <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.43-3391>

509 Chapman T, Liddle LF, Kalb JM, Wolfner MF, Partridge L (1995) Cost of mating in *Drosophila melanogaster*
510 females is mediated by male accessory gland products. *Nature* 373:241-244. <https://doi.org/10.1038/373241a0>

511 Chippindale AK, Alipaz JA, Chen HW, Rose MR (1997) Experimental evolution of accelerated development in
512 *Drosophila*. 1. Developmental speed and larval survival. *Evolution* 51:1536-1551.
513 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.1997.tb01477.x>

514 Civetta A, Singh RS (1995) High divergence of reproductive tract proteins and their association with
515 postzygotic reproductive isolation in *Drosophila melanogaster* and *Drosophila virilis* group species. *J. Mol.*
516 *Evol* 41:1085-1095. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00173190>

517 Clutton-Brock T (2017) Reproductive competition and sexual selection. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., B, Biol.*
518 *Sci* 372:20160310. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2016.0310>

519 Clutton-Brock T, Langley P (1997) Persistent courtship reduces male and female longevity in captive tsetse flies
520 *Glossina morsitans morsitans* Westwood (Diptera: *Glossinidae*). *Behav. Ecol* 8:392-395.
521 <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/8.4.392>

522 Colegrave N, Hollocher H, Hinton K, Ritchie M (2000) The courtship song of African *Drosophila*
523 *melanogaster*. *J. Evol. Biol* 13:143-150. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1420-9101.2000.00148.x>

524 Cordts R, Partridge L (1996) Courtship reduces longevity of male *Drosophila melanogaster*. Anim. Behav
525 52:269-278. <https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.1996.0172>

526 Crudginton HS, Beckerman AP, Brüstle L, Green K, Snook RR (2005) Experimental removal and elevation of
527 sexual selection: does sexual selection generate manipulative males and resistant females? Am. Nat 165:S72-
528 S87. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/429353>

529 Dai H, Chen Y, Chen S, Mao Q, Kennedy D, Landback P, Eyre-Walker A, Du W, Long M (2008) The evolution
530 of courtship behaviors through the origination of a new gene in *Drosophila*. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.
531 105:7478-7483. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0800693105>

532 Dewsbury DA (1982) Ejaculate cost and male choice. Am. Nat. 119:601-610. <https://doi.org/10.1086/283938>

533 Dougherty LR, van Lieshout E, McNamara KB, Moschilla JA, Arnqvist G, Simmons LW (2017) Sexual conflict
534 and correlated evolution between male persistence and female resistance traits in the seed beetle *Callosobruchus*
535 *maculatus*. Proc. Royal Soc. B 284:20170132. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.0132>

536 Duxbury EM, Rostant WG, Chapman T (2017) Manipulation of feeding regime alters sexual dimorphism for
537 lifespan and reduces sexual conflict in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Proc. Royal Soc. B 284:20170391.
538 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.0391>

539 Ernsting G, Isaaks J (1991) Accelerated ageing: a cost of reproduction in the carabid beetle *Notiophilus*
540 *biguttatus* F. Funct. Ecol 5:299-303. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2389268>

541 Fowler K, Partridge L (1989) A cost of mating in female fruit flies. Nature 338:760-761.
542 <https://doi.org/10.1038/338760a0>

543 Friberg U (2005) Genetic variation in male and female reproductive characters associated with sexual conflict in
544 *Drosophila melanogaster*. Behav. Genet 35:455-462. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-004-1246-8>

545 Friberg U (2006) Male perception of female mating status: its effect on copulation duration, sperm defence and
546 female fitness. Anim. Behav 72:1259-1268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2006.03.021>

547 Friberg U, Arnqvist G (2003) Fitness effects of female mate choice: preferred males are detrimental for
548 *Drosophila melanogaster* females. J. Evol. Biol 16:797-811. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1420-9101.2003.00597.x>

549 García-Roa R, Chirinos V, Carazo P (2019) The ecology of sexual conflict: Temperature variation in the social
550 environment can drastically modulate male harm to females. Funct. Ecol 33:681-692.
551 <https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/13652435>

552 Gomez-Llano MA, Bensch HM, Svensson EI (2018) Sexual conflict and ecology: species composition and
553 male density interact to reduce male mating harassment and increase female survival. *Evolution* 72:906-915.
554 <https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.13457>

555 Griffith SC (2019) Cooperation and coordination in socially monogamous birds: moving away from a focus on
556 sexual conflict. *Front. Ecol. Evol* 7:455. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2019.00455>

557 Gromko MH (1987) Genetic constraint on the evolution of courtship behaviour in *Drosophila melanogaster*.
558 *Heredity* 58:435-441. <https://doi.org/10.1038/hdy.1987.72>

559 Hartmann R, Loher W (1999) Post-mating effects in the grasshopper, *Gomphocerus rufus* L. mediated by the
560 spermatheca. *J. Comp. Physiol* 184:325-332. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s003590050330>

561 Holland B, Rice WR (1999) Experimental removal of sexual selection reverses intersexual antagonistic
562 coevolution and removes a reproductive load. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 96:5083-5088.
563 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.96.9.5083>

564 Hooper AK, Spagopoulou F, Wylde Z, Maklakov AA, Bonduriansky R (2017) Ontogenetic timing as a
565 condition-dependent life history trait: High-condition males develop quickly, peak early, and age fast.
566 *Evolution* 71:671-685. <https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.13172>

567 Hunt J, Brooks R, Jennions MD, Smith MJ, Bentsen CL, Bussiere LF (2004) High-quality male field crickets
568 invest heavily in sexual display but die young. *Nature* 432:1024-1027. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03084>

569 Jennions MD, Petrie M (2000) Why do females mate multiply? A review of the genetic benefits. *Biol. Rev*
570 75:21-64. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0006323199005423>

571 Jiang PP, Bedhomme S, Prasad N, Chippindale A (2011) Sperm competition and mate harm unresponsive to
572 male-limited selection in *Drosophila*: an evolving genetic architecture under domestication. *Evol. int. j. org.*
573 *evol* 65:2448-2460. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2011.01328.x>

574 Johnstone RA, Keller L (2000) How males can gain by harming their mates: sexual conflict, seminal toxins, and
575 the cost of mating. *Am. Nat* 156:368-377. <https://doi.org/10.1086/303392>

576 Kirkwood TB, Rose MR (1991) Evolution of senescence: late survival sacrificed for reproduction. *Philos.*
577 *Trans. R. Soc. Lond., B, Biol. Sci* 332:15-24. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1991.0028>

578 Koene JM (2012) Sexual conflict in nonhuman animals. In: *The Oxford handbook of sexual conflict in humans*.
579 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195396706.013.0002>

580 Kotiaho JS (2001) Costs of sexual traits: a mismatch between theoretical considerations and empirical
581 evidence. *Biol. Rev* 76:365-376. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1464793101005711>

582 Kuznetsova A, Brockhoff PB, Christensen RH (2017) lmerTest package: tests in linear mixed effects models. J.
583 Stat. Softw 82:1-26. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v082.i13>

584 Le Galliard J-F, Fitze PS, Ferrière R, Clobert J (2005) Sex ratio bias, male aggression, and population collapse
585 in lizards. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 102:18231-18236 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0505172102>

586 Lemaître J-F, Ronget V, Tidière M, Allainé D, Berger V, Cohas A, Colchero F, Conde DA, Garratt M, Liker A
587 (2020) Sex differences in adult lifespan and aging rates of mortality across wild mammals. Proc. Natl. Acad.
588 Sci. U.S.A. 117:8546-8553. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1911999117>

589 Lenth R, Singmann H, Love J, Buerkner P, Herve M (2018) Emmeans: Estimated marginal means, aka least-
590 squares means. R package version, 1, 3. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.1980.10483031>

591 Linklater JR, Wertheim B, Wigby S, Chapman T (2007) Ejaculate depletion patterns evolve in response to
592 experimental manipulation of sex ratio in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Evolution 61:2027-2034
593 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2007.00157.x>

594 Long T, Pischedda A, Nichols R, Rice W (2010) The timing of mating influences reproductive success in
595 *Drosophila melanogaster*: implications for sexual conflict. J. Evol. Biol 23:1024-1032
596 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2010.01973.x>

597 MacPherson A, Yun L, Barrera TS, Agrawal AF, Rundle HD (2018) The effects of male harm vary with female
598 quality and environmental complexity in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Biol. Lett 14 :20180443
599 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2018.0443>

600 Magnhagen C (1991) Predation risk as a cost of reproduction. Trends Ecol. Evol 6:183-186
601 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-5347\(91\)90210-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-5347(91)90210-O)

602 Maklakov AA, Lummaa V (2013) Evolution of sex differences in lifespan and aging: causes and constraints.
603 BioEssays 35:717-724 <https://doi.org/10.1002/bies.201300021>

604 Manier MK, Belote JM, Berben KS, Novikov D, Stuart WT, Pitnick S (2010) Resolving mechanisms of
605 competitive fertilization success in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Science 328:354-357.
606 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1187096>

607 Markow TA, Hanson SJ (1981) Multivariate analysis of *Drosophila* courtship. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.
608 78:430-434 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.78.1.430>

609 Mital A, Sarangi M, Dey S, Joshi A (2021a) Evolution of lower levels of inter-locus sexual conflict in *D.*
610 *melanogaster* populations under strong selection for rapid development. bioRxiv:2021.2002.2008.430125.
611 doi:10.1101/2021.02.08.430125

612 Mital A, Sarangi M, Nandy B, Pandey N, Joshi A (2021b) Extremely rapid development and early reproduction
613 reduces sexual selection in *D. melanogaster* populations. bioRxiv:2021.2004.2009.439133.
614 doi:10.1101/2021.04.09.439133

615 Montrose VT, Harris WE, Moore P (2004) Sexual conflict and cooperation under naturally occurring male
616 enforced monogamy. J. Evol. Biol 17:443-452 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1420-9101.2003.00654.x>

617 Nandy B, Chakraborty P, Gupta V, Ali SZ, Prasad NG (2013a) Sperm competitive ability evolves in response to
618 experimental alteration of operational sex ratio. Evolution 67:2133-2141 <https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.12076>

619 Nandy B, Gupta V, Sen S, Udaykumar N, Samant MA, Ali SZ, Prasad NG (2013b) Evolution of mate-harm,
620 longevity and behaviour in male fruit flies subjected to different levels of inter locus conflict. BMC Evol. Biol
621 13:1-16 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2148-13-212>

622 Nandy B, Gupta V, Udaykumar N, Samant M, Sen S, Prasad N (2014) Experimental evolution of female traits
623 under different levels of intersexual conflict in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Evolution 68:412-425.
624 <https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.12271>

625 Parker GA (1979) Sexual selection and sexual conflict. Sexual selection and reproductive competition in insects
626 123:166 <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-108750-0.50010-0>

627 Parker GA (2006) Sexual conflict over mating and fertilization: an overview. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., B,
628 Biol. Sci 361:235-259 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1098%2Frsb.2005.1785>

629 Partridge L, Farquhar M (1981) Sexual activity reduces lifespan of male fruit flies. Nature 294:580-582
630 <https://doi.org/10.1038/294580a0>

631 Passananti HB, Matos M (2004) Methuselah flies: a case study in the evolution of aging. World Scientific.
632 <https://doi.org/10.1086/433090>

633 Pitnick S, García-González F (2002) Harm to females increases with male body size in *Drosophila*
634 *melanogaster*. Proc. Royal Soc 269:1821-1828 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2002.2090>

635 Pitnick S, Miller GT, Reagan J, Holland B (2001) Males' evolutionary responses to experimental removal of
636 sexual selection. Proc. Royal Soc 268:1071-1080 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2001.1621>

637 Poiani A (2006) Complexity of seminal fluid: a review. Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol 60:289-310.
638 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-006-0178-0>

639 Promislow DE (1992) Costs of sexual selection in natural populations of mammals. Proc. Royal Soc 247:203-
640 210. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1992.0030>

641 Prowse N, Partridge L (1997) The effects of reproduction on longevity and fertility in male *Drosophila*
642 *melanogaster*. J. Insect Physiol 43:501-512. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1910\(97\)00014-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1910(97)00014-0)
643 Queller DC, Strassmann JE (2018) Evolutionary conflict. Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst 49:73-93.
644 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110617-062527>
645 Rankin DJ, Bargum K, Kokko H (2007) The tragedy of the commons in evolutionary biology. Trends Ecol.
646 Evol 22:643-651. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2007.07.009>
647 Rankin DJ, Dieckmann U, Kokko H (2011) Sexual conflict and the tragedy of the commons. Am. Nat 177:780-
648 791. <https://doi.org/10.1086/659947>
649 Rankin DJ, Kokko H (2006) Sex, death and tragedy. Trends Ecol. Evol 21:225-226.
650 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2006.02.013>
651 Rice WR (1992) Sexually antagonistic genes: experimental evidence. Science 256:1436-1439.
652 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2876947>
653 Rice WR (1996) Sexually antagonistic male adaptation triggered by experimental arrest of female evolution.
654 Nature 381:232-234. <https://doi.org/10.1038/381232a0>
655 Ritchie M, Gleason J (1995) Rapid evolution of courtship song pattern in *Drosophila willistoni* sibling species.
656 J. Evol. Biol 8:463-479. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1420-9101.1995.8040463.x>
657 Rönn J, Katvala M, Arnqvist G (2007) Coevolution between harmful male genitalia and female resistance in
658 seed beetles. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 104:10921-10925. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0701170104>
659 Rose MR, Charlesworth B (1981) Genetics of life history in *Drosophila melanogaster*. II. Exploratory selection
660 experiments. Genetics 97:187-196. <https://doi.org/10.1093/genetics/97.1.187>
661 Rose MR, Vu LN, Park SU, Graves Jr JL (1992) Selection on stress resistance increases longevity in *Drosophila*
662 *melanogaster*. Exp. Gerontol 27:241-250. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0531-5565\(92\)90048-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0531-5565(92)90048-5)
663 Rostant WG, Mason JS, de Coriolis JC, Chapman T (2020) Resource-dependent evolution of female resistance
664 responses to sexual conflict. Evol. Lett 4:54-64. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evl3.153>
665 Ruedi EA, Hughes KA (2008) Natural genetic variation in complex mating behaviors of male *Drosophila*
666 *melanogaster*. Behav. Genet 38:424-436. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-008-9204-5>
667 Service PM (1993) Laboratory evolution of longevity and reproductive fitness components in male fruit flies:
668 mating ability. Evolution 47:387-399. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2410059>
669 Singh SR, Singh BN (2004) Female remating in *Drosophila*: comparison of duration of copulation between first
670 and second matings in six species. Curr. Sci 86:465-470. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24108745>

671 Snook R, Robertson A, Crudgington H, Ritchie M (2005) Experimental manipulation of sexual selection and the
672 evolution of courtship song in *Drosophila pseudoobscura*. Behavior genetics 35:245-255.
673 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10519-005-3217-0>

674 Snow SS, Alonzo SH, Servedio MR, Prum RO (2019) Female resistance to sexual coercion can evolve to pre-
675 serve the indirect benefits of mate choice. J. Evol. Biol 32:545-558. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.13436>

676 Sokal RR, Rohlf FJ (1995) Biometry. New York: W. H. H Freeman and Company.
677 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2343822>

678 Stearns SC (1989) Trade-offs in life-history evolution. Funct. Ecol 3:259-268. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2389364>

679 Stutt AD, Siva-Jothy MT (2001) Traumatic insemination and sexual conflict in the bed bug *Cimex lectularius*.
680 Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 98:5683-5687. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.101440698>

681 Tatar M, Carey JR, Vaupel JW (1993) Long-term cost of reproduction with and without accelerated senescence
682 in *Callosobruchus maculatus*: analysis of age-specific mortality. Evolution 47:1302-1312.
683 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.1993.tb02156.x>

684 Tatarnic NJ, Cassis G, Hochuli DF (2006) Traumatic insemination in the plant bug genus *Coridromius* Signoret
685 (Heteroptera: Miridae). Biol. Lett 2:58-61. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2005.0394>

686 Vincent A, Head ML, Iglesias-Carrasco M (2020) Sexual conflict and the environment: teasing apart effects
687 arising via males and females. Anim. Behav 162:57-66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2020.01.010>

688 Von Schilcher F, Dow M (1977) Courtship behaviour in *Drosophila*: sexual isolation or sexual selection? Z
689 Tierpsychol 43:304-310. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0310.1977.tb00077.x>

690 Wedell N, Kvarnemo C, Tregenza T (2006) Sexual conflict and life histories. Anim. Behav 71:999-1011.
691 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2005.06.023>

692 Wigby S, Brown NC, Allen SE, Misra S, Sitnik JL, Sepil I, Clark AG, Wolfner MF (2020) The *Drosophila*
693 seminal proteome and its role in postcopulatory sexual selection. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., B, Biol. Sci
694 375:20200072. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0072>

695 Wigby S, Chapman T (2004) Female resistance to male harm evolves in response to manipulation of sexual con-
696 flict. Evolution 58:1028-1037. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0014-3820.2004.tb00436.x>

697 Wigby S, Chapman T (2005) Sex peptide causes mating costs in female *Drosophila melanogaster*. Curr. Biol
698 15:316-321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2005.01.051>

699 Wolfner M (2002) The gifts that keep on giving: physiological functions and evolutionary dynamics of male
700 seminal proteins in *Drosophila*. Heredity 88:85-93. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.hdy.6800017>

701 Wolfner MF (1997) Tokens of love: functions and regulation of *Drosophila* male accessory gland products. In-
702 sect Biochem. Mol. Biol 27:179-192. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0965-1748\(96\)00084-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0965-1748(96)00084-7)
703 Yun L, Chen PJ, Singh A, Agrawal AF, Rundle HD (2017) The physical environment mediates male harm and
704 its effect on selection in females. Proc. Royal Soc. B 284:20170424. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.0424>
705 Zar JH (1999) Biostatistical analysis. Pearson Education India.
706
707

Figure captions:

Fig.1 Schematic representation of the design main assay. Experimental subsets were generated from stock populations following one generation of standardization (common garden rearing). Experimental males were generated in the following manner: CO subset was used to generate CO experimental males and CCO males (phenocopied to ACO, these were generated by growing larvae at a density of 240/3ml of standard food) and ACO males were generated from ACO stock. Oregon R females were generated separately under standard conditions as common female for all three regime males. On assay day the whole set-up was divided into two male-exposure condition i.e. single exposure, SE (where males and females are allowed to mate once) and continuous exposure, CE (where males and females were housed together after first mating). Behaviour assays were then carried out for 20 days where female mortality was recorded every day, fecundity and courtship frequency was noted at every 5-day interval). All vials were flipped into fresh food vial at every alternate day

Fig. 2 Effect of exposure to treatment males (ACO/CCO/CO) on female mortality and fecundity. (a) Proportion of females died by the end of the 20-day assay period (cumulative female mortality), under the two male-exposure conditions – single exposure (SE) and continuous exposure (CE). The vertical bars indicate the mean across all replicate populations. Error bars represent the standard errors of means (SEM); (b) Average per capita fecundity of experimental Oregon R females exposed to treatment males across all five age classes, under different male exposure types SE and CE. Means were calculated over five replicate populations. Only relevant multiple comparisons, which were done using Tukey's HSD, are shown. Significant differences are marked with horizontal line and an asterix (*)

Fig. 3 Results of the courtship behaviour assays. (a) Courtship frequency (CF: bouts of courtship per observation) was measured for the 20-days assay period on days – 2, 6, 11, 16, and 20 in the CE vials of the main assay. (b) Courtship component frequency (CCF: proportional contribution of a courtship component) of five components of courtship ritual were measured in a separate assay, where ACO and CO males were held with Oregon R females. The vertical bars indicate the mean across all five replicate populations. Error bars represent the standard errors of means (SEM). Only relevant multiple comparisons are shown in the figure. Significant differences are marked with horizontal line and an asterix (*)

Table 1 Summary of results of three-factor ANOVA on cumulative female mortality, cumulative fecundity, and two-factor ANOVA on dry body weight of males at eclosion. Mortality analysis was done on arcsine square root transformed values. Regime and male-exposure type are taken as fixed factor and block as random factor in female mortality and cumulative fecundity analysis. Regime is taken as fixed factor and block as random factor in dry body weight analysis. All tests were done considering $\alpha=0.05$ and significant p-values are mentioned in bold font style

Trait	Effect	SS	DF	MS	Den DF	Den MS	F	p
Female mortality	Male regime (MR)	2.580	2	1.290	8.005	0.080	16.075	0.001
	Male exposure type (MET)	6.933	1	6.933	4.002	0.070	98.434	<0.001
	Block	0.831	4	0.208	0.371	0.037	5.636	0.550
	MR $\times$ MET	4.560	2	2.280	8.004	0.114	20.032	0.001
	MR $\times$ Block	0.642	8	0.080	8.000	0.114	0.705	0.684
	MET $\times$ Block	0.282	4	0.070	8.002	0.114	0.619	0.661
	MR $\times$ MET $\times$ Block	0.911	8	0.114	265.000	0.047	2.401	0.016
	Block	2.580	2	1.290	8.005	0.080	16.075	0.001
Dry body weight	Male regime	0.543	2	0.271	8.000	0.004	65.570	<0.001
	Block	0.037	4	0.009	8.000	0.004	2.217	0.157
	Male regime $\times$ Block	0.033	8	0.004	135.000	0.001	6.781	<0.001
Cumulative fecundity	Male regime (MR)	206.30	2	103.150	8.001	12.371	8.338	0.011
	Male exposure type (MET)	170.890	1	170.890	4.000	14.423	11.849	0.026
	Block	1322.53	4	330.630	6.482	21.919	15.085	0.002
	MR $\times$ MET	104.850	2	52.430	8.002	4.877	10.750	0.005
	MR $\times$ Block	98.990	8	12.370	8.000	4.877	2.537	0.105
	MR $\times$ Block	57.690	4	14.420	8.002	4.877	2.958	0.090
	MR $\times$ MET $\times$ Block	39.020	8	4.880	267.000	3.044	1.602	0.124

Table 2 Summary of the results of linear mixed model (LMM) analysis of courtship frequency using `lmerTest` function in R. Regime and age were modelled as fixed factors and block as a random factor. All tests were done considering $\alpha=0.05$ and significant p-values are mentioned in bold font style

Effect	SS	DF	MS	Den DF	F	p
Male regime	12.472	1	11.422	480.06	143.125	<0.001
Age	5.927	4	1.437	479.990	17.005	<0.001
Male regime $\times$ Age	9.206	4	2.301	479.990	26.441	<0.001

Table 3 Summary of results of two-factor ANOVA on courtship component frequency (CCF). Male regime was modelled as a fixed factor and block as a random factor. Analysis done on arcsine square root transformed values. All tests were done considering $\alpha=0.05$ and significant p-values are mentioned in bold font style

Trait	Effect	SS	DF	MS	Den DF	Den MS	F	p
Orientation	Male regime	2.255	1	2.255	4.002	0.456	4.947	0.090
	Block	5.485	4	1.371	4.000	0.456	3.007	0.156
	Male regime $\times$ Block	1.824	4	0.456	501.000	0.195	2.340	0.054
Chasing	Male regime	0.084	1	0.084	4.015	0.047	1.782	0.252
	Block	0.738	4	0.184	4.000	0.047	3.935	0.106
	Male regime $\times$ Block	0.188	4	0.047	501.000	0.160	0.292	0.883
Wing vibration	Male regime	0.358	1	0.358	4.004	0.177	2.017	0.228
	Block	3.605	4	0.901	4.000	0.177	5.079	0.072
	Male regime $\times$ Block	0.710	4	0.177	501.000	0.178	0.995	0.410
Licking	Male regime	0.371	1	0.371	4.007	0.065	5.744	0.074
	Block	0.688	4	0.172	4.000	0.065	2.665	0.183
	Male regime $\times$ Block	0.258	4	0.064	501.000	0.098	0.661	0.619
Attempt to copulation	Male regime	0.717	1	0.717	4.008	0.042	16.989	0.014
	Block	0.438	4	0.110	4.000	0.042	2.599	0.189
	Male regime $\times$ Block	0.169	4	0.042	501.000	0.079	0.534	0.711

755

756