Canadian Journal of Zoology
Revue canadienne de zoologie

**No evidence for larger brains in cooperatively breeding
cichlid fishes**

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Zoology</i>
Manuscript ID	cjz-2015-0118.R1
Manuscript Type:	Note
Date Submitted by the Author:	09-Feb-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Reddon, Adam; McGill University, Biology O'Connor, Constance; McMaster University, Ligocki, Isaac; The Ohio State University, Hellmann, Jennifer; The Ohio State University, Marsh-Rollo, Susan; McMaster University, Hamilton, Ian; The Ohio State University, Balshine, Sigal; McMaster University,
Keyword:	COMPARATIVE < Discipline, CENTRAL NERVOUS SYSTEM < Organ System, CICHLIDAE < Taxon

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1 No evidence for larger brains in cooperatively breeding cichlid fishes

2

3 **Adam R. Reddon^{1,4,*}, Constance M. O'Connor^{1,5}, Isaac Y. Ligoeki², Jennifer K. Hellmann²,**
4 **Susan E. Marsh-Rollo¹, Ian M. Hamilton^{2,3} and Sigal Balshine¹**

5

6 1. Department of Psychology, Neuroscience and Behaviour, McMaster University, Hamilton ON,
7 Canada

8 2. Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology, The Ohio State University, Columbus,
9 OH, USA

10 3. Department of Mathematics, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA

11 4. Current address: Department of Biology, McGill University, Montreal QC, Canada

12 5. Current address: Wildlife Conservation Society Canada, Thunder Bay, ON, Canada

13 *Author for correspondence: adam.reddon@mcgill.ca

Abstract: The social brain hypothesis posits that frequent social interactions, characteristic of group living species, select for greater socio-cognitive abilities and the requisite neural machinery. An extension of the social brains hypothesis, known as the cooperative breeding brain hypothesis, postulates that cooperatively breeding species, which live in stable social groups and provide alloparental care, face particularly pronounced cognitive demands as they must recognize, remember, and differentially respond to multiple group members. These socio-cognitive challenges are thought to have selected for increased cognitive capacity, supported by a bigger brain. In order to test the prediction that cooperative breeders have larger brains, we performed a phylogenetically-controlled comparison of the whole brain masses of adult fish from 16 closely related species of cooperatively and independently breeding Lamprologine cichlid species from Lake Tanganyika. We collected data on brain mass from males of eight species of Lamprologine cichlids and added this to brain mass data from eight more species found in the published literature. Controlling for body size and phylogeny, we found that cooperative breeding species did not have larger brains, and this was true of for both our field collected dataset and the expanded dataset including published values. This study adds to a growing body of literature from other taxa casting doubt on the cooperative breeding brain hypothesis.

Keywords: brain mass, Lake Tanganyika, cooperative breeding brain hypothesis, social brain hypothesis

32 Introduction

33 Neural tissue is costly to grow and maintain, and brains are therefore expected to be no larger
34 than is necessary to support survival and reproduction (Aiello and Wheeler 1995). However, larger
35 brains, relative to body size, may arise when there is selection on cognitive capacity (Jerison 1973). For
36 example, across primates the incidence of behavioural innovation and tool use are positively correlated
37 with brain size (Reader and Laland 2002). In the Trinidadian guppy (*Poecilia reticulata* (Peters,
38 1859)), fish that were artificially selected for larger brain size outperformed smaller brained fish in a
39 learning assay, but also developed smaller guts, suggesting a tradeoff between costly tissues (Kotrschal
40 et al. 2013). The social brain hypothesis predicts that social living may be a particularly strong selective
41 force on cognitive capacity and hence driver of increased brain size (Dunbar 1998). According to this
42 hypothesis, group living is cognitively demanding, because social animals must recognize, interact
43 with, and behave appropriately towards a potentially large number of conspecifics and thus require
44 greater neural machinery in order to succeed in these tasks (Dunbar 1998). However, it has been argued
45 that not all of these socio-cognitive abilities are necessarily required in all social animals (Dunbar and
46 Shultz 2007). In fact, many social species form large, relatively anonymous, fission-fusion societies in
47 which complex social relationships between group members may be absent (Krause and Ruxton 2002).
48 Therefore, it is perhaps unrealistic to expect that group living in and of itself will necessarily drive
49 selection on increased brain size. Instead, it is possible that the depth and complexity of social
50 relationships, in addition to grouping behaviour, are potential drivers of socio-cognitive complexity and
51 concomitant brain size evolution (Dunbar and Shultz 2007).

52 A derived version of the social brain hypothesis, the cooperative breeding brain hypothesis,
53 posits that cooperatively breeding species, where non-breeding helpers-at-the-nest aid in offspring care,
54 face particularly strong socio-cognitive challenges emerging from this complex social arrangement and
55 therefore ought to show greater cognitive sophistication compared to their independently breeding
56 relatives (Burkart et al. 2009; Burkart and van Schaik 2010). Cooperative breeders must recognize, and

respond appropriately to each group member according to their social status and their respective relationships within the group (Soares et al. 2010). Thus, cooperatively breeding species are expected to have disproportionately large brains for their body size when compared to their independently breeding relatives (Thornton and McAuliffe 2015). We are aware of only one specific test of this prediction; among the birds of the parvorder Corvida, cooperative breeders did not have larger brains than their closest relatives that breed independently (Iwaniuk and Arnold 2004). However, tests on a greater diversity of taxa are still required to understand the patterns of brain size in relation to cooperative behaviour across taxa.

The explosive radiation of cichlid fishes in the African Great Lakes has made cichlids a model system for the study of ecology and evolution (Salzburger et al. 2005). Cichlids have a remarkable diversity of behavioural and ecological specializations (Barlow 2000). Within the cichlids, the Lamprologine tribe, endemic to Lake Tanganyika, shows an especially impressive diversity of social behaviour including the vast majority of all known cooperatively breeding fishes (Taborsky and Limberger 1981; Taborsky 1994; Heg and Bachar 2006). Therefore, these Lamprologine cichlids represent an excellent opportunity for a test of the prediction that cooperative breeding will be associated with larger relative brain size. Here, we compare the brain mass (correcting for body mass) of adult males from four group-living and cooperatively breeding species (*Neolamprologus pulcher* (Trewavas & Poll, 1952), *N. savoryi* (Poll, 1949), *N. multifasciatus* (Boulenger, 1906), *Julidochromis ornatus* (Boulenger, 1898)) with four closely related non-grouping and independently breeding species (*N. modestus* (Boulenger, 1898), *N. tetracanthus* (Boulenger, 1899), *Telmatochromis temporalis* (Boulenger, 1898), *Lamprologus ocellatus* (Steindachner, 1909)) of Lamprologine cichlid fishes. In a follow-up analysis, we augment our investigation by expanding our sample with eight additional species using mixed-sex data drawn from the published literature (Gonzalez-Voyer et al. 2009a), resulting in a total of 16 species.

82 **Materials and methods**

83 *Study site and field methods*

84 All fish used were sexually mature males captured from southern Lake Tanganyika near
85 Mpulungu, Zambia (8°46'52" S, 31°5'18" E) in February-March, 2013. Individuals of eight species
86 were located and captured using SCUBA, between depths of 6-12 m. Fish were collected using fence-
87 and hand nets, and were brought slowly to the surface. At the surface, fish were weighed using a
88 portable electronic balance (Scout Pro Portable Scale, Ohaus, Parsippany, NJ) before being stunned by
89 submersion in ice water and swiftly decapitated. Whole brains were carefully extracted, and preserved
90 in 4% phosphate buffered paraformaldehyde for transport to McMaster University, Hamilton, ON,
91 Canada, where each brain was weighed three times using an electronic analytic balance (Classic Plus
92 AB204-S/FACT, Mettler Toledo, Mississauga, ON). The mean value from the three measurements was
93 taken as the brain mass for that individual. In total, we sampled $n=80$ sexually mature male fish, with
94 $n=10$ males per species. See Supplementary Table 1 for all field-collected individual data.

96 *Data from the Literature*

97 To supplement our field-collected data, we searched the literature for published accounts of
98 Lamprologine body and brain masses. We found a single source that presents mean body mass and
99 mean brain mass for males and females of eight additional Lamprologine cichlid species, including
100 three cooperatively-breeding species, and five independently-breeding species (Gonzalez-Voyer et al.
101 2009a). These data were drawn from a mixture of male and female fish collected from the field using
102 methods similar to those used in our field collections. See Supplementary Table 2 for the complete
103 dataset from all sixteen species, including mean values from our field-collected fish, as well as the
104 mean values presented in Gonzalez-Voyer et al. (2009a).

106 *Phylogenetic tree*

107 Nucleotide sequences for the NADH dehydrogenase subunit 2 (ND2), cytochrome B (CytB)
108 and mitochondrial control region for the sixteen study species, as well as for four out-group species
109 (*Asprotilapia leptura* (Boulenger, 1901), *Bathybates fasciatus* (Boulenger, 1901), *Boulengerochromis*
110 *microlepis* (Boulenger, 1899), and *Xenotilapia flavipinnis* (Poll, 1985)), were retrieved from the
111 National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) nucleotide data
112 (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nucleotide/>) (Supplementary Table 3). Out-group species were selected
113 because the divergence time for these species from the Lamprologine cichlids has been previously
114 estimated (Koblmüller et al. 2008; Sturmbauer et al. 2010). Nucleotide sequences were aligned using
115 MUSCLE (Edgar 2004a, b) and uploaded to MESQUITE (Maddison and Maddison 2011) to verify
116 aligned sequences and trim the alignment such that only the region with overlapping sequence data for
117 all species was retained. The resulting alignment was then used to estimate phylogenetic relationships
118 using the software program BEAST with BEAUTi v1.8 (Drummond and Rambaut 2007; Drummond et
119 al. 2012) to complete 10 million runs of a Bayesian Markov chain Monte Carlo model with an
120 uncorrelated lognormal relaxed molecular clock (Drummond et al. 2006) and HKY substitution model
121 with gamma + invariant site heterogeneity. The model of nucleotide evolution was selected as the most
122 appropriate using Akaike information criterion (AIC, Posada and Buckley 2004) in the program
123 jModelTest 2 (Guindon and Gascuel, 2003; Darriba et al., 2012). The program Tracer v1.5 (Rambaut et
124 al. 2007) was used to analyse the output from BEAST v1.8 and confirm estimated sample size (ESS)
125 values >200. Within BEAST v1.8, the program TreeAnnotator was used to find the best-supported tree,
126 using a burnin of 10%, set with a posterior probability limit of zero, and a maximum clade credibility
127 tree as the target tree type. The mean heights of each node were set so the final, consensus tree would
128 have the mean height at each node of all the samples (Drummond et al. 2006). Out-group species were
129 trimmed using MESQUITE. The final tree was visualized using the package “phytools” (Revell 2012)
130 within R version 3.1.2 (R Core Team, 2014). Our phylogenetic tree (Fig. 1) was consistent with

previous analysis of phylogenetic relationships among Lamprologine cichlids using mitochondrial genes (Sturmbauer et al. 1994, 2010; Day et al. 2007).

Statistical analyses

We used Bayesian phylogenetically-controlled statistical analyses to test for associations between brain mass and social system, including body mass, and the interaction effect between body mass and social system, as covariates. We performed two analyses. First, we performed an analysis where we used individual data for the eight species for which we had field-collected data. For this analysis, the additional species with only mean values available were trimmed from the phylogenetic tree using MESQUITE. Second, we performed an analysis on all sixteen species using the mean values available in the literature for each species (Gonzalez-Voyer et al. 2009a). Using the package “MCMCglmm” (Hadfield 2010), we performed generalised linear mixed models based on a Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithm. Within the MCMCglmm package, the phylogenetically-controlled analysis is implemented by including the phylogenetic tree as a random factor in the model (Hadfield 2010). Following examples from de Villemereuil and Nakagawa (2014), we defined our priors for the model as $V=1$ and $nu=0.02$ for both random effects and the residual variance, which correspond to an inverse-Gamma distribution with shape and scale parameters equal to 0.01, which is canonical (Gelman 2006). We ran each model for 5 million iterations, with a burnin of 1000, and a thinning interval of 500. With these priors and settings, there was no autocorrelation between successive stored iterations for any of the models (Hadfield 2015). Because Bayesian statistics are based on iterative processes, the outcomes therefore can vary slightly between runs. Therefore, we repeated the analyses three times, and report mean values for the 95% highest posterior density interval (HPD), as well as the P_{MCMC} , which are the Bayesian equivalents of 95% confidence intervals and p-values, respectively. Associations were considered significant when the 95% HPD excluded zero, and P_{MCMC} was less than 0.05. Analyses were conducted using R version 3.2.1 (R Core Team 2015).

Ethical note

Handling time was minimized as much as possible for all of the study animals. The methods described for animal capture and euthanasia were approved by the Animal Research Ethics Board of McMaster University (Animal Utilization Protocol No. 10-11-71) and adhered to both Canadian and Zambian laws, as well as the guidelines of the Canadian Council for Animal Care.

Results

Individual field-collected data

Using the individual level data for eight field-collected species (Fig. 2A), we found that brain mass was highly correlated with body mass (95% HPD interval=[0.30, 0.63]; $P_{\text{MCMC}} < 0.001$). However, there was no relationship between brain mass and social system (95% HPD interval=[-0.21, 0.64]; $P_{\text{MCMC}} = 0.29$). The interaction effect between body mass and social system was also not significant (95% HPD interval=[-0.24, 0.17]; $P_{\text{MCMC}} = 0.73$).

Mean values from all species

Using the mean values from all sixteen species (Fig. 2B), we found that brain mass was highly correlated with body mass (95% HPD interval=[0.47, 0.76]; $P_{\text{MCMC}} < 0.001$). There was no relationship between brain mass and social system (95% HPD interval=[-0.40, 0.33]; $P_{\text{MCMC}} = 0.87$). The interaction effect between body mass and social system was also not significant (95% HPD interval=[-0.17, 0.24]; $P_{\text{MCMC}} = 0.70$).

Discussion

We found no association between cooperative breeding and brain mass among Lamprologine cichlid fishes in either our field-collected sample of eight species or in our expanded sample of 16

species that included data from the published literature. Our results match those of a previous study examining the relationship between cooperative breeding and brain size in corvids, which also found no evidence of cooperative breeders having larger brains (Iwaniuk and Arnold 2004). Furthermore, among primates, cooperatively breeding species actually have some of the smallest brains for their body size (Reader 2003; Thornton and McAuliffe 2015). Although not a comparison between cooperative and independent breeders *per se*, a recent study examined the relationship between cooperative tendencies and brain mass in cleaner fishes, which may face similar demands to recognize and behave appropriately toward social partners, and also found no association between relative brain mass and cooperative tendency (Soares et al. 2015). Collectively, these results suggest that across taxa, cooperation is not associated with larger brain sizes.

The cooperative breeding brain size hypotheses has recently been criticized. Thornton and McAuliffe (2015) argue that many of the socio-cognitive abilities putatively associated with cooperative breeding are not unique to cooperative breeders, and that cooperative breeding in and of itself is unlikely to convey exceptional cognitive demands. For example, in their analysis, Thornton and McAuliffe (2015) do not find any evidence that prosociality, social learning, teaching or social coordination are overrepresented or exceptional among cooperatively breeding species. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that cooperative breeding may be associated with brain evolution, perhaps in more subtle ways that we could not detect with our methodology. First, it is possible that a particular brain area may increase or decrease in size in association with the emergence of cooperative breeding without a corresponding change in overall brain size. In contrast to the concerted model of brain evolution, wherein developmental constraints cause the entire brain to evolve in a relatively coordinated manner (Finlay and Darlington 1995), the mosaic model proposes that brain areas can evolve at least somewhat independently (Barton and Harvey 2000). Recent work suggests that the mosaic model is a better fit than the concerted evolution model for explaining the diversification of neuroanatomy in Tanganyikan cichlids (Gonzalez-Voyer et al. 2009b, c; Gonzalez-Voyer and Kolm

2010). Specifically, overall brain size explains only 86% of the variation in the size of various gross brain structures in Tanganyikan cichlids, a substantially lower proportion than in other taxa (Gonzalez-Voyer and Kolm 2010). This suggests that brain areas are somewhat free to change size independently through evolution, thereby potentially obscuring or abolishing any effect on overall brain size. A recent study on one of the cooperatively breeding Lamprologine cichlid fishes included in our sample, *Neolamprologus pulcher*, provides support for the mosaic model in this species at least on a developmental timescale (Fischer et al. 2015). The treatment of brains as uniform structures is one of several criticisms that have been levelled against studies comparing brain size across species (Healey and Rowe 2007). Admittedly, our study suffers from this limitation, but as a preliminary investigation, our results do suggest that neuroanatomical differences between cooperatively and independently breeding Lamprologine cichlids, if present, are subtle, and may be specific to certain brain areas.

In addition, other ecological or life history differences between the species we examined may have a larger effect on brain mass than cooperative breeding, *per se*. Factors including diet, parental care patterns, depth, habitat complexity and territory size are known to affect various aspects of brain morphology, including whole brain size, in Tanganyikan cichlid fishes (Gonzalez-Voyer et al. 2009a, b, c; Gonzalez-Voyer and Kolm 2010; Tsuboi et al. 2014). Therefore, alternative ecological or life history variables may have confounded or obscured any differences between the cooperatively and independently breeding species in our sample. However, the lack of variation in relative brain size among our sampled species argues against this alternative.

Previous work has shown that sex may be an important factor in determining relative brain size in cichlid fishes (Gonzalez-Voyer et al. 2009a; Kotschal et al. 2012, 2015; Samuk et al. 2014). However, our field-collected data included only males and the literature values we found were not split by sex, precluding any investigation of potential sex specific patterns of brain size in relation to social system. Future work is now needed to address the relationship between sex, social system and brain size in the Lamprologine cichlids.

Finally, the lack of pattern we observed between cooperatively and independently breeding Tanganyikan cichlids could simply result from small sample sizes at the species level, the individual level, or both. Indeed, we had only eight species in our field collected sample and 16 species in our total sample, both of which are substantially fewer than the number used in the previous study on birds (Iwaniuk and Arnold 2004). However, our total sample does cover 35% of the known cooperatively breeding cichlids in Lake Tanganyika, which together account for the vast majority of all known cooperatively breeding fish species (Taborsky 1994; Heg and Bachar 2006). At the individual sample level, our field collected sample size ($n=10$ individuals per species) is greater than the sample sizes used in most other studies (e.g., Iwaniuk and Arnold 2004; Gonzalez-Voyer et al. 2009a, b, c; Gonzalez-Voyer and Kolm 2010). While it is possible that subtle brain size differences do exist between cooperative and independently breeding Lamprologines, this would require large sample sizes to detect and the highly consistent relative brain mass we found among our sampled species suggests that this is unlikely.

Future work should measure the brains of the remaining cooperatively breeding Lamprologine fishes along with a larger sample of closely related independent breeders. It would also be interesting to examine group living species that are not cooperative (e.g., *Neolamprologus caudopunctatus*; Schaedelin et al. 2015) in order to disentangle the effect of group living from cooperative breeding *per se*. Future studies should endeavour to sample females in addition to males, as sex differences in brain size may interact with social system. Finally, exploring how the different brain areas vary in size, complexity and connectivity between cooperative and independent breeders would also be a natural avenue for future investigation. Specifically, a looking at the relative volumes of particular brain areas as a test of the mosaic model of brain evolution would be a worthwhile future direction. The preliminary results we report here add to the evidence suggesting that cooperative breeding in and of itself may not select for larger brains and supports a skeptical appraisal of the cooperative breeding brain size hypothesis.

256 Acknowledgements

257 We thank Kelly Garvy and Joseph Rozek for assistance in the field. This research was
258 supported by a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) Discovery
259 grant, NSERC equipment grant, Ontario Innovation Trust, and Canadian Foundation for Innovation
260 awards to SB. Additional research funding was provided by Canadian Society of Zoologists and
261 McMaster School of Graduate Studies research grants to ARR as well as the Journal of Experimental
262 Biology Travelling Fellowship awarded to CMO. IYL and JKH are supported by The Ohio State
263 University Fish Systematics Endowment, and the SciFund Challenge. ARR was supported by the
264 Margo Wilson and Martin Daly Ontario Graduate Scholarship and is currently supported by a Banting
265 Postdoctoral Fellowship. CMO was supported by the E.B. Eastburn Postdoctoral Fellowship from the
266 Hamilton Community Foundation. JKH is supported by the American Academy of Underwater
267 Sciences. SB is supported by the Canada Research Chair Program.

268 **References**

269 Aiello, L.C., and Wheeler, P. 1995. The expensive-tissue hypothesis: the brain and the digestive system
270 in human and primate evolution. *Curr. Anthropol.*, **36**: 199–221.

271

272 Barlow, G.W. 2000. The cichlid fishes. Nature’s grand experiment in evolution. Perseus Publishing,
273 Cambridge.

274

275 Barton, R.A., and Harvey, P.H. 2000. Mosaic evolution of brain structure in mammals. *Nature*, **405**:
276 1055–1058.

277

278 Burkart, J.M. and van Schaik, C.P. 2010. Cognitive consequences of cooperative breeding in primates?
279 *Anim. Cogn.* **13**: 1–19.

280

281 Burkart, J.M., Hrdy, S.B. and Van Schaik, C.P. 2009. Cooperative breeding and human cognitive
282 evolution. *Evol. Anthropol.* **18**: 175–186.

283

284 Darriba, D., Taboada, G.L., Doallo, R. and Posada, D. 2012. jModelTest 2: more models, new
285 heuristics and parallel computing. *Nat. Methods*, **9**: 772.

286

287 Day, J.J., Santini, S. and Garcia-Moreno, J. 2007. Phylogenetic relationships of the Lake Tanganyika
288 cichlid tribe Lamprologini: the story from mitochondrial DNA. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* **45**: 629-642.

289

- 290 Drummond, A.J., Ho, S.Y., Phillips, M.J. and Rambaut, A. 2006. Relaxed phylogenetics and dating
291 with confidence. *PLOS Biol.* **4**: e88.
- 292
- 293 Drummond, A.J., and Rambaut, A. 2007. BEAST: Bayesian evolutionary analysis by sampling trees.
294 *BMC Evol. Biol.* **7**: 214. http://beast.bio.ed.ac.uk/Main_Page.
- 295
- 296 Drummond, A.J., Suchard, M.A., Xie, D. and Rambaut, A. 2012. Bayesian phylogenetics with
297 BEAUTi and the BEAST 1.7. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **29**: 1969-1973.
- 298
- 299 Dunbar, R.I.M. 1998. The social brain hypothesis. *Evol. Anthropol.* **6**: 178–190.
- 300
- 301 Dunbar, R.I.M. and Shultz, S. 2007. Evolution in the social brain. *Science*, **317**: 1344–1347.
302 doi:10.1126/science.1145463
- 303
- 304 Edgar, R.C. 2004*a*. MUSCLE: multiple sequence alignment with high accuracy and high throughput.
305 *Nucleic Acids Res.* **32**: 1792-1797. <http://www.ebi.ac.uk/Tools/msa/muscle/>
- 306
- 307 Edgar, R.C. 2004*b*. MUSCLE: a multiple sequence alignment method with reduced time and space
308 complexity. *BMC Bioinformatics*, **5**, 113.
- 309
- 310 Finlay, B.L. and Darlington, R.B. 1995. Linked regularities in the development and evolution of
311 mammalian brains. *Science*, **268**: 1578-1584.
- 312

- 313 Fischer, S., Bessert-Nettelbeck, M., Kotrschal, A. and Taborsky, B. 2015. Rearing-group size
314 determines social competence and brain structure in a cooperatively breeding cichlid. *Am. Nat.* **186**:
315 123-140. <http://doi.org/10.1086/681636>
316
- 317 Gonzalez-Voyer, A. and Kolm, N. 2010. Sex, ecology and the brain: evolutionary correlates of brain
318 structure volumes in Tanganyikan cichlids. *PLoS ONE*, **5**: e14355.
319
- 320 Gonzalez-Voyer A., Winberg, S. and Kolm., N. 2009*a*. Social fishes and single mothers: brain
321 evolution in African cichlids. *Proc. R Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **276**: 161–167.
322
- 323 Gonzalez-Voyer, A., Winberg, S., and Kolm, N. 2009*b*. Brain structure evolution in a basal vertebrate
324 clade: evidence from phylogenetic comparative analysis of cichlid fishes. *BMC Evol. Biol.* **9**: 238.
325
- 326 Gonzalez-Voyer, A., Winberg, S., and Kolm, N. 2009*c*. Distinct evolutionary patterns of brain and
327 body size during adaptive radiation. *Evolution*, **63**: 2266–2274.
328
- 329 Gelman, A. 2006. Prior distributions for variance parameters in hierarchical models. *Bayesian Anal.* **1**:
330 515-534.
331
- 332 Guindon, S. and Gascuel, O. 2003. A simple, fast and accurate method to estimate large phylogenies by
333 maximum-likelihood. *Syst. Biol.* **52**: 696-704.
334

- 335 Hadfield, J.D. 2010. MCMC methods for multi-response generalized linear mixed models: the
336 MCMCglmm R Package. J. Stat. Softw., **33**: 1-22.
- 337
- 338 Hadfield, J.D. 2015. MCMCglmm: Course notes. URL: [https://cran.r-](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MCMCglmm/vignettes/CourseNotes.pdf)
339 [project.org/web/packages/MCMCglmm/vignettes/CourseNotes.pdf](https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MCMCglmm/vignettes/CourseNotes.pdf)
- 340
- 341 Healy, S.D. and Rowe, C. 2007. A critique of comparative studies of brain size. Proc. R Soc. Lond. B
342 Biol. Sci. **274**: 453–464.
- 343
- 344 Heg, D. and Bachar, Z. 2006. Cooperative breeding in the Lake Tanganyika cichlid *Julidochromis*
345 *ornatus*. Environ. Biol. Fishes, **76**: 265–281.
- 346
- 347 Iwaniuk, A.N. and Arnold, K.E. 2004. Is cooperative breeding associated with bigger brains? A
348 comparative test in the Corvida (Passeriformes). Ethology, **110**: 203–220.
- 349
- 350 Jerison, H.J. 1973. Evolution of the brain and intelligence. Academic Press, London.
- 351
- 352 Koblmüller, S., Schlieven, U.K., Duftner, N., Sefc, K.M., Katongo, C. and Sturmbauer, C. 2008. Age
353 and spread of the haplochromine cichlid fishes in Africa. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. **49**: 153-169.
- 354
- 355 Kotrschal, A., Buechel, S. D., Zala, S. M., Corral, A., Penn, D. J., and Kolm, N. 2015. Brain size
356 affects female but not male survival under predation threat. Ecol. Lett. **18**: 646-652
- 357

- 358 Kotrschal, A., Räsänen, K., Kristjánsson, B.K., Senn, M., and Kolm, N. 2012. Extreme sexual brain
359 size dimorphism in sticklebacks: a consequence of the cognitive challenges of sex and parenting? PLoS
360 ONE, **7**: e30055. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0030055.g002
361
- 362 Kotrschal, A., Rogell, B., Bundsen, A., Svensson, B., Zajitschek, S., Brännström, I., Immler, S.,
363 Maklakov, A. A. and Kolm, N. 2013. Artificial selection on relative brain size in the guppy reveals
364 costs and benefits of evolving a larger brain. Curr. Biol. **23**, 168–171. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2012.11.058
365
- 366 Krause, J. and Ruxton, G.D. 2002. Living in Groups. Oxford University Press, New York.
367
- 368 Maddison, W.P. and Maddison, D.R. 2011. Mesquite: a modular system for evolutionary analysis
369 [online]. Version 2.75. Available from <http://mesquiteproject.org>. [Accessed 1 June 2015].
370
- 371 Posada, D., and Buckley, T.R. 2004. Model selection and model averaging in phylogenetics:
372 advantages of Akaike information criterion and Bayesian approaches over likelihood ratio tests. Syst.
373 Biol. **53**, 793-808.
374
- 375 Rambaut, A., Suchard, M.A., Xie, D. and Drummond, A.J. 2007. Tracer v1.5, Available from
376 <http://beast.bio.ed.ac.uk/Tracer>
377
- 378 Reader, S.M. 2003. Relative brain size and the distribution of innovation and social learning across the
379 nonhuman primates. In *The biology of traditions: models and evidence*. Edited by D.M. Frigaszy and
380 S. Perry. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. pp. 56–93.
381

- 382 Reader, S.M. and Laland, K.N. 2002. Social intelligence, innovation, and enhanced brain size in
383 primates. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **99**: 4436–4441. doi:10.1073/pnas.062041299
384
- 385 Revell, L.J. 2012. phytools: an R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other things).
386 *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **3**: 217–223.
387
- 388 Salzburger, W., Mack, T., Verheyen, E. and Meyer, A. 2005. Out of Tanganyika: Genesis, explosive
389 speciation, key-innovations and phylogeography of the haplochromine cichlid fishes. *BMC Evol. Biol.*
390 **5**: 17.
- 391
- 392 Samuk, K., Iritani, D. and Schluter, D. 2014. Reversed brain size sexual dimorphism accompanies loss
393 of parental care in white sticklebacks. *Ecol. Evol.* **4**: 3236–3243. doi:10.1002/ece3.1175
394
- 395 Schaedelin, F.C., van Dongen, W.F.D. and Wagner, R.H. 2015. Mate choice and genetic monogamy in
396 a biparental, colonial fish. *Behav. Ecol.* **26**: 782–788. doi:10.1093/beheco/arv011
397
- 398 Soares, M., Bshary, R., Fusani, L., Goymann, W., Hau, M., Hirschenhauser, K. and Oliveira, R.F.
399 2010. Hormonal mechanisms of cooperative behaviour. *Philos. Trans. R Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **365**:
400 2737–2750.
401
- 402 Soares, M.C., André, G.I. and Paula, J.R. 2015. Preliminary notes on brain weight variation across
403 labrid fish species with different levels of cooperative behaviour. *Curr. Zool.* **61**: 274–280.
404

- 405 Sturmbauer, C., Salzburger, W., Duftner, N., Schelly, R. and Koblmüller, S. 2010. Evolutionary history
406 of the Lake Tanganyika cichlid tribe Lamprologini (Teleostei: Perciformes) derived from
407 mitochondrial and nuclear DNA data. *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* **57**: 266-284.
- 408
- 409 Sturmbauer, C., Verheyen, E. and Meyer, A. 1994. Mitochondrial phylogeny of the Lamprologini, the
410 major substrate spawning lineage of cichlid fishes from Lake Tanganyika in Eastern Africa. *Mol. Biol.*
411 *Evol.* **11**: 691-703.
- 412
- 413 Taborsky, M. 1994. Sneakers, satellites, and helpers: parasitic and cooperative behavior in fish
414 reproduction. *Adv. Study Behav.* **23**: 1–100.
- 415
- 416 Taborsky, M. and Limberger, D. 1981. Helpers in fish. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* **8**: 143–145.
- 417
- 418 Thornton, A. and Mcauliffe, K. 2015. Cognitive consequences of cooperative breeding? A critical
419 appraisal. *J Zool. Lond.* **295**: 12–22. doi:10.1111/jzo.12198
- 420
- 421 Tsuboi, M., Husby, A., Kotrschal, A., Hayward, A., Buechel, S.D., Zidar, J., Lovle, H. and Kolm, N.
422 2014. Comparative support for the expensive tissue hypothesis: big brains are correlated with smaller
423 gut and greater parental investment in Lake Tanganyika cichlids. *Evolution* **69**: 190-200.
- 424
- 425 de Villemereuil, P. and Nakagawa, S. 2014. General quantitative genetic methods for comparative
426 biology. *In Modern Phylogenetic Comparative Methods and Their Application in Evolutionary*
427 *Biology: Concepts and Practice*. Edited by L.Z. Garamszegi. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. pp. 287-303.

Figure captions

Figure 1. The phylogenetic relationships among the 16 species of Lamprologine fish included in the current study. These relationships are based on the ND2, cytochrome B, and mitochondrial control region sequences, and created using Bayesian Markov chain Monte Carlo analysis with *A. leptura*, *B. fasciatus*, *B. microlepis*, and *X. flavipinnis* as the out-groups (see Methods for full details; see Supplementary Table 3 for sequence NCBI accession numbers). Each species is represented by a unique symbol (consistent with Fig. 2). Grey symbols represent cooperatively breeding species, while black symbols represent independently breeding species. Filled symbols represent species with field-collected data, while open symbols represent species with literature data.

Figure 2. The relationship between body mass and brain mass for (A) eight species of Lamprologine cichlids with field-collected data ($n=10$ individuals per species), and (B) mean values of 16 species of Lamprologine cichlids species using a combination of field-collected data and data published in Gonzalez-Voyer et al. 2009a. Using a Bayesian phylogenetically-controlled statistical analyses for both the (A) field-collected subset, and (B) the full dataset, we found a significant positive relationship between body mass and brain mass; however, neither social system, nor the interaction effect between body mass and social system were significantly associated with brain mass (see Methods and Results for full details.). For both panels, each species is represented by a unique symbol (consistent with Fig. 1). Grey symbols represent cooperatively breeding species, while black symbols represent independently breeding species. Filled symbols represent species with field-collected data, while open symbols represent species with literature data.