Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Animal Behaviour

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/anbehav

Odour-based social recognition in Damaraland mole-rats, *Fukomys damarensis*

Amy E. Leedale [a, b, c, *, 1] , Jack Thorley [a, b, d, 1] , Tim Clutton-Brock [a, b, e]

[a] *Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, U.K.*
[b] *Kalahari Research Centre, Kuruman River Reserve, Van Zyl Rus, Northern Cape, South Africa*
[c] *Department of Geography and Environmental Science, Liverpool Hope University, Liverpool, U.K.*
[d] *Department of Earth, Ocean and Ecological Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, U.K.*
[e] *Mammal Research Institute, Department of Zoology and Entomology, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa*

The ability to discriminate between conspecifics functions in mate choice, kin-selected cooperation and territory defence. In mammals, olfaction plays a key role in such social interactions. Olfactory cues may be particularly important for subterranean mammals, for which visual and acoustic cues are less effective. Damaraland mole-rats live in groups comprising a breeding pair and their nonbreeding offspring. They are xenophobic, obligate outbreeders and independent dispersal represents the usual route to reproduction for both sexes. As yet, little is known about how dispersing individuals locate mates. Using a series of behavioural experiments, we reveal that mole-rats can discriminate between unfamiliar breeding groups and solitary, nonbreeders of the opposite sex by using odour cues. Our experiments showed that subjects spent more time investigating sand taken from other mole-rat groups than control sand, indicating an ability to recognize substrate-borne conspecific odours. Mole-rats also spent more time digging and sweeping in sand taken from the tunnels of unfamiliar, solitary animals of the opposite sex than sand taken from unfamiliar breeding groups and removed a higher volume of this sand during the experiments. Together, these results suggest an olfactory preference in both sexes for solitary, opposite-sex animals over breeding groups. Our results are supported by observations from the field that immigration into breeding groups is rare, with dispersing females typically establishing new groups, where they are subsequently joined by unfamiliar males. This study supports olfaction as a potential recognition cue which may facilitate adaptive dispersal.
© 2021 The Association for the Study of Animal Behaviour. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Adaptive social decision making depends on an ability to discriminate between conspecifics that offer alternative fitness outcomes upon interaction (Reeve, 1989). Conspecifics might differ in their quality (Buchanan, Spencer, Goldsmith, & Catchpole, 2003), competitive ability (Wyman, Mooring, McCowan, Penedo, & Hart, 2008) or relatedness (Sharp, McGowan, Wood, & Hatchwell, 2005), and mechanisms that allow discriminating individuals, or actors, to distinguish between conspecifics in which these characteristics vary are likely to be under strong selection in many species. There is now both theoretical and empirical evidence that kin discrimination, the differential treatment of conspecifics based on relatedness (Sherman, Reeve, & Pfennig, 1997), facilitates the evolution of both cooperative behaviour (Hamilton, 1971; Wright, McDonald, te Marvelde, Kazem, & Bishop, 2010) and

inbreeding avoidance (Leedale et al., 2020; Lehmann & Perrin, 2003). Discrimination between individuals based on fitness outcomes is usually termed social recognition (Insley, Phillips, & Charrier, 2003). To evolve, recognition requires that different categories of conspecifics produce alternative cues or signals that convey information about themselves to actors. It also demands an ability in actors to perceive these cues and perform appropriate discriminatory behaviour (Reeve, 1989). When certain categories of conspecifics, such as kin, are predictably distributed in space, location can act as a reliable recognition cue (Komdeur & Hatchwell, 1999), but when spatial information is unreliable, phenotypic cues are often used to discriminate conspecifics, relaying sensory information via visual, acoustic or olfactory stimuli (Halpin, 1991). Any cue or combination of cues that reliably correlates with the characteristic affecting fitness may be used for recognition (Beecher, 1982).

In many mammals, olfaction serves as the primary sensory modality for social behaviour (Brennan & Kendrick, 2006; Gosling

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: leedala@hope.ac.uk (A. E. Leedale).
[1] Equal contributions.

& Roberts, 2001). The sensory capacities of the olfactory system have been particularly well studied in rodents, stimulated by the long tradition of work with laboratory mice and rats (Ferguson, Young, & Insel, 2002; Johnston, 2003), and there is evidence from several rodent taxa that olfaction is used in a variety of social contexts. Odour cues can denote sex, reproductive status (Brennan & Kendrick, 2006) and group membership (Heth, Todrank, & Burda, 2002), mediating a suite of social behaviours involved in mate choice, maternal care, competition and cooperation (Rymer, 2020; Stockley, Bottell, & Hurst, 2013; Willis & Poulin, 2000). For example, in communally nesting house mice, *Mus musculus domesticus*, females often form nursing partnerships to rear offspring, and prefer nest partners with their own major urinary protein genotype (Green et al., 2015), assessed using unique odour 'signatures' (Roberts et al., 2018). In Belding's ground squirrels, *Urocitellus beldingi*, odour-based kin discrimination also facilitates the formation of social relationships (Mateo, 2003), promoting kin preferences in nest burrow establishment and territorial defence (Sherman, 1981). There is also some evidence for disassortative mating in rodents using the highly polymorphic major histocompatibility complex (MHC), which is thought to be mediated through odour (Radwan, Tkacz, & Kloch, 2008), although the extent to which MHC functions in mate choice in both captive and wild rodent populations remains controversial, and there are many cases where no such association is found (e.g. Meléndez-Rosa, Bi, & Lacey, 2018; Sommer, 2005).

The use of olfactory signals for social recognition is predicted to be especially important among subterranean rodents because odour cues deposited in substrate can remain active for long periods and near-permanent life underground may render visual and acoustic signals less effective (Francescoli, 2000). In numerous subterranean rodents, such as the blind mole-rats of eastern Europe and the Middle East (family: Spalacidae) the eyes have been covered by a layer of skin and are no longer able to detect light (Sanyal, Jansen, de Grip, Nevo, & de Jong, 1990). In others, such as the African mole-rats (family: Bathyergidae), the eyes have degenerated to rudimentary organs that retain only a basic ability to differentiate light from dark (Hetling et al., 2005). By contrast, African mole-rats display high functional genetic variability at olfactory receptor loci, suggesting that an ability to recognize a broad range of olfactory cues is under strong selection in this family (Stathopoulos, Bishop, & O'Ryan, 2014). There is also a sizeable body of experimental evidence supporting olfactory recognition in subterranean rodents (Hagemayer et al., 2006; Heth, Todrank, Begall et al., 2002, 2004; Heth & Todrank, 2007; Toor, Clement, Carlson, & Holmes, 2015). A review of the topic by Heth and Todrank (2007) concluded that numerous species respond differentially to the odours of conspecifics that differ in their genetic relatedness or degree of familiarity. Empirical evidence from Ansell's mole-rats, *Cryptomys anselli*, suggests phenotype matching, whereby a reliable association between genetic and odour similarity allows individuals to assess relatedness, is the most likely mechanism of kin recognition in this species (Heth & Todrank, 2007). In laboratory experiments, highly social naked mole-rats, *Heterocephalus glaber*, exhibit strong preferences for their own colony odour (Toor et al., 2015), and *Fukomys* mole-rat siblings will readily mate after a prolonged period of separation (Burda, 1995; Kelley, Carter, Goldman, Goldman, & Freeman, 2019), suggesting kin recognition requires prior association. Whether recognition is based on familiarity or phenotype matching, there is clear evidence that subterranean rodents discriminate conspecifics using olfactory cues. However, the extent to which odour cues inform social decisions such as those related to mating remains unclear.

In this study, we investigated whether Damaraland mole-rats use odour cues to discriminate between individuals that offer alternative fitness outcomes from social interaction. Damaraland mole-rats are widely distributed across southern Africa, occurring in areas of arid thornveld where annual rainfall is low and unpredictable. They live in groups of 2–41 individuals (Jarvis & Bennett, 1993) comprising a dominant breeding pair and their nonbreeding offspring, which contribute towards burrow excavation and maintenance, group defence and pup care (Bennett & Faulkes, 2000, pp. 103–105; Zöttl et al., 2016). As in most cooperative breeders, dispersal is thought to be limited by ecological constraints on independent reproduction, including a high mortality risk associated with leaving the group, such that natal philopatry presents a better option than emigration (Faulkes et al., 1997). They are xenophobic, obligate outbreeders (Cooney & Bennett, 2000), and in contrast to several other cooperative breeders, nonbreeding residents rarely inherit the breeding position after the loss of a breeder (Jarvis & Bennett, 1993). Instead, groups remain inactive and finally fragment during periods of heavy rainfall when dispersal conditions are most favourable (Hazell, Bennett, Jarvis, & Griffin, 2000; Young, Oosthuizen, Lutermann, & Bennett, 2010). Both sexes disperse, with males dispersing slightly earlier than females, and although successful immigration of both sexes is rare (Torrents-Ticó, Bennett, Jarvis, Zöttl, 2018), genetic analyses have identified active groups containing immigrant males and extragroup offspring (Burland, Bennett, Jarvis, & Faulkes, 2004).

Although dispersal has never been observed directly in Damaraland mole-rats, the relatively large dispersal distances of recaptured individuals (mean ± SD: males: 738.6 ± 1067.3 m; females: 924.8 ± 1067.1 m; Finn, 2017) and the finding of mole-rat remains in owl scats and open water (Hazell et al., 2000) suggest that dispersal occurs principally above ground. Upon settlement, dispersers dig below the surface to access occupied burrow systems or establish new burrows, suggesting that dispersal is an active process, which may involve substrate-borne external cues. However, little is known about how dispersers locate conspecifics, or what happens when unfamiliar conspecifics are encountered during dispersal, and much of our understanding of intergroup interactions comes from captive populations. On the one hand, encounters with breeding groups present an opportunity to reproduce; resident males and females readily mate with intruders of the opposite sex in captivity (Jacobs, Reid, & Kuiper, 1998). On the other hand, dominant individuals can be aggressive towards intruders (Cooney, 2002), and resident subordinates of either sex attack intruders when groups are breeding (Jacobs et al., 1998). In contrast, dispersers that encounter solitary individuals of the opposite sex are presented with a breeding opportunity without the risk of injury or death through aggressive disputes with same-sex residents, and one might expect dispersers to preferentially target single, opposite-sex individuals if appropriate cues are available for them to do so.

In a series of two-choice behavioural experiments, we investigated whether Damaraland mole-rats can use odour cues to discriminate between members of the same and opposite sex, and between individuals or groups, which represent alternative breeding opportunities with varying levels of competition. We focused on odour cues in sand because this is likely to be the external substrate-borne cue used by overground dispersers to identify conspecifics. Indeed, odour cues in the extruded sand of a burrow system may provide a means for solitary females to advertise themselves to dispersing males (Braude, 2000). We predicted that both male and female mole-rats would discriminate between sand collected from the tunnel systems of males and females. We also predicted that mole-rats would discriminate between sand collected from solitary nonbreeders of the opposite sex, which represent a potential breeding opportunity, and sand from

unfamiliar breeding groups, which represent potential breeding opportunities with competition.

METHODS

Study Animals and Husbandry

Data were collected from a captive population of Damaraland mole-rats maintained between October 2013 and April 2020 at the Kuruman River Reserve in the Northern Cape, South Africa. The captive population originated from 25 wild groups trapped in the reserve and surrounding area between February and October 2013 (mean ± SD wild group size = 8.16 ± 5.0, range 2–26). Since 2013, the captive population was expanded through the pairing of un-related individuals. Groups were housed in standardized artificial tunnel systems made of polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipes, with win-dows of transparent plastic through which behaviour could be observed. Each self-contained tunnel system contained a nestbox, a toilet, a food store and a waste box. Individuals were identified using a unique coloured dye mark applied to their head patch and a passive integrated transponder tag implanted in early life. Animals were provisioned with sweet potatoes and cucumbers twice daily (ad libitum) and fresh sand was provided daily through vertical pipes, which individuals swept through their tunnel system. The fresh sand was taken from a dune close to the laboratory that housed the captive population. As wild mole-rats are not found on this part of the reserve, this sand was also used as a control stimulus in our experiments.

Previous studies have shown that Damaraland mole-rats of both sexes disperse during adulthood (Hazell et al., 2000). Individuals have the potential to reproduce as early as 1.5 years of age and over 90 g in females and 100 g in males (Thorley, Katlein, Goddard, Zöttl, & Clutton-Brock, 2018). Experimental subjects ($N = 12$ males, $N = 13$ females) were subordinate, nonbreeding mole-rats of reproductive age (mean ± SD: males: 2.90 ± 0.95 years; females: 2.62 ± 0.90 years) and weight (mean ± SD: males: 155.33 ± 35.60 g; females: 109.08 ± 25.53 g), selected from a captive population of 554 individuals from 101 groups (mean ± SD captive group size = 5.49 ± 4.44, range 1–17). All experimental subjects were considered predispersive because they had temporarily escaped their tunnel system on more than five occasions in the 6 months before the experiment (pipes occasionally open or individuals gnaw holes in the plastic).

Olfactory Stimuli

Focal subjects were presented with four categories of odour stimuli: sand collected from the tunnel systems of solitary, nonbreeding males ($N = 4$), sand collected from the tunnel systems of solitary, nonbreeding females ($N = 4$), sand collected from the tunnel systems of active breeding groups ($N = 17$) or control sand (see above). For the experimental stimuli, sand was collected from the waste box of tunnel systems at least 12 h after the fresh sand had been provided, so all group members had the opportunity to interact with sand prior to its use in the experiments. All solitary individuals were nonbreeding adults of reproductive age and weight. These animals were either evicted from their natal group as a subordinate nonbreeder ($N = 3$), part of a social pair whose partner died or emigrated before breeding ($N = 3$) or the only remaining subordinate member of a once larger group ($N = 2$). In all cases, animals were solitary for at least 2 months before the experiment began. Breeding groups were defined as groups with a breeding pair that had produced at least one litter within the 6-month period before the experiment, and contained at least one male and one female nonbreeder. All solitary individuals and breeding groups were unfamiliar to the test subject. Subjects were presented with a two-way choice of experimental or control stimuli in a series of experimental treatments: (1) solitary, same-sex nonbreeder (SSN) versus solitary, opposite-sex nonbreeder (SON); (2) breeding group versus SON; (3) control sand versus SON; (4) control sand versus breeding group.

Experimental Procedure

The research carried out in this study was approved by the University of Pretoria Animal Ethics Committee (permit numbers EC089-12 and SOP-004-13). Trials were conducted in a T-maze made from the same PVC pipes used to build the artificial tunnel systems (Fig. 1, Appendix Fig. A1). The maze contained a starting chamber (30 × 20 cm and 14 cm high) with a metal sliding door leading into a 64 × 7 cm entrance tunnel followed by two 80 × 7 cm side tunnels (arms) fitted with windows of transparent film. The end of each arm was filled with a 30 cm plug of sand (total volume = 1154.5 cm^3), with a ratio of 2:1 control sand to mole-rat sand for the experimental stimuli or 30 cm control sand for the control stimulus. Any detritus in the mole-rat sand (e.g. pieces of food, faeces) was removed and, if necessary, control sand was wetted with distilled water so that the two sand stimuli being used in a single trial were of equivalent dampness and thus equally moveable. The first 40 cm of each arm was fitted with a metal grate to dispel cleared sand and minimize the movement of sand from one arm to the other.

Trials were conducted between 0700 and 1600 SAST during 12 February–7 April 2020. Subjects were removed from their tunnel systems and placed in an isolation box with standardized food, sand, paper and enrichment for 12–24 h prior to each trial to simulate emigration. All subjects were exposed to each treatment twice, in a controlled sequence, except for one female that was exposed to treatment 1 once, before being replaced by another female of similar age and weight for the remaining treatments. This generated 192 trials of four treatments on 25 subjects. For each subject, the individual or group used for each experimental stimuli type (e.g. unfamiliar breeding group) was randomly assigned, and subjects were not presented with sand from any tunnel system more than once (full trial design presented in Appendix Table A1). For each trial, stimuli were randomly placed into the left or right arm of the T-maze.

Before each trial, the subject was placed into the starting chamber. The door was opened, and the trial began as soon as the subject moved into the entrance tunnel; the door was then closed. Subjects typically emerged from the starting chamber as soon as the door was opened, and none remained in the starting chamber for more than a few seconds. Subjects were placed back in their tunnel systems for 2–3 days between each trial to retain familiarity with group members. The maze was disassembled and cleaned with 70% ethanol between trials. Data were collected in real time and inputted onto an Android tablet (Pendragon Software Corpo-ration, Chicago, IL, U.S.A.). Trials were also recorded using a Sony HDR CX240 camcorder for cross-checking. Trials lasted 10 min, with pilot studies indicating that this gave individuals the oppor-tunity to interact frequently with sand in both maze arms while also allowing for the possibility that individuals would clear all the sand in the maze. Accordingly, the mean number of alternations between left and right arms across all trials was 0.91 alternations/

Figure 1. Experimental T-maze set-up. After entering the T-maze Damaraland mole-rats had a choice of nosing and moving two 30 cm plugs of sand that each contained a different olfactory stimulus. Any sand removed from the maze arm would pass through a metal grid incorporated in the bottom side of a pipe, preventing mixing of the stimuli. Digging effort was measured in 10 cm increments. A single trial lasted 10 min or until mole-rats completely cleared both arms of sand.

min (median $\pm$ SD = 19.9 $\pm$ 27.3). Subjects cleared both arms of sand on 24 occasions (N = 192 trials).

Behavioural Response

Mole-rat responses were recorded by behavioural assay. The full ethogram is presented in Appendix Table A2. Briefly, behaviour was recorded continuously as dig, gnaw, nose sand, retreat, sniff, sweep and miscellaneous. Whether these behaviours were observed in the neutral entrance tunnel, the left arm or the right arm was recorded, allowing the recovery of complete time budgets. In addition, as a measure of digging effort, the time taken to move 10 cm, 20 cm or 30 cm of sand from each maze arm was recorded as instantaneous events. Subjects were considered to exhibit discrimination between the two presented stimuli if one or more of the following differed between maze arms: (1) the proportion of time spent in the arm, (2) the proportion of time spent nosing sand, which is a display of investigative behaviour, (3) the proportion of time spent moving sand (summed duration of digging and sweeping) or (4) the amount of sand removed by the end of the trial. Traditional preference test set-ups, such as the 'habituation-generalization paradigm', can elucidate whether individuals discriminate odours by quantifying differences in the time spent interacting with them, but whether this is motivated by the scent's novelty, or by some attractive or repulsive property of the producer, is not always clear. By using sand as the experimental stimulus, and by separating behavioural parameters into investigative and digging behaviour, we tried to address motivation to engage with an odour, as well as interest. In our study, subjects were considered to exhibit a preference for the experimental stimulus if they spent proportionally more time moving sand from the arm containing the experimental stimulus compared to the control and/or removed more experimental sand.

Statistical Analysis

All analyses were performed in R version 3.6.1 (R Core Team, 2020). To test whether different combinations of sand stimuli affect behavioural time budgets, we fitted a series of multinomial logistic regressions. These models capture the multinomial nature of our behavioural observations, whereby the more time an individual spends engaged in one behaviour, the less time it has to engage in other behaviours. We used these models to investigate whether mole-rats discriminated between sand stimuli based on the following behavioural responses: (1) the proportion of time spent in each arm of the T-maze, (2) the proportion of time spent moving sand and (3) the proportion of time spent nosing sand. In all cases, the behavioural responses of males and females were grouped to allow comparisons by sex, and models were fitted in a Bayesian framework to include random effects for the individual and the trial.

To investigate the effect of sand stimulus on the time spent in each arm of the T-maze, we fitted a multinomial model to quantify the probability per unit time of being in a given arm, i.e. the proportion of time spent in that arm. The response variable represented the per second location of each individual within each trial (N = 25 individuals, 48 trials). Thus, for a 10 min observation, a single individual has 600 rows of data denoting its location during each trial (mean $\pm$ SD trial duration = 591.02 $\pm$ 33.95 s, median 600 s, range 367–600 s). Setting the reference category as the neutral tunnel of the T-maze, the log-odds that individual i in trial j is in the arm with sand stimuli 1 (k = 2) or sand stimuli 2 (k = 3) instead of the neutral tunnel (k = 1) at time t is given as:

$$\log\left(\frac{\pi_{1ijt}}{\pi_{2ijt}}\right) = \beta_{1ijt} + \beta_{3ijt} + \gamma_{1i} + \gamma_{1j}$$

$$\log(\frac{\pi_{1ijt}}{\pi_{3ijt}}) = \beta_{2ijt} + \beta_{4ijt} + \gamma_{2i} + \gamma_{2j}$$

where the probability of observing each category is π_k, and $\pi_1 + \pi_2 + \pi_3 = 1$, following the generalized Bernoulli distribution. Here, β_{1ijt} and β_{2ijt} are the intercepts that contrast the two sand stimuli against the neutral tunnel, β_{3ijt} and β_{4ijt} are the fixed effects of sex on each behaviour, and Υ_n are the individual level, i, and trial level, j, random effects. Models were fitted in the 'brms' package (Bürkner, 2018) with three chains of 3000 iterations, of which 600 were dedicated to the warm-up. Model diagnostics and posterior predictive checks highlighted adequate mixing of chains and appropriate choice of priors. Because multinomial models provide odds ratios, coefficients are not straightforward indicators of the effect of a predictor on the probability of doing behaviour k, so their interpretation should make use of predicted probabilities. In our results, we therefore emphasize cases where the 95% credible intervals (CI) of the predicted probabilities do not overlap.

To investigate the effect of sand stimulus on the time spent moving and nosing sand we repeated the above framework, but here, the response variable was the behaviour being performed. We fitted a multinomial model to quantify the probability per unit time of nosing or moving sand, i.e. the proportion of time spent performing these behaviours, in each arm. For each model, the response represented one of $k = 5$ behavioural categories: Moving sand stimulus 1, Moving sand stimulus 2, Nosing sand stimulus 1, Nosing sand stimulus 2 and Other. Here, 'Other' refers to any other behaviour observed irrespective of stimuli and was set as the reference category. Sex was fitted as a fixed effect and as before, biological importance was determined by the difference in CIs for the predicted probabilities of moving and nosing sand between the two stimuli. Full model outputs are presented in Appendix Tables A3–A7.

To quantify digging effort, we measured the amount of sand removed during the trial and, when any arm was cleared of sand before the trial finished, which arm was cleared first. To test the effect of sand stimulus on the amount of sand removed, we carried out ordinal logistic regressions (cumulative link mixed models, CLMM) fitted in the R package 'ordinal' (Christensen, 2019). In short, ordinal logistic regressions model the cumulative probability of ordered categories, where each cumulative probability reflects the probability of a given categorical value or lower. In our case, data from each treatment were analysed in separate models, and for each model, the distribution of outcomes (four factor levels: 0 cm, 10 cm, 20 cm, 30 cm) was parameterized on the log-cumulative-odds scale, giving three intercepts that represent 'cut-points' at 0–10 cm, 10–20 cm and 20–30 cm of sand moved. Sand stimulus was included as an explanatory variable throughout to estimate the change in log-cumulative-odds at each intercept, allowing for an overall shift in the probability mass towards higher or lower amounts of sand clearing according to the contrast in response to different sand stimuli. Trial ID nested within subject ID were fitted as random effects throughout. In the results, we report the effect of sand stimuli in the different treatments as an indicator of significance and include full model tables (including intercepts) in Appendix Table A8.

Finally, we performed a series of one-sample tests for equality of proportions with continuity correction to determine whether sand stimulus affected which arm was cleared first (Appendix Table A9). For all non-Bayesian analyses we interpreted all effects below an alpha threshold of 0.05 as being biologically important, but also note cases where alpha <0.1 as being indicative of a trend in the data.

RESULTS

Time Budgets

Individuals of both sexes spent more time nosing the sand taken from the tunnel systems of mole-rat groups (whether SON or breeding) than control sand, as indicated by the significant contrasts in Fig. 2, demonstrating that individuals can identify mole-rat odours in the sand. Females spent more time moving the sand taken from the tunnels of solitary males (Fig. 3), and more time in the maze arm containing sand from the tunnels of solitary males (Fig. 4) when compared with breeding groups. Although an increase in time spent moving sand from solitary females was also detected in males presented with the same treatment, the contrasts only reached statistical significance in females (Fig. 3; full model outputs in Appendix Tables A3–A7).

Digging Effort

Males removed more sand from arms containing sand from the tunnels of solitary females when presented with sand from solitary females versus breeding groups (CLMM: estimate $\pm$ SE = 1.35 $\pm$ 0.63, $Z = 2.14$, $P = 0.03$) and control sand (CLMM: estimate $\pm$ SE = 1.82 $\pm$ 0.72, $Z = 2.51$, $P = 0.01$). Males also removed more sand from breeding groups when presented with sand from breeding groups versus control sand (CLMM: estimate $\pm$ SE = -1.39 $\pm$ 0.66, $Z = -2.12$, $P = 0.03$), and exhibited a tendency to move more sand from arms containing sand from solitary male tunnels when presented with sand from the tunnels of solitary males versus solitary females (CLMM: estimate $\pm$ SE = 1.14 $\pm$ 0.63, $Z = 1.80$, $P = 0.07$; Table 1). In contrast, sand stimulus had little effect on the amount of sand moved in females, although there was a tendency for females to move more sand in arms containing sand from solitary male tunnels when presented with sand taken from solitary male tunnels versus control sand (CLMM: estimate $\pm$ SE = 1.21 $\pm$ 0.69, $Z = 1.76$, $P = 0.08$; Table 1).

Males cleared the arm containing sand from breeding groups first when presented with sand from breeding groups versus control sand ($X^2_1 = 4.9$, $P = 0.02$), and solitary male sand first when presented with sand from the tunnels of solitary males versus solitary females ($X^2_1 = 4.08$, $P = 0.04$; Table 2). There was also a tendency for males to clear the arm containing sand from solitary females first when presented with sand from solitary female tunnels versus breeding groups ($X^2_1 = 2.76$, $P = 0.09$; Table 2). However, sand stimulus type had no effect on which arm females cleared first (Table 2).

DISCUSSION

This study shows that Damaraland mole-rats are able to discriminate between sand taken from the tunnel systems of other mole-rat groups and control sand, suggesting they have the capacity to identify conspecifics using olfactory cues. Both sexes spent more time investigating sand taken from mole-rat tunnels when compared with control sand, irrespective of whether the sand was taken from solitary, opposite-sex nonbreeders (SONs) or breeding groups (Fig. 2). Mole-rats also tended to move more sand from maze arms containing sand from mole-rat tunnels when compared with control sand (Table 1), indicating that odour cues in sand could potentially be used by dispersing individuals to locate non-natal groups. Only a handful of studies have investigated the use of olfactory cues for social recognition in bathyergid mole-rats (Heth, Todrank, & Burda, 2002; Toor et al., 2015), despite other aspects of their behaviour and physiology receiving much attention (Sherman, Jarvis, & Alexander, 1991; Bennett & Faulkes, 2000;

Figure 2. Proportion of time spent nosing sand in each arm. Model predictions of mole-rat time budgets across four two-choice experimental treatments (*N* = 24): (a) same-sex nonbreeder (SSN) versus solitary, opposite-sex nonbreeder (SON), (b) breeding group versus SON, (c) control sand versus SON, (d) control sand versus breeding group. Points display the predicted mean proportion of time spent nosing sand for males and females, with 89% (thick line) and 95% (thin line) credible interval (CI). Horizontal dotted lines mark upper and lower CIs of contrasting stimuli.

Buffenstein, 2008). Our experimental results therefore form an important step in guiding future studies on social recognition in this clade. When presented with a choice of sand taken from the tunnels of SONs or breeding groups, females spent more time moving the sand from solitary males (Fig. 3). Although males did not spend significantly more time moving sand, they did remove a higher volume of sand taken from solitary females in this treatment (Table 1). This suggests that males expended greater effort per unit time when moving sand from solitary females. Another possibility is that because males are larger, they are able to clear sand at faster rates (Zelová, Šumbera, Okroujlík, & Burda, 2010), and that as a consequence, any contrasts in digging effort are accentuated when considered in terms of the amount of sand moved, especially when this amount was measured on a categorical rather than a continuous scale. Considering both sexes together, these results suggest a preference for SONs over breeding groups. Our results are supported by field data showing that immigration of dispersers of either sex into active breeding groups is rare, with females being most likely to settle alone after natal dispersal where they are often joined by unfamiliar dispersing males (Finn, 2017). Indeed, repeated captures of wild individuals have shown that once a new tunnel system has been excavated, solitary females can remain there for years, rather than attempting a secondary dispersal to join an active breeding group (Finn, 2017). A similar pattern of dispersal has been identified in naked mole-rats, in which nascent groups are formed in a two-step process, whereby lone females disperse from their natal group and settle in isolated burrow systems and then are

joined by dispersing males with whom they will breed (Braude, 2000). Laboratory studies have also shown that Damaraland mole-rats are highly xenophobic (Jacobs et al., 1998). Aggression by residents towards immigrants is sex specific, with females directing aggression towards females and males directing aggression towards males (Cooney & Bennett, 2000), and is mostly initiated by the dominant breeder (Cooney, 2002). Although laboratory studies have shown that attempts to join established groups often result in severe or fatal injury (Jacobs et al., 1998), wild groups can contain immigrants and extrapair offspring, suggesting that immigration is occasionally successful, if only for a brief time (Burland et al., 2004; Torrents-Ticó et al., 2018). However, our findings are consistent with dispersers avoiding active breeding groups and the risk of costly disputes with same-sex residents, via olfactory cues.

One unexpected result from our study was the tendency for both males and females to exhibit a greater response to male odour, as we had predicted that both sexes, when given the choice, would prefer opposite-sex nonbreeders that provided a mating opportunity without competition. Although not always receiving statistical support, one possible explanation for this tendency is that the sand from males was more odoriferous. However, if odour strength was the basis on which the choice was made then we may have also expected to see a stronger response towards sand from breeding groups when contrasted with sand from solitary individuals, which was not borne out in our results. An alternative explanation is that the greater response of either sex to male odour might reflect competing drives. For females, the response to

Figure 3. Proportion of time spent moving sand in each arm. Model predictions of the mole-rat time budgets across four two-choice experimental treatments (*N* = 24): (a) same-sex nonbreeder (SSN) versus solitary, opposite-sex nonbreeder (SON), (b) breeding group versus SON, (c) control sand versus SON, (d) control sand versus breeding group. Points display the predicted mean proportion of time spent moving sand for males and females, with 89% (thick line) and 95% (thin line) credible interval (CI). Horizontal dotted lines mark upper and lower CIs of contrasting stimuli.

male odour may indeed reflect the benefits of a mating opportunity, whereas in males, the response towards males might be driven by intrasexual competition, to the point where this overrides any competing preference for a potential mating. Although speculative, the possibility for competition to mediate the sex difference in response, with males being more strongly inclined towards agonism with conspecifics, is supported by data showing that males have shorter breeding tenures than females (Young & Bennett, 2013), as well as being substantially larger. In general, though, sexual selection in mole-rats has received little attention and whether this presents a plausible explanation for this specific result warrants further study.

The use of odour cues for social recognition is well documented, particularly in rodents (e.g. Johnston, 2003; Roberts et al., 2018; Stockley et al., 2013). Whether odour profiles in Damaraland mole-rats differ between males and females, or between breeders and nonbreeders, is currently not known, but differential odour profiles, or 'signatures', that signal sex or reproductive status have been identified in several rodent species, such as house mice, *Mus musculus*, Syrian golden hamsters, *Mesocricetus auratus*, and meadow voles, *Microtus pennsylvanicus* (reviewed by Ferkin, 2018). Analyses of volatile odour compounds using gas chromatography have revealed that the relative proportions of common volatiles in the odour profile convey information about identity (Singer, Beauchamp, & Yamazaki, 1997). It is possible that olfactory cues associated with breeding status could provide a mechanism by which Damaraland mole-rats recognize breeding groups.

Alternatively, it may be the case that odour cues from breeding groups are simply more complex than those from solitary individuals and that this is enough to aid in decision making. Although the proximate basis for olfactory recognition in Damaraland mole-rats is beyond the scope of this study, further advances in methods for sampling volatile compounds (Weiß et al., 2018) offer a promising approach for testing whether odour signatures exist in Damaraland mole-rats, which may mediate the discriminatory behaviour we observed in our experiments.

In previous mole-rat studies, focal individuals have been presented with urine, faeces or anogenital secretions collected from conspecifics (Heth, Todrank, & Burda, 2002; Toor et al., 2015). In this study, the presentation of odour cues was indirect: we presented individuals with sand taken from different categories of mole-rat tunnel system, and the sand was assumed to contain odour cues that permit discrimination between these categories due to the differences discussed above. A further assumption of our experiment was that olfactory cues, if present in the sand, were strong enough to elicit a response. That more direct odour stimuli, such as urine, or indirect stimuli which may contain more olfactory compounds, such as nesting material, could elicit a stronger response than sand is a possibility. However, we selected sand as our experimental stimulus for three reasons. First, it is more ecologically relevant to dispersal behaviour in the wild, whereby the first conspecific odour a disperser encounters is within the mounds of sand extruded by other groups. Only after entering a novel burrow system will individuals have the opportunity to sniff

Figure 4. Proportion of time spent in each arm. Model predictions of mole-rat time budgets across four two-choice experimental treatments ($N = 24$): (a) same-sex nonbreeder (SSN) versus solitary, opposite-sex nonbreeder (SON), (b) breeding group versus SON, (c) control sand versus SON, (d) control sand versus breeding group. Points display the predicted mean proportion of time in each arm for males and females, with 89% (thick line) and 95% (thin line) credible interval (CI). Horizontal dotted lines mark upper and lower CIs of contrasting stimuli.

Table 1
Total amount of sand removed

Sex	Sand removed (cm)	Treatment 1		Treatment 2		Treatment 3		Treatment 4	
		SSN	SON	Breeding group	SON	Control sand	SON	Control sand	Breeding group
Female	0	2	1	7	2	4	2	8	3
	10	8	12	6	8	7	7	6	9
	20	9	7	8	6	8	7	6	8
	30	5	4	3	8	4	8	4	4
Median		20	10	10	20	15	20	10	15
Male	0	4	5	5	0	3	2	4	2
	10	5	5	7	7	8	5	12	9
	20	5	11	6	6	9	6	4	4
	30	10	3	6	11	4	11	4	9
Median		20	20	15	20	20	20	10	20

Mole-rat digging effort measured as frequency of increasing amounts of sand removed from T-maze arms across four two-choice experimental treatments ($N = 24$): treatment 1: same-sex nonbreeder (SSN) versus solitary, opposite-sex nonbreeder (SON); treatment 2: breeding group versus SON; treatment 3: control sand versus SON; treatment 4: control sand versus breeding group. Sand removed (cm) is binned into 10 cm increments to a maximum of 30 cm. Within treatments, median volume of sand removed (cm) is reported for each stimulus type. Trials lasted 10 min.

other individuals or locate the nest, the consequences of which could be fatal because of the xenophobic nature of mole-rats (Jacobs et al., 1998). Second, food exudates in the sand are used to locate food sources in the closely related Ansell's mole-rat (Heth, Todrank, Begall, et al., 2002), suggesting that odour cues in sand could also be effective in social contexts. Finally, by using sand we argue that it is possible to assess the motivation of individuals to engage with an odour, as measured by the amount of time spent

digging and the amount of sand removed. Our finding that mole-rats spent more time investigating sand from other mole-rat tunnels than control sand and that both sexes increased their digging effort in sand taken from solitary, opposite-sex individuals over breeding groups indicate that conspecific odour cues are present in sufficient quantities to elicit behavioural responses.

Despite our focus on olfaction, it is worth considering whether social recognition may involve cues of other sensory modalities. In

Table 2
First arm to clear of sand

Sex		Treatment 1	Treatment 2	Treatment 3	Treatment 4
Male	SSN	10	–	–	–
	SON	2	10	8	–
	Breeding group	–	3	–	9
	Control sand	–	–	3	1
	Not cleared	12	11	13	14
Female	SSN	3	–	–	–
	SON	3	8	8	–
	Breeding group	–	2	–	3
	Control sand	–	–	2	4
	Not cleared	18	14	14	17

The number of trials in which the first arm mole-rats cleared contained sand from a same-sex nonbreeder (SSN), opposite-sex nonbreeder (SON), breeding group or control sand ($N = 24$) across four two-choice experimental treatments: treatment 1: SSN versus SON; treatment 2: breeding group versus SON; treatment 3: control sand versus SON; treatment 4: control sand versus breeding group. In some treatments, no arm was cleared. Trials lasted 10 min.

naked mole-rats, vocalizations are used frequently in social interactions (Pepper, Braude, Lacey, & Sherman, 1991; Yosida, Kobayasi, Ikebuchi, Ozaki, & Okanoya, 2007), and recent work has also identified group level dialects that can facilitate group recognition (Baker et al., 2021). Elsewhere, a study on the spalacid mole-rat *Tachyoryctes daemon* suggests that seismic signals propagated through the environment may also be used for communication (Hrouzková, Dvořáková, Jedlička, Šumbera, 2013), but the precise function of seismic signals, and whether they convey producer identity, remain to be determined. Generally, although odour may still operate in combination with other phenotypic cues, olfaction appears to have a primary role in social recognition in this clade.

Conclusions

By their subterranean nature it will always remain challenging to investigate social behaviour of mole-rats in the wild. Genetic analyses of natural populations can further our understanding of some aspects of social recognition, such as whether breeding individuals pair assortatively (e.g. Meléndez-Rosa et al., 2018). Alongside field data, laboratory experiments will be crucial for investigating the cues that facilitate intraspecific interactions in these highly social mammals. While the reproductive physiology of social mole-rats is relatively well studied, much remains unknown about how social behaviour is mediated and the proximate mechanisms by which conspecifics are recognized. This study provides timely insight into the role of olfactory cues in discriminatory behaviour and reveals a putative mechanism by which mole-rats are able to make adaptive dispersal decisions.

References

Baker, A. J., Veviurko, G., Bennett, N. C., Hart, D. W., Mongraby, L., & Lewin, G. (2021). Cultural transmission of vocal dialect in the naked mole-rat. *Science, 371*, 503–507.

Beecher, M. D. (1982). Signature systems and kin recognition. *American Zoologist, 22*, 477–490.

Bennett, N., & Faulkes, C. (2000). *African mole-rats: ecology and eusociality.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Braude, S. (2000). Dispersal and new colony formation in wild naked mole-rats: Evidence against inbreeding as the system of mating. *Behavioral Ecology, 11*, 7–12.

Brennan, P. A., & Kendrick, K. M. (2006). Mammalian social odours: Attraction and individual recognition. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 361*, 2061–2078.

Buchanan, K. L., Spencer, K. A., Goldsmith, A. R., & Catchpole, C. K. (2003). Song as an honest signal of past developmental stress in the European starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 270*, 1149–1156.

Buffenstein, R. (2008). Negligible senescence in the longest living rodent, the naked mole-rat: Insights from a successfully aging species. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B: Biochemical, Systemic, and Environmental Physiology, 178*, 439–445.

Burda, H. (1995). Individual recognition and incest avoidance in eusocial common mole-rats rather than reproductive suppression by parents. *Experientia, 51*, 411–413.

Bürkner, P.-C. (2018). Advanced Bayesian multilevel modeling with the R package brms. *R Journal, 10*, 395–411.

Burland, T. M., Bennett, N. C., Jarvis, J. U. M., & Faulkes, C. G. (2004). Colony structure and parentage in wild colonies of co-operatively breeding Damaraland mole-rats suggest incest avoidance alone may not maintain reproductive skew. *Molecular Ecology, 13*, 2371–2379.

Christensen, R. H. B. (2019). *ordinal—Regression Models for Ordinal Data*. R package version 2019.12-10 https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ordinal.

Cooney, R. (2002). Colony defense in Damaraland mole-rats, *Cryptomys damarensis*. *Behavioral Ecology, 13*, 160–162.

Cooney, R., & Bennett, N. C. (2000). Inbreeding avoidance and reproductive skew in a cooperative mammal. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 267*, 801–806.

Faulkes, C. G., Bennett, N. C., Bruford, M. W., O'Brien, H. P. O., Aguilar, G. H., & Jarvis, J. U. M. (1997). Ecological constraints drive social evolution in the African mole-rats. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 264*, 1619–1627.

Ferguson, J. N., Young, L. J., & Insel, T. R. (2002). The neuroendocrine basis of social recognition. *Frontiers in Neuroendocrinology, 23*, 200–224.

Ferkin, M. (2018). Odor communication and mate choice in rodents. *Biology, 7*, 13.

Finn, K. (2017). *Density-dependent effects on body size, philopatry, and dispersal in the Damaraland mole-rat (*Fukomys damarensis*).* MSc Thesis. Eastern Cape, South Africa: Rhodes University. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10962/50495.

Francescoli, G. (2000). Sensory capabilities and communication in subterranean mammals. In E. A. Lacey, J. Patton, & G. N. Cameron (Eds.), *Life Underground: The Biology of Subterranean Rodents* (pp. 111–114). Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Gosling, L. M., & Roberts, S. C. (2001). Scent-marking by male mammals: Cheat-proof signals to competitors and mates. *Advances in the Study of Behaviour, 30*, 169–217.

Green, J. P., Holmes, A. M., Davidson, A. J., Paterson, S., Stockley, P., Beynon, R. J., et al. (2015). The genetic basis of kin recognition in a cooperatively breeding mammal. *Current Biology, 25*, 2631–2641.

Hagemayer, P., & Begall, S. (2006). Individual odour similarity and discrimination in the Coruro (*Spalacopus cyanus, Octodontidae*). *Ethology, 112*, 529–536.

Halpin, Z. T. (1991). Kin recognition cues of vertebrates. In P. G. Hepper (Ed.), *Kin Recognition* (pp. 220–258). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Hamilton, W. D. (1971). Selection of selfish and altruistic behavior in some extreme models. In J. F. Eisenberg, & W. S. Dillon (Eds.), *Man and beast: comparative social behavior* (pp. 57–91). Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Hazell, R. W. A., Bennett, N. C., Jarvis, J. U. M., & Griffin, M. (2000). Adult dispersal in the co- operatively breeding Damaraland mole-rat (*Cryptomys damarensis*): A case study from the Waterberg region of Namibia. *Journal of Zoology, 252,* 19—25.

Heth, G., & Todrank, J. (2007). Using odours underground. In S. Begall, H. Burda, & C. E. Schleich (Eds.), *Subterranean rodents: news from the underground* (pp. 85—96). Berlin, Germany: Springer Verlag.

Heth, G., Todrank, J., Begall, S., Koch, R., Zilbiger, Y., Nevo, E., et al. (2002). Odours underground: Subterranean rodents may not forage 'blindly'. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology, 52,* 53—58.

Heth, G., Todrank, J., Begall, S., Wegner, R. E., & Burda, H. (2004). Genetic relatedness discrimination in eusocial *Cryptomys*, Bathyergidae, Rodentia. *Folia Zoologica, 53,* 269—278.

Heth, G., Todrank, J., & Burda, H. (2002). Individual odor similarities within colonies and across species of eusocial *Cryptomys* mole rats. *Journal of Mammalogy, 83,* 569—575.

Hetling, J. R., Baig-Silva, M. S., Comer, C. M., Pardue, M. T., Samaan, D. Y., Qtaishat, N. M., et al. (2005). Features of visual function in the naked mole-rat *Heterocephalus glaber*. *Journal of Comparative Physiology: Neuroethology, Sensory, Neural, and Behavioral Physiology, 191,* 317e330.

Hrouzková, E., Dvořáková, V., Jedlička, P., & Šumbera, R. (2013). Seismic communication in demon African mole rat Tachyoryctes daemon from Tanzania. *Ethology, 31,* 255—259.

Insley, S., Phillips, A. V., & Charrier, I. (2003). A review of social recognition in pinnipeds. *Aquatic Mammals, 29,* 181—201.

Jacobs, D. S., Reid, S., & Kuiper, S. (1998). Out-breeding behaviour and xenophobia in the Damaraland mole-rat, *Cryptomys damarensis*. *South African Journal of Zoology, 33,* 189—194.

Jarvis, J. U. M., & Bennett, N. C. (1993). Eusociality has evolved independently in two genera of bathyergid mole-rats — but occurs in no other subterranean mammal. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology, 33,* 253—260.

Johnston, R. E. (2003). Chemical communication in rodents: From pheromones to individual recognition. *Journal of Mammalogy, 84,* 1141—1162.

Kelley, J. B., Carter, S. N., Goldman, B. D., Goldman, S., & Freeman, D. A. (2019). Mechanisms for establishing and maintaining the reproductive hierarchy in a eusocial mammal, the Damaraland mole-rat. *Animal Behaviour, 158,* 193—200.

Komdeur, J., & Hatchwell, B. J. (1999). Kin recognition: Function and mechanism in avian societies. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 14,* 237—241.

Leedale, A. E., Simeoni, M., Sharp, S. P., Green, J. P., Slate, J., Lachlan, R. F., et al. (2020). Cost, risk, and avoidance of inbreeding in a cooperatively breeding bird. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 117,* 15724—15730.

Lehmann, L., & Perrin, N. (2003). Inbreeding avoidance through kin recognition: Choosy females boost male dispersal. *American Naturalist, 162,* 638—652.

Mateo, J. M. (2003). Kin recognition in ground squirrels and other rodents. *Journal of Mammalogy, 84,* 1163—1181.

Meléndez-Rosa, J., Bi, K., & Lacey, E. (2018). Genomic analysis of MHC-based mate choice in the monogamous California mouse. *Behavioural Ecology, 29,* 1167—1180.

Pepper, J. W., Braude, S. H., Lacey, E., & Sherman, P. W. (1991). Vocalisations in the naked mole-rat. In P. W. Sherman, J. U. M. Jarvis, & R. D. Alexander (Eds.), *Biology of the Naked mole-rat* (pp. 273—285). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

R Core Team. (2020). *R: a language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. http://www.R-project.org.

Radwan, J., Tkacz, A., & Kloch, A. (2008). MHC and preferences for male odour in the bank vole. *Ethology, 114,* 827—833.

Reeve, H. K. (1989). The evolution of conspecific acceptance thresholds. *American Naturalist, 133,* 407—435.

Roberts, S. A., Prescott, M. C., Davidson, A. J., McLean, L., Beynon, R. J., & Hurst, J. L. (2018). Individual odour signatures that mice learn are shaped by involatile major urinary proteins (MUPs). *BMC Biology, 16,* 48.

Rymer, T. L. (2020). The role of olfactory genes in the expression of rodent paternal care behaviour. *Genes, 11,* 292.

Sanyal, S., Jansen, H. G., de Grip, W. J., Nevo, E., & de Jong, W. W. (1990). The eye of the blind mole rat, *Spalax ehrenbergi*. Rudiment with hidden function? *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science, 31,* 1398—1404.

Sharp, S. P., McGowan, A., Wood, M. J., & Hatchwell, B. J. (2005). Learned kin recognition cues in a social bird. *Nature, 434,* 1127—1130.

Sherman, P. W. (1981). Kinship, demography, and Belding's ground squirrel nepotism. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology, 8,* 251—259.

Sherman, P. W., Jarvis, J. U. M., & Alexander, R. D. (1991). *Biology of the naked mole-rat*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sherman, P. W., Reeve, H. K., & Pfennig, D. W. (1997). Recognition systems. In J. R. Krebs, & N. B. Davies (Eds.), *Behavioral Ecology: An Evolutionary Approach* (pp. 69—96). Cambridge, U.K.: Blackwell Science Ltd.

Singer, A. G., Beauchamp, G. K., & Yamazaki, K. (1997). Volatile signals of the major histocompatibility complex in male mouse urine. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 94,* 2210—2214.

Sommer, S. (2005). Major histocompatibility complex and mate choice in a monogamous rodent. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology, 58,* 181—189.

Stathopoulos, S., Bishop, J. M., & O'Ryan, C. (2014). Genetic signatures for enhanced olfaction in the African mole-rats. *PloS One, 9,* Article e93336.

Stockley, P., Bottell, L., & Hurst, J. L. (2013). Wake up and smell the conflict: Odour signals in female competition. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 368,* 20130082.

Thorley, J., Katlein, N., Goddard, K., Zöttl, M., & Clutton-Brock, T. (2018). Reproduction triggers adaptive increases in body size in female mole-rats. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 285,* 20180987.

Toor, I., Clement, D., Carlson, E. N., & Holmes, M. M. (2015). Olfaction and social cognition in eusocial naked mole-rats, *Heterocephalus glaber*. *Animal Behaviour, 107,* 175—181.

Torrents-Ticó, M., Bennett, N. C., Jarvis, J. U. M., & Zöttl, M. (2018). Sex differences in timing and context of dispersal in Damaraland mole-rats (*Fukomys damarensis*). *Journal of Zoology, 306,* 252—257.

Weiß, B. M., Marcillo, A., Manser, M., Holland, R., Birkemeyer, C., & Widdig, A. (2018). A non-invasive method for sampling the body odour of mammals. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution, 9,* 420—429.

Willis, C., & Poulin, R. (2000). Preference of female rats for the odours of non-parasitised males: The smell of good genes? *Folia Parasitologica, 47,* 6—10.

Wright, J., McDonald, P. G., te Marvelde, L., Kazem, A. J. N., & Bishop, C. M. (2010). Helping effort increases with relatedness in bell miners, but 'unrelated' helpers of both sexes still provide substantial care. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 227,* 437—445.

Wyman, M. T., Mooring, M. S., McCowan, B., Penedo, M. C. T., & Hart, L. A. (2008). Amplitude of bison bellows reflects male quality, physical condition and motivation. *Animal Behaviour, 76,* 1625—1639.

Yosida, S., Kobayasi, K. I., Ikebuchi, M., Ozaki, R., & Okanoya, K. (2007). Antiphonal vocalization of a subterranean rodent, the naked mole-rat (*Heterocephalus glaber*). *Ethology, 113,* 703—710.

Young, A. J., & Bennett, N. C. (2013). Intra-sexual competition in cooperative birds and mammals: Why are females not bigger and better armed? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 236,* 20130075.

Young, A. J., Oosthuizen, M. K., Lutermann, H., & Bennett, N. C. (2010). Physiological suppression eases in Damaraland mole-rat societies when ecological constraints on dispersal are relaxed. *Hormones and Behavior, 57,* 177—183.

Zelová, J., Šumbera, R., Okroujlík, J., & Burda, H. (2010). Costs of digging is determined by extrinsic factors rather than by substrate quality in two subterranean rodent species. *Physiology & Behavior, 99,* 54—58.

Zöttl, M., Vullioud, P., Mendonça, R., Torrents Ticó, M., Gaynor, D., Mitchell, A., & Clutton-Brock, T. (2016). Differences in cooperative behavior among Damaraland mole rats are consequences of an age-related polyethism. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 113,* 10382—10387.

Appendix

Table A1

Experimental design for 192 trials conducted on 25 individuals

Subject	Sex	Trial 1	Trial 2	Trial 3	Trial 4	Trial 6	Trial 7	Trial 8
1	Female	A	A					
2	Female	A	A	B	F	E	B	F
3	Female	A	A	E	B	F	E	B
4	Female	A	A	E	F	B	E	F
5	Female	A	A	F	B	E	F	B
6	Female	A	A	F	E	B	F	E
7	Female	A	A	B	E	F	B	E
8	Female	A	A	B	F	E	B	F
9	Female	A	A	E	B	F	E	B
10	Female	A	A	E	F	B	E	F
11	Female	A	A	F	B	E	F	B
12	Female	A	A	F	E	B	F	E
13	Female			B	E	F	B	E
14	Male	A	A	B	C	D	B	C
15	Male	A	A	B	D	C	B	D
16	Male	A	A	C	B	D	C	B
17	Male	A	A	C	D	B	C	D
18	Male	A	A	D	B	C	D	B
19	Male	A	A	D	C	B	D	C
20	Male	A	A	B	C	D	B	C
21	Male	A	A	B	D	C	B	D
22	Male	A	A	C	B	D	C	B
23	Male	A	A	C	D	B	C	D
24	Male	A	A	D	B	C	D	B
25	Male	A	A	D	C	B	D	C

Each letter (A—F) denotes a specific treatment: A: solitary male versus solitary female; B: breeding group versus control sand; C: solitary female versus control sand; D: breeding group versus solitary female; E: solitary male versus control sand; F: breeding group versus solitary male. In each case, the placement of the sand stimuli in the left or right arm was determined randomly.

Table A2
Ethogram for the experimental trials

	Description
Continuous behaviour	
Dig	Using teeth and front paws to dig in the sand of either tunnel arm
Gnaw	Gnawing on the tunnel walls or elsewhere (e.g. metal plate divider) with the incisors
Nose sand	Investigating sand by touching it with the nose. Often includes slight movements of the head, making it clear that the individual is smelling the sand
Retreat	The rapid reversing of a mole-rat after nosing the sand or sniffing in a tunnel arm. Where observed, seems apparent that animal is escaping from the area in which it finds itself
Sniff	Sniffing the air or parts of the tunnel system. Accompanied by slight movements of the head and wrinkling of the nose. (cf 'Nose sand')
Sweep	Animals moving backwards while pushing sand with the hindlegs. Often taking a grip with nose or teeth
Miscellaneous	Any behaviour that cannot be assigned to the other categories. It includes all variations of locomotion, e.g. walking, running.
Continuous location	
Neutral tunnel	Mole-rat in the neutral maze arm (including the junction)
Left tunnel	Mole-rat in left maze arm
Right tunnel	Mole-rat in right maze arm.
Instantaneous event	
Cleared 10 cm sand	Mole-rat has moved past the 10 cm line and cleared all sand up to this location by sweeping it away
Cleared 20 cm sand	Mole-rat has moved past the 20 cm line and cleared all sand up to this location by sweeping it away
Cleared 30 cm sand	Mole-rat has completely cleared the plug of sand in the maze arm and swept it away from the end of the tunnel arm
Instantaneous behaviour	
Pump	Repetitive up and down movement of body somewhat akin to a 'press up'

The sand-clearing 'instantaneous' events were always linked to a maze arm. Because individuals rarely retreated from a sand stimulus, we did not investigate retreat behaviour statistically, despite our initial expectation that this behaviour might be interesting.

Table A3
Time budget for trial with sand from solitary female versus sand from solitary male

Contrast	Fixed effects	Estimate	95% CI
Solitary female—Solitary male (SSN—SON)	Intercept: solitary female_moving sand (SSN)	−1.60	−1.91 to −1.29
	Intercept: solitary female_nosing sand (SSN)	−4.30	−4.83 to −3.81
	Intercept: solitary male_moving sand (SON)	−1.46	−1.74 to −1.18
	Intercept: solitary male_nosing sand (SON)	−3.53	−4.05 to −3.04
	Sex M: solitary female_moving sand (SON)	0.03	−0.41 to 0.47
	Sex M: solitary female_nosing sand (SON)	0.02	−0.69 to 0.73
	Sex M: solitary male_moving sand (SSN)	0.21	−0.19 to 0.60
	Sex M: solitary male_nosing sand (SSN)	−0.14	−0.83 to 0.59
	Random effects		
	~AnimalID: solitary female_moving sand intercept	0.27	0.02 to 0.58
	~AnimalID: solitary male_nosing sand intercept	0.30	0.01 to 0.79
	~AnimalID: solitary female_nosing sand intercept	0.31	0.04 to 0.57
	~AnimalID: solitary male_nosing sand intercept	0.53	0.05 to 1.04
	~ TrialID: solitary female_moving sand intercept	0.62	0.46 to 0.80
	~TrialID: solitary male_nosing sand intercept	1.01	0.73 to 1.36
	~TrialID: solitary female_moving sand intercept	0.48	0.35 to 0.65
	~TrialID: solitary male_nosing sand intercept	0.84	0.59 to 1.16

Model output tables for the multilevel multinomial logistic regressions that modelled the behavioural time budget of mole-rats in a two-choice experimental treatment in which subjects ($N = 12$ males, $N = 12$ females) were presented with sand from a solitary male and a solitary female. Because of how the model was coded, intercepts are reported for 'solitary female' and 'solitary male' (relative to neutral tunnel); depending on the sex, fixed effects then represent SON or SSN. Subjects were exposed to each treatment twice. In all trials, 'Other' behaviour formed the reference category, with estimates then representing the log-odds of engaging in either moving sand or nosing sand (in maze arms with either sand stimulus) instead of the reference level. See Figs 2 and 3 for plots of model predictions. CI: credible interval.

Table A4
Time budget for trial with sand from breeding group versus sand from solitary opposite-sex nonbreeder (SON)

Contrast	Fixed effects	Estimate	95% CI
Breeding group—SON	Intercept: breeding_moving sand	−2.00	−2.66 to −1.35
	Intercept: breeding_nosing sand	−3.58	−4.22 to −2.95
	Intercept: SON_moving sand	−1.11	−1.41 to −0.83
	Intercept: SON_nosing sand	−2.83	−3.32 to −2.33
	Sex M: breeding_moving sand	0.53	−0.37 to 1.43
	Sex M: breeding_nosing sand	−0.28	−1.22 to 0.62
	Sex M: SON_moving sand	0.12	−0.28 to 0.54
	Sex M: SON_nosing sand	−0.49	−1.20 to 0.21
	Random effects		
	~AnimalID: breeding_moving sand intercept	0.66	0.05 to 1.29
	~AnimalID: breeding_nosing sand intercept	0.51	0.03 to 1.16
	~AnimalID: SON_moving sand intercept	0.30	0.03 to 0.58
	~AnimalID: SON_nosing sand intercept	0.40	0.02 to 0.90
	~TrialID: breeding_moving sand intercept	1.22	0.87 to 1.66
	~TrialID: breeding_nosing sand intercept	1.27	0.90 to 1.72
	~TrialID: SON_moving sand intercept	0.50	0.37 to 0.67
	~TrialID: SON_nosing sand intercept	0.99	0.74 to 1.30

Model output tables for the multilevel multinomial logistic regressions that modelled the behavioural time budget of mole-rats in a two-choice experimental treatment in which subjects ($N = 12$ males, $N = 12$ females) were presented with sand from a breeding group and sand from a solitary, opposite-sex nonbreeder. Subjects were exposed to each treatment twice. In all trials, 'Other' behaviour formed the reference category, with estimates then representing the log-odds of engaging in either moving sand or nosing sand (in maze arms with either sand stimulus) instead of the reference level. See Figs 2 and 3 for plots of model predictions. CI: credible interval.

Table A5
Time budget for trial with control sand versus sand from solitary opposite-sex nonbreeder (SON)

Contrast	Fixed effects	Estimate	95% CI
Control sand–SON	Intercept: control sand_moving sand	−1.73	−2.22 to −1.25
	Intercept: control sand_nosing sand	−4.72	−5.46 to −4.04
	Intercept: SON_moving sand	−−1.15	−1.49 to −0.79
	Intercept: SON_nosing sand	-3.08	−3.54 to −2.63
	Sex M: control sand_moving sand	0.04	−0.65 to 0.73
	Sex M: control sand_nosing sand	-0.84	−1.89 to 0.18
	Sex M: SON_moving sand	-0.16	−0.70 to 0.35
	Sex M: SON_nosing sand	-0.70	−1.37 to −0.07
	Random effects		
	~AnimalID: control sand_moving sand intercept	0.71	0.35 to 1.10
	~AnimalID: control sand_nosing sand intercept	0.35	0.01 to 1.00
	~AnimalID: SON_moving sand intercept	0.40	0.04 to 0.76
	~AnimalID: SON_nosing sand intercept	0.40	0.02 to 0.89
	~TrialID: control sand_moving sand intercept	0.62	0.45 to 0.87
	~TrialID: control sand_nosing sand intercept	1.48	1.06 to 2.02
	~TrialID: SON_moving sand intercept	0.65	0.48 to 0.87
	~TrialID: SON_nosing sand intercept	0.84	0.60 to 1.14

Model output tables for the multilevel multinomial logistic regressions that modelled the behavioural time budget of mole-rats in a two-choice experimental treatment in which subjects ($N = 12$ males, $N = 12$ females) were presented with control sand and sand from a solitary, opposite-sex nonbreeder. Subjects were exposed to each treatment twice. In all trials, 'Other' behaviour formed the reference category, with estimates then representing the log-odds of engaging in either moving sand or nosing sand (in maze arms with either sand stimulus) instead of the reference level. See Figs 2 and 3 for plots of model predictions. CI: credible interval.

Table A6
Time budget for trial with control sand versus sand from breeding group

Contrast	Fixed effects	Estimate	95% CI
Control sand–Breeding group	Intercept: control sand_moving sand	−1.47	−1.82 to −1.12
	Intercept: control sand_nosing sand	−3.44	−4.00 to −2.88
	Intercept: breeding_moving sand	−1.95	−2.47 to 1.42
	Intercept: breeding_nosing sand	−5.57	−6.59 to −4.68
	Sex M: control sand_moving sand	0.15	−0.35 to 0.65
	Sex M: control sand_nosing sand	−0.36	−1.18 to 0.43
	Sex M: breeding_moving sand	0.20	−0.54 to 0.96
	Sex M: breeding_nosing sand	−0.44	−1.80 to 0.90
	Random effects		
	~AnimalID: control sand_moving sand intercept	0.39	0.04 to 0.73
	~AnimalID: control sand_nosing sand intercept	0.72	0.24 to 1.18
	~AnimalID: breeding_moving sand intercept	0.68	0.17 to 1.12
	~AnimalID: breeding_nosing sand intercept	0.76	0.04 to 1.73
	~TrialID: control sand_moving sand intercept	0.64	0.47 to 0.85
	~TrialID: control sand_nosing sand intercept	0.73	0.49 to 1.06
	~TrialID: breeding_moving sand intercept	0.81	0.59 to 1.12
	~TrialID: breeding_nosing sand intercept	1.62	1.05 to 2.35

Model output tables for the multilevel multinomial logistic regressions that modelled the behavioural time budget of mole-rats in a two-choice experimental treatment in which subjects ($N = 12$ males, $N = 12$ females) were presented with control sand and sand from a breeding group. Subjects were exposed to each treatment twice. In all trials, 'Other' behaviour formed the reference category, with estimates then representing the log-odds of engaging in either moving sand or nosing sand (in maze arms with either sand stimulus) instead of the reference level. See Figs 2 and 3 for plots of model predictions. CI: credible interval.

Table A7
Proportion of time spent in the neutral tunnel, left arm or right arm of the T-maze

Model	Contrast	Fixed effects	Estimate	95% CI	Random effects	Estimate	95% CI
1-	Solitary female–Solitary male (SSN–SON)	Intercept: solitary female (SSN)	−0.12	−0.43 to 0.20	~AnimalID: solitary female intercept	0.27	0.02−0.58
		Intercept: solitary male (SON)	0.15	−0.17 to 0.47	~AnimalID: solitary male intercept	0.36	0.04−0.67
		Sex M: solitary female (SON)	0.14	−0.30 to 0.58	~TrialID: solitary female intercept	0.62	0.47−0.80
		Sex M: solitary male (SSN)	0.15	−0.32 to 0.60	~TrialID: solitary female intercept	0.54	0.40−0.73
2	Breeding–SON	Intercept: breeding	−0.12	−0.48 to 0.24	~AnimalID: breeding intercept	0.39	0.03−0.74
		Intercept: SON	0.44	0.10 to 0.77	~AnimalID: SON intercept	0.46	0.19−0.73
		Sex M: breeding	0.37	−0.15 to 0.89	~TrialID: breeding intercept	0.62	0.45−0.84
		Sex M: SON	0.04	−0.43 to 0.53	~TrialID: SON intercept	0.45	0.33−0.63
3	Control sand–SON	Intercept: control sand	−0.19	−0.64 to 0.26	~AnimalID: control intercept	0.63	0.32−0.98
		Intercept: SON	0.34	−0.03 to 0.71	~AnimalID: SON intercept	0.48	0.15−0.79
		Sex M: control sand	0.03	−0.60 to 0.65	~TrialID: control intercept	0.57	0.42−0.79
		Sex M: SON	−0.10	−0.60 to 0.42	~TrialID: SON intercept	0.53	0.38−0.72
4	Control sand–Breeding	Intercept: control sand	−0.41	−0.78 to 0.04	~AnimalID: control intercept	0.37	0.03−0.74
		Intercept: breeding	−0.15	−0.52 to 0.21	~AnimalID: breeding intercept	0.45	0.09−0.78
		Sex M: control sand	0.24	−0.31 to 0.74	~TrialID: control intercept	0.70	0.52−0.93
		Sex M: breeding	0.30	−0.22 to 0.83	~TrialID: breeding intercept	0.59	0.43−0.81

Model output tables for the multilevel multinomial logistic regressions that modelled the proportion of time spent in each of the three areas of the T-maze across four two-choice experimental treatments: treatment 1: same-sex nonbreeder (SSN) versus solitary, opposite-sex nonbreeder (SON); treatment 2: breeding group versus SON; treatment 3: control sand versus SON; treatment 4: control sand versus breeding group. In all trials ($N = 192$), the neutral tunnel formed the reference category, with estimates representing the log-odds of engaging in another behaviour instead of the reference level. 'Contrast' denotes the two sand stimuli present in each trial. Because of how model 1 was coded, intercepts are reported for 'solitary female' and 'solitary male' (relative to neutral tunnel); depending on the sex, fixed effects then represent SON or SSN, as plotted in Fig. 4. All individuals ($N = 24$) were exposed to each treatment twice. See Fig. 4 for plots of model predictions. CI: credible interval.

Table A8
Total amount of sand removed

Sex	Treatment	Estimate ± SE	Z	P	Random effect	Variance (SD)
Female	SON versus SSN	−0.39 ± 0.58	−0.68	0.50	TrialID:AnimalID	2.09 (1.45)
	Threshold: 0|10 cm	−3.70 ± 0.96	−3.48		AnimalID	0.04 (0.17)
	Threshold: 10|20 cm	−0.40 ± 0.57	−0.71			
	Threshold: 20|30 cm	1.80 ± 0.67	2.69			
	SON versus Breeding group	1.04 ± 0.55	1.87	0.06	TrialID:AnimalID	0.00 (0.00)
	Threshold: 0|10 cm	−1.13 ± 0.49	−2.29		AnimalID	0.00 (0.00)
	Threshold: 10|20 cm	0.40 ± 0.45	0.89			
	Threshold: 20|30 cm	1.89 ± 0.54	3.47			
	SON versus Control sand	0.86 ± 0.56	1.53	0.13	TrialID:AnimalID	0.00 (0.00)
	Threshold: 0|10 cm	−1.60 ± 0.55	0.55		AnimalID	0.00 (0.00)
	Threshold: 10|20 cm	0.14 ± 0.44	0.44			
	Threshold: 20|30 cm	1.71 ± 0.57	0.57			
	Breeding group versus Control	−0.65 ± 0.56	−1.17	0.24	TrialID:AnimalID	0.00 (0.00)
	Threshold: 0|10 cm	−1.78 ± 0.58	−3.06		AnimalID	0.00 (0.00)
	Threshold: 10|20 cm	−0.11 ± 0.45	−0.26			
	Threshold: 20|30 cm	−1.60 ± 0.56	2.86			
Male	SON versus SSN	1.14 ± 0.63	1.80	0.07	TrialID:AnimalID	2.03 (1.42)
	Threshold: 0|10 cm	−1.77 ± 0.76	−2.33		AnimalID	1.26 (1.12)
	Threshold: 10|20 cm	−0.02 ± 0.63	−0.04			
	Threshold: 20|30 cm	2.24 ± 0.81	2.78			
	SON versus Breeding group	1.35 ± 0.63	2.14	0.03	TrialID:AnimalID	0.54 (0.73)
	Threshold: 0|10 cm	−1.91 ± 0.64	−2.97		AnimalID	0.33 (0.57)
	Threshold: 10|20 cm	0.17 ± 0.49	0.36			
	Threshold: 20|30 cm	1.44 ± 0.57	2.52			
	SON versus Control sand	1.82 ± 0.72	2.51	0.01	TrialID:AnimalID	6.80 (2.61)
	Threshold: 0|10 cm	−3.32 ± 1.10	−3.01		AnimalID	0.00 (0.00)
	Threshold: 10|20 cm	−0.19 ± 0.75	−0.25			
	Threshold: 20|30 cm	2.56 ± 0.94	2.72			
	Breeding group versus Control	−1.39 ± 0.66	−2.12	0.03	TrialID:AnimalID	1.61 (1.27)
	Threshold: 0|10 cm	−3.83 ± 1.09	−3.50		AnimalID	1.80 (1.34)
	Threshold: 10|20 cm	−0.28 ± 0.68	−0.41			
	Threshold: 20|30 cm	0.99 ± 0.72	1.38			

Model outputs from ordinal logistic regressions (cumulative link mixed models, CLMM) comparing the amount of sand removed from T-maze arms across four two-choice experimental treatments ($N = 24$): treatment 1: same-sex nonbreeder (SSN) versus solitary, opposite-sex nonbreeder (SON); treatment 2: breeding group versus SON; treatment 3: control sand versus SON; treatment 4: control sand versus breeding group. Sand removed (cm) is binned into 10 cm increments to a maximum of 30 cm. Trials lasted 10 min. Thresholds represent log-cumulative-odds at three cut-points in the data: 0 cm, 10 cm and 20 cm of sand moved. The treatment effect then estimates the change in log-cumulative-odds at each threshold, allowing for an overall shift in the probability mass towards higher or lower amounts of sand clearing according to the contrast in either sex. Random effects estimates are not presented.

Table A9
First arm to clear of sand

Sex	Treatment	X^2	df	P
Female	SON versus SSN	0	1	1
	SON versus Breeding group	2.5	1	0.11
	SON versus Control sand	2.5	1	0.11
	Breeding group versus Control	0	1	1
Male	SON versus SSN	4.08	1	0.04
	SON versus Breeding group	2.76	1	0.09
	SON versus Control sand	1.45	1	0.22
	Breeding group versus Control	4.9	1	0.02

Outputs from one-sample tests for equality of proportions with continuity correction comparing the number of trials in which the first arm mole-rats cleared contained sand from a same-sex nonbreeder (SSN), opposite-sex nonbreeder (SON), breeding group or control sand ($N = 24$) across four two-choice experimental treatments: treatment 1: SSN versus SON; treatment 2: breeding group versus SON; treatment 3: control sand versus SON; treatment 4: control sand versus breeding group. In some treatments, no arm was cleared. Trials lasted 10 min.

Figure A1. Image of the experimental set-up. The mole-rat in the image is sweeping sand from the right arm of the tunnel, leading to sand being expelled through the grid.