

1 **Parent-offspring Conflict in feral dogs: A Bioassay**

2

3 Sreejani Sen Majumder<sup>1</sup>, Manabi Paul<sup>1</sup>, and Anindita Bhadra<sup>1</sup>

4 <sup>1</sup> Behaviour and Ecology Lab, Department of Biological Sciences,

5 Indian Institute of Science Education and Research – Kolkata.

6

7 **Address for Correspondence:**

8 **Anindita Bhadra**

9 Behavior and Ecology Lab, Department of Biological Sciences,

10 Indian Institute of Science Education and Research – Kolkata

11 C.V. Raman Building,

12 PO BCKV Main Campus, Mohanpur,

13 PIN 741252, Nadia, West Bengal, INDIA.

14 Ph: +91 33 25873120 – 207

15 E-mail: [abhadra@iiserkol.ac.in](mailto:abhadra@iiserkol.ac.in)

16

17 **Abstract**

18 The parent-offspring conflict theory is an interesting premise for understanding the dynamics of  
19 parental care. However, this theory is not easy to test empirically, as exact measures of parental  
20 investment in an experimental set-up are difficult to obtain. We have used the Indian feral dog as  
21 a model system to test the POC theory in their natural habitat in the context of the mother's  
22 tendency to share food given by humans with her pups in the weaning and post-weaning stage.  
23 Our behavioural bioassay convincingly demonstrates an increase of conflict and decrease of  
24 cooperation by the mother with her offspring over a span of 4-6 weeks. We also demonstrate that  
25 the conflict is intentional, and is not influenced by the hunger levels of the pups or the litter size.

26

27 Keywords: Parent-offspring conflict, *Canis familiaris*, weaning, bioassay.

28

29 **Introduction**

30 Parental care is an indispensable part of development in mammalian species, where mothers  
31 suckle their offspring. The offspring often continue to stay with the mother after weaning and the  
32 mother continues to share food and shelter with them. It is interesting to note that in the animal  
33 world even the most caring of mothers do not extend care towards their offspring for indefinite  
34 periods, and at some point of time after weaning the offspring become independent of the  
35 mother. The parent-offspring conflict theory delineates a zone of conflict between the mother  
36 and her offspring over weaning [1]. We expect that the mother would try to wean her offspring  
37 off a little earlier than the offspring would be ready to wean themselves, thereby entering the  
38 zone of conflict for a short span of time. Though the theory was originally formulated in the  
39 context of weaning, it is also relevant in other contexts where a parent and his/her offspring have  
40 conflicting interests. Conflict has been reported over feeding, grooming, travelling, evening  
41 nesting, and mating in various species [2-12].

42  
43 There are several theoretical models that address parent-offspring conflict in different contexts  
44 like reproduction, intra-brood competition, sexual conflict, and parental favouritism toward  
45 particular offspring [13-16]. Though relatedness between parents, offspring and siblings can be  
46 measured easily, it is not easy to measure precisely parental investment and the costs and  
47 benefits to the concerned parties in nature. In some studies attempts have been made to quantify  
48 parental care in terms of milk ingested by offspring, sometimes as a correlate of weight gain by  
49 the individual pups, and sometimes by the duration of suckling [17-21]. However, we have to  
50 accept that there is considerable variation in the suckling rates of individual pups, and in hunger  
51 levels of individuals, and hence such measures can only provide a rough estimate of parental  
52 investment. It is therefore not surprising that empirical tests of the theory in a field set up are  
53 sparse, especially in the original context of weaning. The parent-offspring conflict theory has in  
54 fact been claimed to be one of the most contentious subjects in behavioural and evolutionary  
55 ecology and also one of the most recalcitrant to experimental investigation [22, 23].

56  
57 Feral dogs are an indispensable part of the urban ecology in many countries. These dogs live in  
58 small groups or singly on streets and depend on garbage for their sustenance. Competition over  
59 food is quite high, and fights are very common at vats, near roadside food stalls, or when humans

60 occasionally offer a piece of food to the dogs. The feral dogs in India are an excellent study  
61 system for addressing various questions in behavioural ecology. These dogs typically breed  
62 twice a year, once in the autumn and once in the spring, but a given female usually produces one  
63 litter per year. The mother typically spends most of her time with the pups in the early weeks,  
64 and only moves out of her shelter to feed for short periods. Her absence increases when the pups  
65 gain mobility (Paul and Sen Majumder, unpublished data). Weaning in dogs typically begins  
66 when the pups are about 6 weeks old. At this stage the mother begins to refuse to feed the pups  
67 while they continue to demand suckling [24]. The feral dog pups begin to eat solid food from  
68 around 5 weeks, when the mother gives them regurgitated food and at times hunts small prey to  
69 feed her pups. Often mothers with litters are fed by kind people and the pups share this food with  
70 their mother when they begin to feed on solids.

71

72 We observed that the mother begins to refuse sharing of such food with her pups soon after  
73 weaning and the competition between them and the mother seems to increase over the weeks.  
74 Since it is extremely difficult to measure parental investment in terms of the actual amount of  
75 milk that a pup receives or the energy that the mother spends in caring for her pups, we used the  
76 mother's tendency to share food with her pups as a surrogate for parental care. This is especially  
77 relevant in these dogs because they are scavengers, and they often beg for food from humans.  
78 Competition over food is high, and most of the agonistic interactions within and between dog  
79 groups take place at feeding sites [25]. Using the surrogate behaviour of food sharing by the  
80 mother for our bioassay, we carried out a field experiment to examine whether post-weaning  
81 conflict over food exists between the mother and her pups in the Indian feral dogs.

82

### 83 **Methods**

84 The experiment was performed between January and March 2011 on litters of feral dogs in  
85 Kolkata (22° 34' N, 88° 24' E) and at the IISER-K campus at Mohanpur (22° 94' N, 88° 53' E),  
86 West Bengal, India. Each litter was observed for a minimum of four and a maximum of six  
87 weeks, and only the groups where the mother and at least one pup survived through this period

88 were used for the analysis. Thus we obtained data on 8 out of 14 available litters, varying in size  
89 from a single pup to seven pups. We had a total of 8 mothers and 31 pups in our data (Table 1).

90

91 The experiment was conducted in two sessions, morning (between 1000-1230h) and evening  
92 (between 1530-1700h), on three consecutive days of a week for all litters, thus yielding a total of  
93 210 sessions. The mother and her pups were offered pieces of bread and biscuits (cookies) in the  
94 week before the commencement of the experiment and their preference for either were noted.  
95 Some groups were choosy about a particular type of food, while others ate whatever was given.  
96 We chose to give them either bread or biscuits because they are likely to find these in their day to  
97 day foraging at bins and vats, and they also receive these from people quite often when they beg  
98 for food. Hence it would be natural for them (or at least the mother) to receive pieces of bread or  
99 biscuits from the experimenter, without causing alarm.

100

101 The experiment comprised of giving pieces of bread or biscuits to the mother-litter groups, and  
102 recording the response of the individuals to the food. Bread was used for only those groups who  
103 had showed a clear preference for bread over biscuits. The experimenter offered a piece of food  
104 to the group of dogs and waited until it was completely consumed before offering the next piece.  
105 The number of offerings made during a session was equal to the number of individuals present in  
106 the group at the time of the experiment. The entire experiment was video recorded and the videos  
107 were used to tabulate the data at the end of the experiment. For each piece of food offered, we  
108 recorded who ate the piece, the latency to first reaction, time taken to eat the piece and the  
109 interactions between the mother and pups towards each other. The data was analyzed in  
110 StatistiXL version 1.8 and Statistica Release 7.

111

## 112 **Results**

113 The pups were perpetually hungry, but the mothers often chose not to react to the given food.  
114 Since there was always at least one pup who displayed an interest in the offered morsel, we used

115 the mother's behaviour towards the pup to define cooperation and conflict. Here we describe six  
116 distinct behaviours that the mother showed towards the pups as a response to the giving of food.

117 Disinterest (DI): The mother did not make an attempt to reach the food in any way or looked  
118 away from it.

119 Allow (AL): The mother looked at the food, but did not move to grab it, allowing the pups to  
120 take it.

121 Offer (OF): The mother took the food and then gave it to the pups, without eating it herself.

122 Share (SH): The mother took the food and shared it with the pups, and did not show any  
123 aggression.

124 Compete for food (CF): The mother and pups both tried to grab the food and whoever got to the  
125 food first took it, without showing any aggression towards the others.

126 Compete aggressively (CA): The mother barked at or attacked the pups if they tried to get the  
127 food, and took the food herself.

128 Snatch (SN): The mother snatched the food away from the pups and ate it herself.

129 We pooled all instances of allow, offer and share into the category of co-operation and all  
130 instances of compete, compete aggressively and snatch into the category of conflict for our  
131 analysis.

132 (i) Conflict exists:

133 In all the eight groups we recorded instances of conflict over food between the mother and pups,  
134 though the amount of conflict and the time of onset of conflict were quite variable across groups  
135 (ESM Figure 1). The pooled data on proportions of conflict and cooperation across the groups  
136 revealed that there was an increase in conflict (linear regression;  $r = 0.096$ , S.E. = 0.026,  $p =$   
137  $0.009$ ) and decrease in cooperation (linear regression;  $r = -0.117$ , S.E. = 0.012,  $p = 0.000$ ), with  
138 the age of the pups (Figure 1).

139

140 (ii) The pups eat more:

141 We calculated the proportion of food taken by the mother and each of the pups in a group out of  
142 the total number of pieces given in a week. In spite of the fact that there was conflict over food  
143 between the mother and the pups, when we pooled the data across weeks, the pups were seen to  
144 have eaten most of the given food, which was significantly more than that eaten by the mother  
145 (Mann-Whitney U test;  $U = 64.00$ ,  $df = 8,8$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). In spite of the cases of conflict over food,  
146 the mother always ate less than 50% of the food provided during the experiment in any week.  
147 However, when we considered only those cases where there was conflict over a piece of food,  
148 the mother took as many pieces as the average pup (Mann Whitney U test;  $U = 51.0$ ,  $df = 8,8$ ,  $p$   
149  $= 0.05$ ) and the pup which took the maximum number of pieces in the litter, designated as the  
150 max pup (Mann Whitney U test;  $U = 51.0$ ,  $df = 8,8$ ,  $p = 0.05$ ). The average and max pups in a  
151 litter were comparable in terms of the proportion of food taken (Mann Whitney U test;  $U = 49.5$ ,  
152  $df = 8,8$ ,  $p = 0.08$ ) (Figure 2).

153

154 (iii) Effect of litter size:

155 The proportion of food taken by the mother did not depend on the size of her litter (linear  
156 regression;  $r = 0.022$ ,  $S.E. = 0.03$ ,  $p = 0.48$ ), which suggests that she took as much of the food as  
157 she wanted, irrespective of how many pups competed with her. However, in case of the pups,  
158 there was a significant negative correlation between the number of pups in a litter and the  
159 proportion of food that the average pup had taken (linear regression;  $r = -0.103$ ,  $S.E. = 0.031$ ,  $p =$   
160  $0.01$ ). Even in case of the max pup, the proportion of food taken decreased with litter size (linear  
161 regression;  $r = -0.081$ ,  $S.E. = 0.032$ ,  $p = 0.04$ ), which suggests that there was considerable  
162 competition among the pups (Figure 3). The probability of the mother eating the food to convert  
163 it to milk is negligible, as conflict is low in the early weeks of observation, when some suckling  
164 occurs, and high when suckling is totally absent (See ESM).

165

166 (iv) Conflict decisions are faster:

167 The latency of first reaction to the food was significantly lower in case of situations of conflict  
168 than in cases of cooperation (Mann-Whitney U test;  $U = 55.0$ ,  $df = 8,8$ ,  $p = 0.015$ ) and disinterest  
169 (Mann-Whitney U test;  $U = 58.0$ ,  $df = 8,8$ ,  $p = 0.005$ ) for the mother (Figure 4). Thus it appears  
170 that in cases of conflict the mother decides to react faster than when she is disinterested or she  
171 wants to allow the pups to eat. Thus it is evident that the conflict is quite real, and the mother is  
172 actually in competition with the pups over food. The time taken to finish a piece of food whether  
173 by a pup or the mother did not vary in the three cases (Mann-Whitney U test;  $p > 0.05$ ).

174

## 175 **Discussion**

176 The cost (in terms of reproductive success) that a mother incurs if she loses an offspring, and the  
177 benefit the offspring gets by helping its mother raise its sibling are the two currencies that  
178 delineate parent-offspring conflict over parental investment [1]. However, costs and benefits  
179 across generations are difficult to measure, and even more difficult to measure is parental  
180 investment in terms of the actual amount of milk that a mother produces to feed her offspring or  
181 the energy that she spends in caring for them. So, in order to check if such conflict exists in a  
182 species, we need to use surrogates for parental investment.

183

184 In the Indian feral dogs, competition over food is a reality, and we have observed mothers fight  
185 with their offspring over food. Mother dogs lose a lot of weight when they suckle, and they have  
186 to compete with other dogs to obtain food in order to regain their energies to support the next  
187 litter. We have often observed that people tend to give food to suckling mothers, but such  
188 supplies typically do not continue when the pups grow up and begin to fend for themselves.  
189 Hence the mother has a short window of time when she can get food without fighting with other  
190 adults, and her only competition comes from her own offspring, who are always hungry. Hence  
191 we considered food given by humans to be a good surrogate for parental investment in our study  
192 system. We expected that the mother should be ready to share food with her offspring at the early  
193 stages of weaning, but should compete more often as the pups grow older. So we chose a small  
194 window of time, spreading over 4-6 weeks for a litter, beginning around the onset of weaning,  
195 when conflict if any, is expected to become evident.

196

197 We categorized the behaviour of the mother towards her offspring as a reaction to the giving of  
198 the food into cooperation, conflict and disinterest. It was obvious that there is real conflict over  
199 food between the mother and her pups as we not only recorded instances of conflict in all the  
200 eight groups studied, but also saw that the conflict increased and cooperation decreased over  
201 time. It is worthy of note that this increase in conflict and reduction of cooperation was observed  
202 in spite of the fact that most of the food given was taken by the pups. This shows in those few  
203 cases that the mother actually took the given food she did so by competing with her pups, and  
204 not because the pups did not want the food. We also recorded instances of aggression between  
205 the mother and her pups over a piece of food. The pups competed among themselves over food,  
206 which is evident from the result that the proportion of food obtained by a pup was negatively  
207 correlated with its litter size. The fact that the size of the litter did not have any effect on the  
208 proportion of food taken by the mother again suggests that she took a piece of food when she  
209 wanted it, irrespective of whether the pups were hungry and how many pups were hungry, and  
210 her decision was swiftly taken. When she did not take the food, she either allowed her offspring  
211 to get the food because she was not interested in it herself, or because she wanted them to have  
212 it.

213

214 Since the feral dogs depend largely on garbage and on food provided by humans for their  
215 sustenance, their diet is not protein rich. Food provided to humans chiefly comprises of  
216 carbohydrates in the form of rice, bread and biscuits. Leftovers sometimes contain fish and meat  
217 bones, but typically no flesh. Bread and biscuits are the two most common food items that they  
218 encounter on a day to day basis. Hence we used these items in our experiment. Since we saw  
219 such clear cases of conflict over bread and biscuits, we can expect to see enhanced conflict over  
220 more rich food like meat, a situation that would occur in the ancestors of these dogs that  
221 probably befriended hunters in the early days of dog domestication. Such conflict would be  
222 difficult to observe in pets though, as typically households keep single dogs, and in cases where  
223 multiple dogs are kept together, they are usually trained to eat from their designated bowls. The  
224 need for conflict might also be redundant in pets, as for them food is not a limiting resource. This  
225 study is to the best of our knowledge the first empirical evidence for conflict over given food

226 between the mother and her offspring in any species. The results of this bioassay are exciting  
227 because this shows parent-offspring conflict over extended parental investment in a species in its  
228 natural habitat, and opens up avenues for many more interesting field experiments using the feral  
229 dogs as a model system.

230

## 231 **Acknowledgements**

232 IISER-Kolkata, CSIR India and INSA funded this project. The experiments were carried out  
233 equally by SSM and MP. AB designed the experiment, wrote the paper and supervised the work.  
234 The work described here complies with the current laws of India. We thank Prof. Raghavendra  
235 Gadagkar, Dr. Annagiri Sumana and Dr. Ruchira Sen for their comments on the manuscript.

236

## 237 **References**

238 [1] Trivers R. L. 1964. Parent-offspring conflict. *Am. Zool.* **14**, 249-264.

239

240 [2] Duncan P., Harvey P. H., Wells, S. M. 1984. On lactation and associated behaviour in a  
241 natural herd of horses. *Anim Behav.* 32, 255-263. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0003-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(84)80345-0)  
242 3472(84)80345-0

243

244 [3] Packard J. M., Mech L. D., Ream R. R. 1992. Weaning in an arctic wolf pack: Behavioural  
245 mechanisms. *Can. J. Zool.* **70**, 1269-1275.

246

247 [4] Bateson P. 1994. The dynamics of parent-offspring relationships in mammals. *Trends. Ecol.*  
248 *Evol.* **9**, 399-403.

249

250 [5] Clark C. B. 1977. A preliminary report on weaning among chimpanzees of the Gombe  
251 National Park, Tanzania. In *Primate Bio-Social Development* (eds. Chevalier-Skolnikoff S., and  
252 Poirier F. E.), pp. 235–260. New York, USA: Garland.

253

- 254 [6] Goodall J. 1968. The behaviour of free-living chimpanzees in the Gombe Stream Reserve.  
255 *Anim. Behav. Monogr.* **1**, 161–311.  
256
- 257 [7] Horvat J. R., Kraemer H. C. 1982. Behavioral changes during weaning in captive  
258 chimpanzees. *Primates* **23**, 488–499. doi: [10.1007/BF02373960](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02373960)  
259
- 260 [8] Pusey A.E. 1983. Mother–offspring relationships in chimpanzees after weaning. *Anim.*  
261 *Behav.* **32**, 363–377. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472\(83\)80055-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(83)80055-4)  
262
- 263 [9] van de Rijt-Plooij H. H. C., Plooij F. X. 1987. Growing independence, conflict and learning  
264 in mother–infant relations in free-ranging chimpanzees. *Behav.* **101**, 1–86.  
265 doi: 10.1163/156853987X00378  
266
- 267 [10] Yerkes R. M., Tomilin M. I. 1935. Mother–infant relations in chimpanzees. *J. Comp.*  
268 *Psychol.* **20**, 321–348.  
269
- 270 [11] Stamps J., Clark A., Arrowood P., Kus B. 1985. Parent-Offspring Conflict in Budgerigars.  
271 *Behav.* **94**, 1-40. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/156853985X00253>  
272
- 273 [12] van Dijk R. E., Székely T., Komdeur J., Pogány A., Fawcett T. W., Weissing F. J. 2012  
274 Individual variation and the resolution of conflict over parental care in penduline tits. *Proc. R.*  
275 *Soc. B* **279**, 1927-1936. doi:10.1098/rspb.2011.2297.  
276
- 277 [13] Parker G. A., Royle N. J., Hartley I. R. 2002. Intrafamilial conflict and parental investment:  
278 a synthesis. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B* **357**, 295–307. doi:10.1098/rstb.2001.0950  
279
- 280 [14] Macnair M.R., Parker G. A. 1978 Models of parent-offspring conflict. III. Intra-brood  
281 conflict. *Anim. Behav.* **27**, 1202-1209. doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0003-3472\(79\)90067-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0003-3472(79)90067-8)  
282
- 283 [15] Mock D. W., Parker G. A. 1997. *The evolution of sibling rivalry*. New York, USA: Oxford  
284 University Press.

- 285  
286 [16] Lessells C. M. 2002. Parentally biased favouritism: why should parents specialize in caring  
287 for different offspring? *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* **357**, 381–403. doi:10.1098/rstb.2001.0928.  
288
- 289 [17] Riek, A. 2008. Relationship between milk energy intake and growth rate in suckling  
290 mammalian young at peak lactation: an updated meta-analysis. *J. Zool.* **274**, 160-170.  
291 doi:10.1111/j.1469-7998.2007.00369.x
- 292
- 293 [18] Pluháček, J., Bartoš, L., Bartošová, J. 2010. Mother-offspring conflict in captive plains  
294 zebra (*Equus burchellii*): Suckling bout duration. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sc.* **122**, s. 127-132. doi:  
295 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2009.11.009>
- 296
- 297 [19] Gomendio, M. 1991. Parent/offspring conflict and maternal investment in Rhesus  
298 macaques. *Anim. Behav.* **42** (6), 993-1005. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472\(05\)80152-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(05)80152-6)  
299 [6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(05)80152-6)
- 300
- 301 [20] Ahlstrøm, Ø., Wamberg, S. 2000. Milk intake in blue fox (*Alopex lagopus*) and silver fox  
302 (*Vulpes vulpes*) in the early suckling period. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. Part A: Mol. & Int.*  
303 *Physiol.* **127** (2), 225-236. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1095-6433\(00\)00269-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1095-6433(00)00269-5)
- 304
- 305 [21] Godfray H. C. J., Parker G. A. 1992. Sibling competition, parent-offspring and clutch size.  
306 *Anim. Behav.* **43**, 473-490. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472\(05\)80106-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(05)80106-X)
- 307
- 308 [22] Alexander, R. D. 1974. The evolution of social behaviour. *A. Rev. Ecol. Sys.* **5**, 325-383.  
309 doi:10.1146/annurev.es.05.110174.001545
- 310
- 311 [23] Clutton-Brock. T. H. 1991. *The evolution of parental care*. Princeton University Press,  
312 Princeton, NJ.

313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321

[24] Malm K., Jensen P. 1997. Weaning and Parent-Offspring conflict in the domestic dog. *Ethol.* **103**, 653-664. doi: 10.1111/j.1439-0310.1997.tb00176.x

[25] Pal S. K., Ghosh B., Roy S. 1998. Agonistic behaviour of free-ranging dogs *Canis familiaris* in relation to season, sex and age. *Appl. Anim. Behav. Sc.* **59**, 331–348. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591\(98\)00108-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(98)00108-7)

<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Commencement of Experiment</b>	<b>Age of pups (weeks)</b>	<b>Litter size</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>
Bud 1	05.01.2011	8 – 13	4	2	2
LEL	19.01.2011	8 – 13	2	1	1
Saltlake 1	08.01.2011	8 – 12	2	1	1
Saltlake 2	15.01.2011	8 – 12	5	3	2
BNS	04.03.2011	8 – 12	5	2	3
Canteen	09.03.2011	10 – 15	5	4	1
Bud 2	23.02.2011	11 – 14	1	0	1
Batanagar	15.01.2011	9 – 14	7	7	0
Total			31	20	11

322

323 Table 1: Details of the 8 litters used in the study, with the date of commencement of the  
324 experiment.

325 **Legends to figures**

326 **Figure 1**

327 Conflict exists: The proportion of cooperation and conflict over different ages of the pups in  
328 weeks. There is an overall increase in conflict and decrease in cooperation between the mother  
329 and pups over food.

330

331 **Figure 2**

332 Pups eat more: The mean and standard deviation of the proportion of food taken (of the total  
333 number of pieces offered to the group in a week) by the mother, average pup and max pup (the  
334 pup who takes the most number of pieces of food) in all the eight groups pooled together.

335

336 **Figure 3**

337 The relationship between the proportion of food taken (of the total number of pieces offered to  
338 the group in a week) by the mother (circles), the max pup (triangles) and the average pup  
339 (crosses) versus the size of the litter of the respective individuals.

340

341 **Figure 4**

342 Mean and standard deviation of the latency for first reaction to the giving of the food in cases of  
343 cooperation, conflict and disinterest by all individuals taken together.

344

345

Figure 1





Figure 2







Figure 4




1 **Parent-offspring Conflict in feral dogs: A Bioassay**

2 Electronic Supplementary Material

3

4 **Conflict exists**



5


6 **ESM Figure 1:** The proportion of conflict over different ages of the pups in weeks in the eight  
7 groups studied. Conflict is quite variable between the groups, but there is an overall increase in  
8 conflict over weeks.

9

10 **Suckling**

11 We counted the number of suckling attempts and refusal to suckle by the mother in all the  
12 videos. In the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> weeks there were some suckling attempts, but these attempts decreased  
13 drastically over the weeks. Even among the attempts, about half were refused by the mother. The  
14 graph shows the mean and SD of all suckling attempts and refusals pooled over litters for each  
15 week.

16



17

18 **ESM Figure 2:** Number of suckling attempts by the pups over weeks, pooled across the eight  
19 groups. The suckling attempts reduce over weeks and stop at 12 weeks (linear regression, co-eff:  
20 22.421, S.E. = 7.839,  $p = 0.029$ ). It is interesting to note that the maximum conflict was recorded  
21 in the 13<sup>th</sup> week (Figure 1).