

Implications of the Trivers-Willard Sex Ratio Hypothesis for Avian Species and Poultry Production, And a Summary of the Historic Context of this Research

Dan E. Willard

State University of New York at Albany

Abstract

At a theoretical level, the Trivers-Willard Sex Ratio Hypothesis applies to both avian species and mammals. This article, however, conjectures that at a statistical level, sex ratio effects are likely to produce sharper numerical variations among avian species. We explain, moreover, that this greater statistical variation could have major implications for improving the efficiency of world-wide poultry egg and possibly also meat production.

Keywords and Phrases: Fisher's Sex Ratio Theory, the Trivers-Willard Hypothesis, Sex Determination Controls among Avian Species, Enhancing Poultry Egg Production.

Comment: A 30-minute invited talk summarizing the contents of this article was presented on June 18, 2017 at the NEEPS-2017 Conference at Binghamton University. This manuscript consists of 10 pages plus the cover page.

1 Introduction

The Trivers-Willard Hypothesis is an extension of Fisher's Sex Equilibrium paradigm [9, 32]. Fisher noted that essentially all vertebrate species will invest a roughly equal amount of energy raising male and female offspring because such corresponds to the favored stabilizing equilibrium state that Darwinian Evolution gravitates towards over an extended period of time. The Trivers-Willard Hypothesis (TW) was based on the observation that some mating couples will have genes more useful to male reproductive success, while others will have genes more useful to a female's reproductive success. TW predicted that it would be useful, accordingly, for Darwinian Evolution to attempt to guess which couple's genes are more useful to which sex's reproductive success, and then to adjust the sex ratio to reflect the strategy that maximizes long-term reproductive success. This prediction will be called the *Generalized Version* of the Trivers-Willard Hypothesis.

I conceived of this version of the TW during a 25-minute bicycle ride, after taking, in the Spring of 1968, a philosophy course at SUNY Stony Brook. Its reading material included the Desmond Morris book entitled *The Naked Ape* [16]. During that fateful bicycle ride, I also reconstructed Fisher's general sex ratio paradigm (without knowing that Fisher conceived of this idea more than thirty years earlier). I also noticed that the preceding "Generalized" theory would imply that a mating couple should be more likely to produce male offspring when they are in better health condition (or have an above average nutritional diet). This latter observation was a consequence of the well known anthropological observation that competitive success benefits the reproduction rate of a male more than a female because a male is capable of inseminating simultaneously several females.

At the conclusion of this 1968 bicycle ride, I was left with a quandary as to what to do next? This is because I was uncertain what part of the "Generalized" theory was new, if any part of it was actually new? There were several occasions in the past when I developed theories that I learned later others had discovered substantially earlier¹. In the end, I decided to make no effort to publish the Generalized Theory in 1968 because I thought it likely that either someone had thought of a similar idea earlier, or it would be difficult to persuade the academic

¹ For example during a bicycle ride in 1964, I reconstructed many of the famous integration formulas, taught in a Freshman Calculus course, without knowing about the famous mathematical research done 200 years earlier. The resulting series of brain-storming thoughts actually resulted in my discovering of Euler's irrational number of "e", without knowing what Euler had done. Humorously, I naively called this number "W" (for "Willard's constant") before learning, to my naive teen-age chagrin, that Euler discovered "e" two centuries earlier.

community that these principles are sound. (My reluctance to publish this “Generalized” theory was further amplified by two family tragedies, where my father experienced a heart attack and my mother was diagnosed with cancer during that same year of 1968. My mother was diagnosed with cancer, actually, only a few weeks after my bicycle ride. I doubt I would have had the temperament to discover the General Theory, had the chronology of these two events been physically reversed.)

The remainder of the history behind the TW discovery has been told by Robert Trivers. In 1970, I attended Harvard University as a graduate student and audited a course taught by Irven Devore, where Robert Trivers was a teaching assistant. In one lecture during that course, Trivers reviewed Fisher’s Sex Ratio Principle, and he mentioned in a subsequent second lecture that it was known that upper class income families were statistically more likely to have male offspring. I was delighted when I heard the first of Trivers’s two lectures because I had inadvertently reconstructed Fisher’s 50/50 sex ratio principle during my earlier 1968 bicycle ride. I explained to Trivers, subsequently after his second lecture, my explanation for the statistical paradigms he mentioned. Trivers warmly encouraged me to publish this result.

Distracted by the illness of both my parents, as well as the burden of preparing for Harvard’s notoriously hard Ph D Qualifying exam in Mathematics, I did not pursue the TW project further. As a consequence, Bob Trivers generously wrote up the manuscript of what would ultimately become our announced paradigm. Our paper [21] later became a classic article, according to Rebecca Goldstein [14], within sociobiology’s broader and ever-expanding literature.

A period of 49 years has now transpired between the current date and the occasion when I took that fateful 25-minute bicycle ride in 1968. It is accurate to state that no single 25-minute investment of my time (conjoined with Robert Trivers excellent and very meticulous write-up of our joint paper [21]) has produced a greater impact on the academic community from my research. Thus on 23 June 2017, Google Scholar recorded that there were 3,338 citations to [21]’s research, *except for one hilarious error*, that deserves to be in a Woody Allen movie and which will make the academic community laugh at the incompetence of the careless computer engineers who embedded an amusingly schizophrenic bug into what was supposed to be their sagacious Google-Scholar software ² .

² This quite amusing error is that neither Dan Willard nor Robert Trivers were listed by Google-Scholar as the authors of the article [21], as recently as 23 June 2017. Instead, “James A. McKanna” is listed as the author of an article with the same title and page numbers as [21]. This error occurred because *Science Magazine* listed, in 1973, the authors of its articles on the specified article’s last page (rather than on its first

In any case, this silly “*Google Bug*” is of little importance because the significance of the TW article is well known. Thus, there have been in at least four recent mentions of this article in the popular news media [6, 18, 19, 20]. The latter included one year-2017 article in the *Sunday Week in Review* section of the *New York Times* [20] .

Our purpose in the current short note will be to achieve three goals. The first will be to suggest that avian species are likely to follow the predictions of the TW hypothesis with greater statistical accuracy than do mammals. A second objective will be to suggest that this prediction is likely to have financial implications in enhancing the efficiency of poultry farms. A third goal, confined to §4, will be to provide the reader with a brief summary of my research into symbolic logic and into Gödel’s Incompleteness theorem. This research has, traditionally, been treated as a subfield of mathematics and philosophy. But as we shall explain, it also has plenty of implications for anthropology and psychology.

My 25-year investigation into the Incompleteness Effect has not yet produced as broad a scholarly impact, as the short 25-minute bicycle ride I took in 1968. It is our hope that the momentum from this 1968 bicycle ride, combined with our 2-page summary of our last 25 years of research in §4, will also increase interest in especially our article [31]. This is because this latter paper has substantial background implications germane to anthropology and understanding the structure of psychological motivation

2 A New Amendment to the Trivers-Willard Hypothesis for Avian Species

Our interest in applying the TW hypothesis to avian species was initially stimulated by an article by Nancy Burley [4]. It studied the behavior of Australian Zebra Finches, and found that their propensity to produce male offspring would be enhanced if colored bands were attached to their legs that made the males look more attractive and the females less attractive. The

page). Moreover, McKanna’s 1973 paper ended on the first column of the same page 90, whose second and third columns were occupied by the TW article. Thus, the supposedly sagacious Google-Scholar software had gone amusingly schizophrenic, when it tried to guess who was the actual author of this particular article with an unusual quantity of 3,338 citations ? (This error persisted during all the Winter and Spring months of the year 2017. In fairness to Google, their error was corrected on June 26, 2017, shortly after I gave my June 18 talk at NEEPS-2017. We are not sure exactly why, but Google Scholar’s software has made this persistent error and then corrected it, on several occasions, during the last few years.)

reverse sex ratio would be produced if the bands had polar opposite types of sexual attraction factors.

I had not predicted such an effect. However with retrospection, I do have an interesting explanation as to why avian species might, actually, follow the predictions of the Generalized TW Hypothesis with more statistical accuracy than mammals.

The explanation is that sperm type determines the sex of mammal offspring, but it is unfertilized egg type that is the control agent among birds. Thus, it is well known that it is the X or Y sperm type which controls the sex among mammals (since an XX offspring is a daughter and an XY offspring is a son). In contrast among birds, a “ZZ” genetic mix produces a male offspring, and a “ZW” mixture corresponds to a female. The latter implies that it is the *unfertilized egg* (rather than donated sperm) that determines the sex type for a bird.

Among both mammals and birds, the TW Hypothesis predicts that Darwinian Evolution has an incentive to guess which sex of offspring is likely to produce more grandchildren for a mating couple. The engine, however, to determine which type of sperm will first reach the egg is complicated, when a male mammal donates several million competing sperms, at once. The comparable engine for sex ratio control among birds is, presumably, simpler because only a small number of “Z” or “W” unfertilized eggs are deposited by the mother for the purposes of being fertilized by the male.

This amendment to the TW Hypothesis will be very hard to empirically test to check for its correctness. It would require a meticulous study that compares various species of mammals to sundry species of birds. It would, however, be theoretically interesting if Avian species were found to obey the predictions of the TW Hypothesis with greater statistical levels of accuracy than among mammals. Moreover, the next section will suggest that our prediction, if correct, could increase the world-wide efficiency of poultry egg production.

3 Poultry Farms

It is well known that the efficiency of Poultry Farms shall increase if more female chickens are born. In that case, egg production will quickly increase, and also poultry meat production may also increase, somewhat.

It is apparent that if chickens do function similarly to Australian Zebra Finches, then a mating couple will produce more female offspring, if they are artificially endowed with female color features.

Moreover, a large variety of other techniques are likely to be also available for influencing the sex of offspring. For instance, if an excess of male rooster-like sounds were pumped into a chicken farm then it is probable that more females will be born (because the illusion of an excess supply of males would have been temporarily created).

One drawback of such strategies is that the inbred supply of farm animals will naturally evolve in a direction *that is exactly the opposite* to a farmer's intentions. This is because the classic local farm animal population will spontaneously degrade in a direction towards a 50/50 ratio, according to Fisher's Sex Equilibrium argument [9].

A useful remedy is for a concerned farmer to keep a log of which chickens come from a genetic lineage producing more female offspring — and to encourage those particular chickens to breed.

Unfortunately, such a log would require a labor-intensive effort to maintain, thus undermining its cost effectiveness. Fortunately, there is a solution to this challenge in the modern computer age. A unique computerized bar-code name identifier could be attached to each chicken, and a robot could ascertain that the correct genetic line of chickens are breeding.

In other words, we are suggesting that a computerized algorithm could maintain some type of desired protocol to enhance the ratio of female offspring, and that this protocol will probably be cost effective in the new age of computerized robotics that is now emerging.

Such a prospect should be investigated, with the same level of intensity, as the 1973 TW paper [21] was. This proposed research undertaking should not be treated as merely *the idle arm-chair speculations* of a mathematician who published a very famous paper 44 years ago. This is because it could have significant impact on improving the efficiency of world-wide poultry egg production, and also perhaps (?) world-wide chicken meat production as well.

More specifically, it is known that some species of vertebrates allow laboratory researchers to gain essentially 100 % control of the sex of offspring. Thus, it is known [2, 3, 8, 12, 22] that controlling the incubation temperatures for turtle eggs provides an essentially 100 % control of the sex ratio of offspring (e.g. studies of 14 different genres of turtles have shown that a 25 Celsius incubation temperature produces an all-male rate of offspring, while a 31 Celsius incubation temperature leads to an all-female population).

Thus by analogy, it would not be very surprising if the Avian ZZ/ZW sex determination mechanism allows for a much more dexterous control of the sex of offspring than does the XX/XY mechanism used by mammals.

Our point is that while our proposed amendment to the TW hypothesis has certainly not yet been formally demonstrated to be true, it warrants deeper investigation because it could have a very significant impact in improving the underlying efficiency of the world-wide poultry egg and possibly also meat production.

4 Historic Context of this Research

The preceding discussion mentioned that Willard's main contribution to the article [21] consisted of a flash insight that I developed during a short bicycle ride. The curiosity of many readers may have been stirred by this fact. Some readers may, perhaps, begin to wonder what other intellectual projects I had worked on during the last 44 years, in the aftermath of [21]'s publication.

Essentially, my research has had two focal points. Prior to 1992, my focus was on mainly classical topics concerning computer algorithm design. My best known work in this area consisted of a joint study with Fredman to determine the optimal cost for computerized sorting and related searching methodologies. Our joint work showed that the then-commonly-held presumption that sorting could run no faster than in $O(N \text{ Log}(N))$ time was incorrect (i.e. a theoretical speed-up for sorting and searching was demonstrated in [10, 11]). These two projects produced four papers (if one counts separately their journal and conference publications). It is reported in Google Scholar that 920 academic citations to these four variations of our work had subsequently appeared. Moreover, the *1991 Annual Report of the National Science Foundation* [17] cited this particular "Fusion Tree" investigation as the *chronologically first* among only six projects that were mentioned in its *1991 Mathematics and Computer Science* section.

Starting in 1993, I started publishing papers [23]-[31] about Gödel's historic Incompleteness Theorem. Gödel's work has traditionally been of interest to researchers in fields as broadly diverse as mathematics, philosophy and computing (as a reader can quickly surmise by looking at any one of the biographies of Gödel [5, 13, 33]). Gödel's "First Incompleteness Theorem"

had indicated there existed no systematic manner to categorize all the technically true statements *in even the simplest branch* of mathematics. His “Second Incompleteness Theorem” indicated conventional logical systems are also unable to confirm their own consistency, in a fully formal sense [7, 15].

There is no question that both these incompleteness results are rigorously correct, but they raise the question about whether Darwinian Evolution might favor the evolving of an advanced primate specie, that finds it adaptive to employ an *unconventional mode of thought*, in order to maintain some type (?) of specially *modified knowledge* of its own consistency. The latter topic was the stimulus for our on-going investigations in [23]-[31]. These articles proposed a variety of unconventional revisions of arithmetic’s formal axiomatic structure. They found these delicate revisions could preserve most of the pragmatic content of traditional arithmetic, *while simultaneously providing* at least some type of philosophically meaningful, albeit partially diluted, formalized appreciation of their own internal self consistency.

The best and indeed preferred paper to examine first, in the preceding 24-year long series of papers, is our final article [31]. The Remark 7.5 of [31] mentions that we suspect some variation of our proposed “IQFS” formalism has applications to anthropology, psychology and philosophy, as well as to linguistics. We do not suggest this paper is of easy reading. A reader can, however, at least partially appreciate [31]’s gist, when its examination is conjoined with also a reading of at least some select parts of the books [5, 7, 13, 15, 33].

We do not want to overstate this point, but the Remark 7.5 of [31] does indicate that our newly proposed “indeterminate function symbol” θ should have implications for each of the fields of anthropology, psychology and philosophy, as well as linguistics. A wide spectrum of readers is, thus, encouraged to, at least, glance briefly at [31]’s discussion.

Our main purpose in this article was, thus, to discuss amendments to the TW Sex Ratio Theory, but we thought some readers might find it interesting for us to also briefly mention our other main research projects during the last 44 years.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT: I thank Glenn Geher for his very useful suggestion, conveyed on June 18 to me at the NEEPS-2017 conference [12], that my article should briefly mention the relevance and fascinating aspects of documented sex ratio effects, appearing within a variety of different species of turtles.

References

- [1] J.J. Bull, “ Sex Determination in Reptiles”, *Quarterly Review in Biology*, 55 (1980), pp. 3-21.
- [2] J.J. Bull and R.V. Vogt, “Temperature-Dependent Sex Determination in Turtles”, *Science* (New Series Volume 206), December 7, 1979, pp. 1186-1188.
- [3] J.J. Bull, R.V. Vogt and M. G. Bullmer, “Heritability of Sex Ratio in Turtles with Environmental Sex Determination”, *Evolution* 36:2 (1982), pp. 333-341.
- [4] N. Burley, “Sex ratio manipulation and selection for attractiveness”, *Science* (New Series, Volume 211) February 13, 1981, pp.721-722.
- [5] J W Dawson, *Logical Dilemmas: The life and work of Kurt Gödel*, AKPeters, 1997
- [6] *The Economist*, “Sons and Mothers”, July 11, 2009 (London), page 83 (no author given).
- [7] H. B Enderton, *Mathematical Introduction Logic*, Academic Press, 2011
- [8] M. A. Ewert, D. R. Jackson and C. R. Nelson, “Patterns of Temperature-Dependent Sex Determination in Turtles”, *Journal of Experimental Zoology* 270 (1994), pp. 3-15.
- [9] R. A. Fisher, *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*, Clarendon, Oxford, 1930.
- [10] M. L. Fredman and D. E. Willard, “Surpassing the Information Theoretic Barrier with Fusion Trees”, *The Journal of Computer and Systems Sciences* 47 (1993) pp. 424-433.
- [11] M. L. Fredman and D. E. Willard, “Transdichotomous Algorithms for Minimum Spanning Trees and Shortest Paths” *The Journal of Computer and Systems Sciences* 48 (1994) pp. 533-551.
- [12] Glenn Geher, Private Communications on June 18 at the NEEPS-2017 conference summarizing the literature about Sex Determination in species of turtles.
- [13] R. Goldstein, *Incompleteness: The Proof and Paradox of Kurt Gödel*, Norton Press, 2005.
- [14] R. Goldstein, private communications in 2012 during a visit by Goldstein to the SUNY-Albany campus. During those communications, Goldstein told me that it was both her impression (and those of her husband Steven Pinker) that the TW article [21] played a major role in the historic development of Sociobiology because it was one of the first examples of a Sociobiology article making purely theoretical predictions, that were later statistically verified with much corroborating evidence.

- [15] E. Mendelson, *Introduction to Mathematical Logic*, CRC Press, 2010.
- [16] D. Morris, *The Naked Ape*, Penguin Publishing House, 1967.
- [17] *National Science Foundation 1991 Annual Report*, “Mathematics and Computer Science Section” (The Fredman-Willard “fusion tree” methodology of [10, 11] was the chronologically first among six research projects mentioned in this section.)
- [18] *Psychology Today*. “10 politically incorrect truths about human nature” (by Alan S. Miller and Satoshi Kanazawa), August 2007, pp. 88-95. (The Trivers-Willard Hypothesis was “Politically Incorrect Truth # 6”.)
- [19] *The New York Times*, “Survival of species linked to lopsided sex ratios” (by Walter Sullivan), front page of science section, February 16, 1981.
- [20] *The New York Times*, “Does breast milk have a sex bias” (by Nancy L Segal and Satoshi Kanazawa) in Sunday Review section, January 21, 2017.
- [21] R.L. Trivers and D E, Willard, “Natural selection of parental ability to vary sex ratio of offspring”, *Science* (New Series, Volume 179) January 5, 1973, pp. 90-92,
- [22] R. C. Vogt and J. J. Bull, “Temperature Controlled Sex Determination in Turtles: Ecological and Behavioral Aspects”, *Herpetologica* 38:1 (1982), pp. 156-164.
- [23] D. E. Willard, “Self-verifying axiom systems”, *Computational Logic and Proof Theory: The Third Kurt Gödel Colloquium* (1993), Springer-Verlag LNCS#713, 325-336.
- [24] D. E. Willard, “Self-verifying systems, the incompleteness theorem and the tangibility reflection principle”, in *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 66 (2001) pp. 536-596.
- [25] D. E. Willard, “How to extend the semantic tableaux and cut-free versions of the second incompleteness theorem almost to Robinson’s arithmetic Q”, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 67 (2002) pp. 465–496.
- [26] D. E. Willard, “An exploration of the partial respects in which an axiom system recognizing solely addition as a total function can verify its own consistency”, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 70 (2005) pp. 1171-1209.
- [27] D. E. Willard, “A generalization of the second incompleteness theorem and some exceptions to it”. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 141 (2006) pp. 472-496.

- [28] D. E. Willard, “On the available partial respects in which an axiomatization for real valued arithmetic can recognize its consistency”, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 71 (2006) pp. 1189-1199.
- [29] D. E. Willard, “Passive induction and a solution to a Paris-Wilkie question”, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 146(2007) pp. 124-149.
- [30] D. E. Willard, “On the broader epistemological significance of self-justifying axiom systems”, *Proceedings of 21st Wollic Conference*, Springer Verlag LNCS 8652 (2014), pp. 221-236.
- [31] D. E. Willard, “On how the introducing of a new θ function symbol into arithmetic’s formalism is germane to devising axiom systems that can appreciate fragments of their own Hilbert consistency”, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1612.08071> a Cornell Archives report. The first version of this paper was issued in December 2016, and the second in June 2017. (The difference between these two versions is that the second converts the first’s “IQFS conjecture” into a formally proven result, embodied by Theorem 6.2.)
- [32] E. O. Wilson, *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*, Harvard University Press, 1975.
- [33] P. Yourgrau, *A World Without Time: The Forgotten Legacy of Gödel and Einstein*, Basic Books, 2005.