

Sex-biased dispersal: a review of the theory

Xiang-Yi Li^{1*} and Hanna Kokko¹

¹Department of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies, University of Zurich,
Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH-8057 Zurich, Switzerland

*Email address: xiangyi.li@ieu.uzh.ch, Tel: +41 (0)79 354 44 75

Abstract

Dispersal is ubiquitous throughout the tree of life: factors selecting for dispersal include kin competition, inbreeding avoidance and spatiotemporal variation in resources or habitat suitability. These factors differ in whether they promote male and female dispersal equally strongly, and often selection on dispersal on one sex depends on how much the other disperses: for example, for inbreeding avoidance it can be sufficient that one sex disperses away from the natal site. Attempts to understand sex-specific dispersal evolution have created a rich body of theoretical literature, which we review here. We highlight an interesting gap between empirical and theoretical literature. The former associates different patterns of sex-biased dispersal with mating systems, such as female-biased dispersal in monogamous birds and male-biased dispersal in polygynous mammals. The predominant explanation is traceable back to Greenwood's (1980) ideas of how successful philopatric or dispersing individuals are at gaining mates or resources required to attract them. Theory, however, has developed surprisingly independently of these ideas: predominant ideas in theoretical work track how immigration and emigration change relatedness patterns and alleviate competition for limiting resources, typically considered sexually distinct, with breeding sites and fertilizable females limiting reproductive success for females and males, respectively. We show that the link between mating system and sex-biased dispersal is far from resolved: there are studies showing that mating systems matter, but the oft-stated association between polygyny and male-biased dispersal is not a straightforward theoretical expectation. Here, an important understudied factor is the extent to which movement is interpretable as an extension of mate-searching (e.g. are matings possible *en route* or do they only happen after settling in new habitat – or can females perhaps move with stored sperm). We also point out other new directions for bridging the gap between empirical and theoretical studies: there is a need to

build Greenwood's influential yet verbal explanation into formal models, which also includes the possibility that an individual benefits from mobility as it leads to fitness gains in more than one final breeding location (a possibility not present in models with a very rigid deme structure). The order of life cycle events is likewise important, as this impacts whether a departing individual leaves aside important resources for female or male kin, or perhaps both, in the case of partially overlapping resource use.

Keywords

Demographic stochasticity; Environmental stochasticity; Inbreeding; Kin competition; Life cycle; Mathematical modelling; Mating systems; Resource competition; Sexual dimorphism; Sex ratio

List of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Models of different scopes and methodologies
- III. Drivers of sex-biased dispersal
 - (1) Kin selection
 - a. Kin competition within the same generation
 - b. A better studied corner: Coevolution between sex-biased dispersal and primary sex ratio adjustment
 - c. Kin competition between parents and offspring
 - (2) Inbreeding
 - (3) Asymmetric limiting resources and their spatiotemporal variations
- IV. A special integrative case: haplodiploidy, kin competition and metapopulation structure
- V. Conclusions

I. Introduction

Dispersal is defined as the movement of individuals or propagules with potential consequences for gene flow across space (Ronce, 2007; Saastamoinen *et al.*, 2018). Dispersal exposes individuals to various

costs, with possibilities including the energetic cost of movement, increased exposure to predators, failure to find a suitable site to settle in, and (in territorial species) hostile behaviors of resident individuals that aim to prevent immigrants from settling down (for a review see Bonte *et al.*, 2012). Despite these costs, dispersal is a ubiquitous phenomenon that occurs throughout the tree of life.

There are often biases in the propensity and distance of dispersal between the two sexes. In mammals, males often disperse more frequently and further away than females, the opposite pattern being typical for birds (Greenwood, 1980) where male-biased dispersal is common in only some groups (Anatidae in particular, see Clarke, Sæther, & Røskaft, 1997). Fishes offer examples of male-biased (Hutchings & Gerber, 2002; Anseeuw *et al.*, 2008; Cano, Mäkinen, & Merilä, 2008) as well as female-biased dispersal (Taylor *et al.*, 2003), as do reptiles (male-biased examples: Keogh, Webb, & Shine, 2007; Dubey *et al.*, 2008; Ujvari, Downton, & Madsen, 2008; female-biased case: Olsson & Shine, 2003). In insects, there are numerous cases of wing polymorphism (Andersen, 1997), sometimes with a clear sex difference such that the females are the wingless sex (e.g. Barbosa, Krischik, & Lance, 1989; Wahlberg *et al.*, 2010; Hopkins *et al.*, 2015). In plants, pollen (that move paternal genes) and seeds (that move both paternal and maternal genes) disperse at different time and also have distinct dispersal ranges (Ghazoul, 2005). The review of Trochet *et al.* (2016) collected 257 species of vertebrates and arthropods for which sex-biased dispersal has been assessed.

Empirical studies have identified a great variety of factors impacting dispersal, including environmental cues, the developmental stage and physiological conditions of the organism, and the cognitive abilities of animals (Bowler & Benton, 2005; Nathan *et al.*, 2008; Morales *et al.*, 2010). Obviously, listing proximate factors alone is not enough to explain the ultimate causes behind dispersal evolution. Because it is often hard or not feasible to collect data and/or test hypotheses of dispersal in open populations (Ims & Yoccoz, 1997; Ruckelshaus, Hartway, & Kareiva, 1997), and because different driving forces of dispersal are often intertwined in a multicausal fashion (Starrfelt & Kokko, 2012a), the study of dispersal has benefited greatly from mathematical models that can clarify the steps of logic behind statements such as “even if habitats are always stable and dispersal is costly, individuals are still selected to move as long as this frees resources to be used by related individuals” (a seminal finding by Hamilton & May, 1977). Similarly,

Bengtsson (1978) showed that inbreeding avoidance can be a strong driver of dispersal. Thus, since the 1970s, mathematical models have been expanding our knowledge, and deepening our understanding of this complex problem.

There are excellent general reviews of the mechanisms and causes behind the evolution and maintenance of dispersal (see Ronce, 2007; Duputié & Massol, 2013 for concise reviews, and Clobert *et al.*, 2001, 2012 for book-length treatments). Quite a large fraction of the theoretical dispersal literature, however, ignores sex differences in dispersal. Recent synthetic treatments of sex-biased dispersal (Mabry *et al.*, 2013; Trochet *et al.*, 2016), on the other hand, focuses on testing largely verbally expressed theories without providing a thorough review of the relevant developments of mathematical models in the field.

Thus, we have an interesting situation at hand where general theories of dispersal tend to lean rather heavily on the theoretical developments that have their origins in the influential works of Hamilton & May (1977) and Bengtsson (1978), while hypotheses on which sex should disperse more (and to what extent dispersal probabilities or distance kernels share similarities between the sexes) tend to rely on verbal explanations, often traceable back to Greenwood's (1980) idea of which factors govern male and female success in birds and mammals. This is clearly an important taxonomic comparison (Mabry *et al.*, 2013), but also considers a vanishingly small proportion of global biodiversity. It appears useful to fill the gap between the causalities identified by general theory of dispersal evolution, and the sex-specific ideas presented in the literature.

Dispersal requires that either direct or (more generally) inclusive fitness can potentially be improved by moving; the reasons for this can be attributed to three different categories of mechanisms: (1) direct kin competition; (2) inbreeding; (3) asymmetric limiting resources (incl. mating opportunities) and their spatiotemporal variations. To what extent these can create sex differences is one topic in our review. It is important to note that the three major driving forces are not exclusive in determining the propensity and distance distribution of dispersal of each sex. Instead, they almost always interact in nature (Starrfelt & Kokko, 2012a), and in mathematical models, it is also common that several causal routes are considered simultaneously. We therefore also comment on the extent to which verbally expressed ideas (particularly

those of Greenwood, 1980) communicate with the theoretical development to date; this leads us to highlight avenues of research that have not yet been explored in detail.

II. Models of different scopes and methodologies

Before summarising mathematical models about the evolution of sex-biased dispersal according to the three different categories of causes described above, we first comment on the types of models that exist based on the intended scope: does a model make a general point about the factors that selectively promote or hinder dispersal, or investigate a more specific question?

Models of dispersal differ in their scope (intended taxonomic breadth). Some are designed to fit a specific biological system, the simulation model of Hirota (2004) being a typical example of this type. The model is based on the life history of the cabbage white butterfly *Pieris rapae curcivora*. The model includes a bounded chessboard spatial structure and assumes random fluctuations of environmental conditions, designed to capture the large patchy cruciferous crop fields that are frequently disturbed by harvesting, pesticide spraying and the alternation of crops. But it is important to note that even these kinds of models are not exact maps of reality (no models should intend to be – otherwise there is no point in moving from studying reality to a mathematical/computerized version of it, see Kokko, 2007). For example, although females of this butterfly species copulate twice on average in the field, the majority of eggs are laid before the second copulation takes place (Suzuki, 1978). Because the first copulation and the offspring produced with the first mate are much more important than subsequent events, Hirota (2004) modelled the female butterflies as functionally monogamous.

In contrast to models designed for studying a particular biological system, the (more common) “proof-of-principle” models simplify reality much more strongly, usually including a minimal set of assumptions to show that a specific mechanism of causality is possible. The classic model of Hamilton & May (1977) is a typical example of the “proof-of-principle” model: it was designed to show that kin competition can select for costly dispersal even if neither environmental nor population density fluctuations exist. Here, it is not appropriate to argue that the model is poorly designed because the assumptions (constant and

homogeneous environment conditions, saturated populations, identical fitness of females, identical carrying capacity of one single individual on each site, etc.) are almost never met in real biological systems. The model instead investigates a world without many of the complications that would, if present, make it hard for us to see that kin competition can be a strong driver of dispersal even in environments that at first sight do not seem to provide a reason for an individual to move elsewhere.

Models of dispersal (including sex-biased dispersal) also differ in whether they use analytical, numerical or simulation modelling approaches (Table 1). Each approach has merits and limitations. Analytical models predict the evolving dispersal rates or other properties (e.g. the kernels of dispersal distance) generally based on relatively few input parameters. They offer the advantage of presenting each step of the reasoning clearly and formally, as well as summarizing the findings in concise formulas. The first model in Hamilton & May (1977) is a good example: if individuals reproduce asexually, the evolutionary stable dispersal probability based on the assumed population updating process is simply $1/(2-p)$, in which p represents the survival probability of dispersers. From the simple formula, the authors drew the striking conclusion that due to kin competition, more than half of the offspring should disperse – even if the survival probability of dispersers is close to zero (and irrespective of how many siblings the mother produced). The clarity in the reasoning contrasts with the unrealistic nature of the prediction.

Table1: Examples of models that have different levels of taxonomic specificity and using different approaches.

	Analytical	Numerical	Simulation
--	------------	-----------	------------

High specificity	Johnstone, Cant, & Field (2012) build an analytical model that studies sex-biased dispersal, haplodiploidy, and the evolution of helping in social insects.	Lehmann & Perrin (2003) examine analytical results to numerical work when studying the role of inbreeding on sex-biased dispersal in species where females discriminate male kin.	Bonte, Hovestadt, & Poethke (2009) use an individual based model to study sex-biased dispersal in anthropod populations infected by male-killing endosymbionts.
Low specificity	Bonte <i>et al.</i> (2009) build an analytical model to study the evolution of sex-biased dispersal when dispersal decision is density dependent.	Gros, Hovestadt, & Poethke (2008) use numerical approaches to study the effect of dispersal cost, inbreeding and stochasticity on sex-biased dispersal.	Brom <i>et al.</i> (2016) build an individual based model to study sex-biased dispersal across populations with different mating systems.

The model, however, is based on the assumption that offspring that stay at their natal site all compete with each other so that only one can survive and reproduce, while offspring that disperse to elsewhere never encounter each other as competitors, and this makes it counterproductive to increase the number of offspring staying at home, almost irrespective of the life history situation of the individuals. Obviously, a reader of their model has to be aware of which assumption are delimiting the applicability of the central idea: the lesson that kin competition matters is an important take-home message that probably applies widely, whereas the prediction of philopatric offspring being the minority should be taken with a much larger pinch of salt.

This brings us to a key feature of analytical models: they need to rely on assumptions that are required to make calculus possible, rather than being necessarily dictated by biology. In analytical models of sex-

biased dispersal, it is typical to assume a spatial structure that consists large or infinite numbers of habitat patches with random dispersal of offspring between them (Gandon, 1999; Perrin & Mazalov, 1999, 2000; Nelson & Greeff, 2011; Hovestadt, Mitesser, & Poethke, 2014), as well as constant environmental conditions on each habitat patch (Gandon, 1999; Perrin & Mazalov, 1999, 2000; Leturque & Rousset, 2003; Wild & Taylor, 2004; Wild, Greenwood-Lee, & Taylor, 2006). These assumptions often make it difficult to compare model predictions with empirical results. The beauty of analytical understanding therefore comes at a cost of a temptation to downplay the importance of any effect (in the sense of leaving it unstudied) that is mathematically difficult to deal with. An example is demographic stochasticity, which is often known to influence the evolution of dispersal strategies (Ronce, Perret, & Olivieri, 2000; Ronce, 2007) but typically left out of analytical models. Demographic stochasticity, however, is not impossible to consider analytically: e.g. Hovestadt *et al.* (2014) not only consider habitats with fluctuating population sizes but also allow individuals to use local conditions for making dispersal decisions.

In contrast to analytical models, simulation models are not constrained by demands of calculus. Their flexibility allows, in principle, a researcher to study population dynamics and evolution in landscapes with fragmented, clustered habitats, and avoid potential biases such as assuming discrete generations merely for the sake of mathematical convenience. Details in the life cycle and various ways of dispersal can be conveniently implemented, and likewise there is no problem handling and keeping track of the fluctuations in size and composition of each habitat patch, or the spatiotemporal fluctuations of the environment. Pre-built simulation packages also provide convenient technical assistance to the modeling. For example, the Nemo package (Guillaume & Rougemont, 2006) provides a stochastic, individual-based simulation platform that can flexibly handle different life histories and explicit genetic architectures, and it has been used to model the effect of inbreeding in sex-biased dispersal (Guillaume & Perrin, 2009).

But all these advantages come with a drawback: the ease of implementing various factors in a model that then spits out results like from a black box. The emergent behaviors and potential coevolution of several traits are not necessarily easy to interpret in a way that truly increases understanding: systematic explorations of the parameter space can help, but this is computationally costly, and the inevitable finiteness of computing power will make it very difficult to make statements of the kind “X can never

happen in any of the scenarios we consider”, while “Y can happen, at least sometimes” is easier to state. Dynamic trajectories of a simulation model (that includes Monte Carlo effects of demographic stochasticity) are never completely repeatable. Therefore, analyzing the results and drawing conclusions also rely heavily on statistics and running the simulation for a large number of times.

It is probably not surprising that modellers of specific systems often go for the simulation approach. To illustrate this, we again use the model of sex-biased dispersal of the butterfly *P. r. crucivora* (Hirota, 2004) as an example. The author concludes that environmental variations create conditions for the evolution of female-biased dispersal if mating occurs before dispersal, but not if it occurs after dispersal. The model is specifically designed to capture the life cycle of the butterfly, and thus its conclusions of female-biased dispersal may be cautiously extrapolated to other species with pre-dispersal mating that inhabit large habitat patches that experience random and drastic environmental changes, but the applicability to other situations remain untested. Potentially, however, such results could also serve as inspiration for designing a more general model of the key idea, with less taxonomically specific assumptions.

A type of model that intermediates between the analytical and the simulation model is the numerical model. Numerical models are ideal for studying problems with complexity levels at a point where some analytical works are possible, but finding closed-form solutions is still remains out of reach, or even if these are found, they may be so convoluted that their inspection leads to little insight. Numerical depictions of the expected evolutionary patterns can then yield insight that falls between analytical and simulation approaches, sometimes forming a good compromise between causal clarity and the ability to include many interacting factors in a model. One example is the work of Leturque & Rousset (2003) on the coevolution of sex ratio and sex-biased dispersal in an environment with high-quality and low-quality habitats. The model starts from an analytical framework, and the evolutionarily stable conditions linking sex ratio, fitness and reproductive values are expressed explicitly. But the forms of the equations are too complicated for finding closed-form solutions or making intuitive sense. With the numerical approach, the authors could, however, state that sex ratio evolution can lead to higher dispersal from the high-quality habitat, and that there might be quite general conditions for overproduction of the more dispersing sex in high quality habitat.

III. Drivers of sex-biased dispersal

(1) Kin selection

a. Kin competition within the same generation

Even if dispersal incurs many costs, it is easy to understand that a lineage lacking dispersal cannot persist for long if the habitat is ephemeral, or if environmental conditions fluctuate drastically. Similarly, it is intuitive that dispersal can pay off if the local population has reached its carrying capacity, while there are suitable and unsaturated habitats elsewhere, but the work of Hamilton & May (1977) shows a less immediately apparent result: due to kin competition, dispersal can evolve even if the environment is static and the population is saturated.

The first model in Hamilton & May (1977) does not consider sexual reproduction. While it is thus not a model suitable for making predictions about sex bias, understanding it is important for any subsequent discussion of sex-biased dispersal. The authors assume a population of a parthenogenetic species living in an environment with fixed number of sites. In each site only one adult can survive. At the end of each year, all adults produce the same numbers of offspring and die. If there is no dispersal, all offspring produced on the same site compete with each other, leaving only a single survivor. A mutant strategy, that allows only one of the offspring (of the mutant) stay and make the rest disperse randomly to other sites – where they compete on equal terms with the offspring there – is bound to have higher fitness. This is because the single offspring that stays in the natal site has no competitors and thus will certainly survive and reproduce, while the dispersers each have a chance to colonize other sites. In this way, the mutant dispersal strategy is likely to spread, and the consequent competition by immigrants makes fitness of different strategies frequency dependent, with an evolutionarily stable outcome of nonzero dispersal probability.

The first model in Hamilton & May (1977) shows clearly that kin competition can be a powerful driver of dispersal in asexual populations. Being asexual, their basic model obviously did not comment on sex differences, but their paper also includes one modelling extension that allows the authors to discuss some consequences of sexual reproduction. They note that sexuality comes with the possibility of inbreeding,

which will complicate the computations of fitness expectations. To consider a case of minimal complexity, the authors assumed that all males always disperse, and ask whether females should also disperse or not, if their subsequent breeding follows the same rules of competition as before. The authors could then show that sexual reproduction lowers the evolutionarily stable dispersal probabilities of females (Figure 1), as parent-offspring relatedness is lower than under asexuality.




Figure 1: Evolutionarily stable (ES) dispersal probability as a function of the mortality rate in the model of Hamilton & May (1977) in asexual and sexual populations. The black solid line is ES dispersal probability of individuals in a parthenogenetic population. The blue dotted line represents the ES dispersal probability of females in a sexual population, where all males are forced to disperse (red dotted line), and the black dotted line is the mean dispersal probability of the sexual population, assuming 1:1 sex ratio.

Given the essential role of kin competition in driving dispersal, it is somewhat curious that not more work is devoted to understand when it might lead to sex-biased dispersal. A much-cited review on sex differences in selection to disperse or not (Greenwood, 1980) is instead focused on identifying the reasons why a male or female may enjoy particularly elevated direct fitness when staying in the natal habitat, rather than thinking about kin effects. Taking a kin selection approach to sex-biased dispersal is useful because it identifies a key question: the stay-at-home relative's success is not necessarily increased equally much when the dispersing individual is a male or a female, and the sex of the staying relative is obviously of importance, too. To answer how kin competition shapes sex-biased dispersal, we clearly need to know whether females and males compete for the same resources or different ones. There are interesting but unstudied complications because, typically at least, both sexes need nutrition that they acquire locally, and

other non-sharable local resources may be similarly important for survival (in some species space itself is a limiting resource). On the other hand, additionally, males compete among each other for fertilization opportunities in a way that does not occur between the sexes. In some situations, females may also compete for access to males.

There is work considering some exciting consequences of these asymmetries. For example, mating systems matter: due to elevated kin competition among males, male-biased dispersal can evolve under monandry and polyandry, but not under monogamy (Perrin & Mazalov, 2000; Brom *et al.*, 2016). Note, however, that such models tend to ignore any ecological resources that are of interest to both sexes simultaneously. Perrin & Mazalov (2000), for example, make an assumption in their local competition model that all competition occurs within a sex: males compete for fertilization opportunities, while females have a total of N breeding opportunities per patch. A male's presence on a patch therefore does not deplete the food or have any other ecological effect on the success of local females (that may include his sisters). In Brom *et al.* (2016), there is a different structure because density dependence impacts the survival of all individuals (thus brothers do harm their sisters), but as this happens after birth and before dispersal (and generations are non-overlapping), there is again no scope for dispersal to alter the way the two sexes can survive in the presence or absence of each other.

The study of Brom *et al.* (2016) highlights a generally important point: the importance of kin competition can be adjusted by changing the order of life cycle events. If (most of) sibling competition is scheduled to happen after a window for dispersal has been used (or not used), then higher dispersal rates can relax competition between siblings, but this effect of dispersal cannot occur if effects of competition are felt before dispersal is possible. Investigating effects of the order of events in the life cycle have become commonplace in general models of dispersal (e.g. Bach *et al.*, 2006; Massol & Débarre, 2015), but sex-biased dispersal models have so far seldom make systematic comparisons across life cycles with different orders of life-cycle events; the few valuable exceptions we know of (Wild & Taylor, 2004; Guillon & Bottein, 2011) are discussed below, as they also combine dispersal evolution with sex ratio evolution.

Kin competition is so ubiquitous in mathematical models of sex-biased dispersal that making it completely ineffectual is almost always intentional. Here, there appears to be more work that takes an explicit sex-bias focus than in models that modify the strength of kin selection via order of life cycle effects. Perrin & Mazalov (1999) created conditions where kin competition cannot operate (by artificially setting the relatedness within patches to zero) in order to isolate the effect of inbreeding avoidance. The technique is also used in Perrin & Mazalov (2000). Similarly, in the first model of Hovestadt *et al.* (2014), kin competition is removed from the model by assuming unlimited resources and by letting the population grow geometrically (all mated females are expected to produce the same numbers of daughters no matter of the population density in their patches), in order to isolate the effect of fluctuating local sex ratios on the evolution of male dispersal probability. The book chapter of Perrin & Goudet (2001) used a similar approach of eliminating resource competition (in their section *Inbreeding without competition*) for isolating the effect of inbreeding depression on the evolution of sex-biased dispersal.

In individual-based models of dispersal, kin competition naturally emerges if its operation is not prevented on purpose. For example, to confirm that kin competition indeed is the driver of sex-biased dispersal, Brom *et al.* (2016) created a case where kin competition is deliberately eliminated by a shuffling procedure that destroys relatedness structure while leaving the demographic structure and ecological setting unchanged (similar to Poethke, Pfenning, & Hovestadt (2007), where dispersal is not sex-specific); this made the sex bias in dispersal disappear.

b. A better studied corner: Coevolution between sex-biased dispersal and primary sex ratio adjustment

Interestingly, the question of sex-specific kin competition appears most intensely studied in the very specific context where it coevolves with sex ratio biases (Leturque & Rousset, 2003; Wild & Taylor, 2004). The key insight is that a mother producing a biased sex ratio can modulate the intensity of competition within each sex (Werren, 1980; Herre, 1985; Macke, Olivieri, & Magalhães, 2014) — and dispersal does the same (Leturque & Rousset, 2003). What is then the expected co-evolutionary pattern? If males compete with each other for the access to females, from their point of view, the patch-specific sex ratio directly determines the “quality” of the patch in terms of expected reproductive success. Therefore,

the way that male-biased sex ratio promotes male dispersal can be similar to the way that low quality habitat promotes emigration (Taylor, 1988; Nelson & Greeff, 2011). If the sizes of habitat patches are similar to each other, sex ratio is also an indication of the number of reproductive females, which determines the relatedness among the offspring and the intensity of kin competition (Gandon, 1999).

Above, we remarked that the order of life cycle events can matter as it impacts the composition of the set of individuals interacting with each other when competition over limited resources occurs. This principle can impact the coevolution of sex ratio and sex-biased dispersal (Wild & Taylor, 2004). If dispersal occurs before mating, sex ratios are expected to evolve a bias towards the sex that is less likely to compete in its natal patch, as it makes sense to produce many individuals of the sex that, due to dispersal, ends up avoiding much of the competition with its siblings. This situation becomes more complicated if males disperse before mating whereas females disperse after mating (carrying sperm with them): female-biased sex ratios evolve when males are more likely to compete locally, but the reverse is not always true; male-biased sex ratio now only evolve under more stringent conditions. If sex-specific dispersal mortality rates and the sex-specific order of life cycle events are considered simultaneously, almost any combination of sex ratio bias and sex-biased dispersal can evolve, except the joined occurrence of male-biased sex ratio and female-biased dispersal (Wild & Taylor, 2004).

Wild & Taylor (2004) also produced a somewhat counterintuitive result: despite coevolution, knowledge of the primary sex ratio is not required for predicting evolutionarily stable dispersal rates. Nelson & Greeff (2011) point out that this result ceases to be true if one includes environmental and/or demographic stochasticity, as in this case the sex ratios no longer remain homogeneous across habitats. Without heterogeneity in sex ratios, a male cannot expect to improve his chance of finding a patch with a more favourable sex ratio by dispersing. Using an individual based modelling approach with demographic stochasticity, and assuming that different genes determine dispersal probabilities from patches of specific sex ratios (this implicitly assumes that individuals can measure the local sex ratio and use the information for making dispersal decisions), Nelson & Greeff (2011) show that the probability of dispersal can evolve to be dependent on the sex ratio.

c. Kin competition between parents and offspring

In species with overlapping generations, kin interactions are not restricted to occur within a generation. There can be conflict of interest between parents and offspring, and this may form a powerful driving force of sex-biased dispersal, especially if competition solely, or mostly, occurs within one sex (Hamilton, 1964; Trivers, 1974; Hamilton & May, 1977). Here, an important determinant of the conflict is the control of the dispersal phenotype: given the observation “an individual has moved”, is this best understood as the individual’s genes being expressed – or perhaps those of its parent(s)? One example of the latter is the adjustment of the chemical environment during larval development by fig wasp mothers, which allows them to control how many of her sons become dispersers (small and elongated) or non-dispersing fighters (large and aggressive) (Pienaar & Greeff, 2003). In plants, the seed coat together with any dispersal structure, and fruits (that may be attractive to frugivores who then disperse seeds) express the mother’s genotype, rather than any offspring genes. Dispersal-determining genes in mothers are selected to maximize the mother’s fitness, whereas genes in the offspring are selected to maximize the fitness of the offspring (Trivers, 1974).

Normally offspring dispersal rates are higher if determined by the mother rather than by the offspring themselves (Hamilton & May, 1977). This has also been shown to hold if the evolving trait is dispersal distance (Starrfelt & Kokko, 2010). It is in the mother’s interest to “manage” risk and make offspring go far enough to maximize her total reproductive success. The perspective of an individual offspring differs from this, as each would benefit by making their siblings take the high-risk option of high mobility, while themselves settling at a distance that is easier to survive. Starrfelt & Kokko (2010) noted that considering sex-specificity of dispersal in the context of parent-offspring conflict is an obvious next step; we are unaware of such work being conducted, however, and the call remains valid. It appears important to consider to what extent females and males (e.g. mother and sons) compete for the same resources or different ones, as already mentioned in the context of section 2.1.1.

The “Oedipus” hypothesis (Liberg & von Schantz, 1985) is an example of verbal statements about resource competition between parents and offspring of the same sex. The authors argue that sex-biased dispersal may result from parents specifically benefiting from avoiding a prolonged interaction with

offspring of one specific sex. Philopatric daughters could cause fitness loss to their parents through nest parasitism, with female-biased natal dispersal being the consequence in monogamous birds. Similarly, in order to prevent sons from outcompeting their fathers, male-biased natal dispersal should evolve in promiscuous mammals if fathers have the power to decide who stays in the area. The hypothesis not only involves cross-generation kin-interaction, but also highlights the difference in the limiting resource for reproduction between the two sexes; as we have highlighted above, explicit theoretical work in this area appears lacking.

Parent-offspring conflict is also relevant for models that link sex ratio evolution with sex-biased dispersal. If the offspring sex ratio is under maternal control, and the offspring of one sex is more expensive to produce or rear than the other, the sex ratio should be biased towards the “cheaper” sex (often males) (Trivers, 1974), and dispersal rate of the “cheaper” sex should also be higher (Taylor, 1988; Gandon, 1999). The mother’s reproductive success is optimized if just enough sons remain in the natal patch to fertilize the daughters, whereas the rest disperse to reduce local competition and also to maximize the change of spreading her genes to other habitats. From the viewpoint of her sons, however, dispersal may be costly (e.g. through mortality) with no guarantee of mating success elsewhere. Therefore, if sons can control their own dispersal, the dispersal probability should evolve to be lower than the rate favoured by the mother; if the mother then still has the power to control sex ratio, fewer males may be the result.

(2) Inbreeding

Because individuals that are far away from each other are unlikely to mate, inbreeding avoidance can select for dispersal (Bengtsson, 1978; Waser, Austad, & Keane, 1986; Perrin & Mazalov, 1999, 2000; Guillaume & Perrin, 2009; Henry *et al.*, 2016), though the astute reader will note that this statement makes implicit assumptions about the timing of mating—for dispersal to help, it should precede mating.

Inbreeding avoidance is an intricate problem because of three interesting insights: (1) All else being equal, mating with a relative can be detrimental for the fitness of both male and female parents alike. But the “all else equal” needs to be treated with caution, because it needs to be specified to what extent the production of an inbred offspring implied forgoing producing another outbred one (e.g. when annual fecundity is one

and a female fertilizes her only egg for the season) or whether the offspring is an “extra” opportunity on top of all other young produced (for a detailed discussion in a non-dispersal context see Waser *et al.*, 1986; Kokko & Ots, 2006; Lehtonen & Kokko, 2015; Duthie & Reid, 2016, and in a dispersal context, Perrin & Mazalov, 2000). (2) If one sex routinely disperses far away from the natal site, the inbreeding problem has also been “solved” for the other sex. (3) Inbreeding avoidance will not automatically evolve as soon as there is inbreeding depression, because inbreeding also brings about a numerical benefit of transmitting alleles to the generation (Fisher, 1941; Kokko & Ots, 2006; Duthie, Bocedi, & Reid, 2016).

In the majority of models considering inbreeding and dispersal, inbreeding avoidance interacts with other forces to determine the probability of dispersal, including kin competition, mortality cost of dispersal, mating systems, environmental and/or demographic stochasticity. To understand how the three insights can lead to sex-specific predictions, it is useful to first look at a model that considers inbreeding avoidance as the sole reason to disperse: the island population model of Perrin & Mazalov (1999).

In Perrin & Mazalov (1999), the numbers of breeding sites (which in a saturated habitat equals the number of breeding females) are the same on each of an infinite number of demes. The evolving traits are the sex-specific dispersal probabilities m_M and m_F for males and females, respectively. The mortality cost due to dispersal (expressed as survival $s < 1$) is the same for both sexes, and there is an additional cost of reduced competitiveness of immigrants, which may be sex-specific: male and female immigrants are less competitive than natives, by a factor of a_M and a_F , respectively, in obtaining breeding opportunities. To account for the cost of inbreeding, the authors assume that the female fecundity decreases linearly with coancestry between mates. The authors then calculate equilibrium coancestry (which decreases with patch size), the probabilities of staying on the natal deme for males, k_M , and females, k_F , the cost of inbreeding i , and relate these to the cost of dispersal for males ($c_M = 1 - sa_M$) and females ($c_F = 1 - sa_F$). By optimizing the trade-off between the benefits (higher reproductive fitness from avoiding inbreeding) and costs (mortality due to dispersal and disadvantages in competing for breeding opportunities) of dispersal, the evolutionary stable strategy (ESS) of dispersal takes a very simple form for both males and females:

$$c_M = i k_F$$

$$c_F = i k_M$$

The elegant expressions can be understood intuitively as the dispersal cost counterbalancing the net cost of inbreeding depression. But if one took this to predict that the system stabilizes at the internal equilibrium $k_M c_M = k_F c_F$, where the more dispersive sex also incurs higher dispersal cost, one would soon encounter a surprise. This internal equilibrium is unstable: if, for example, females are perturbed (e.g. by genetic drift) to disperse a little bit more, the selection on males to disperse will weaken, as the “problem” of inbreeding is now reduced. Perturbations will eventually push the system to one of the boundary equilibria where only one sex disperses, and the other sex becomes completely philopatric.

Thus, even though inbreeding tolerance is predicted to differ between the sexes (Parker, 1979; Kokko & Ots, 2006), this difference does not yield solid predictions about which sex becomes dispersive and which sex becomes philopatric. The statement is typical of situations with positive feedback, where a system can reach two alternative evolutionary stable states depending on initial conditions (Lehtonen & Kokko, 2012). Similar results where inbreeding leads to random initial conditions determining which sex ends up being the dispersive one are also shown in Gandon, (1999), Perrin & Mazalov (2000), and Perrin & Goudet (2001).

Intriguingly, inbreeding tolerance also experiences another positive feedback: if inbreeding in a population as a whole is rare, we expect there to be many lethal (or sublethal) recessives and inbreeding depression will be strong (and inbreeding as a mating strategy is selected against); but if inbreeding occurs regularly, these recessives are exposed to selection and purged, and the system can thereafter move to tolerating inbreeding (Lande & Schemske, 1985). There is little work considering the interaction between the positive feedback involved in sex-specific dispersal and the other (possibly slower) feedback that is active in determining the strength of inbreeding depression. We are not aware of any analytical work in this area. Some authors have used simulations to examine the coevolution of inbreeding load and dispersal, the first one being Guillaume & Perrin (2006); under most (which they argue to be realistically mild) settings of deleterious mutations, their model did not produce significant differences between male and female dispersal, and a bistable case where either females or males evolve to disperse, but this case only emerged

when parameter values were beyond what they consider a realistic range. Note that their model considered minimal sexual asymmetry in reproductive strategy, implying that male and female variances in offspring number remain similar. It would be interesting to relax this assumption as well as combine it with results of Roze & Rousset (2009), whose model suggests heterosis can have potentially strong consequences on dispersal when the deleterious mutation rate is at the upper end of what can be considered realistic – but the genetic structure used by Roze & Rousset (2009) did not allow dispersal to be sex-specific.

Bistability per se does not mean that the situation is entirely symmetrical: bistability can coexist with bias towards, say, female dispersal, in the sense of the system being shifted towards one equilibrium with higher probability when using unbiased starting conditions, or the system evolves to one equilibrium from wider range of starting conditions. Guillaume & Perrin (2009) discuss such a case based on an intriguing sexual asymmetry that arises when inbreeding combines with polygyny. Under random mating, the fitness of a philopatric female varies more drastically than that of a dispersing female, because the former sometimes mates with related and sometimes with unrelated males, while the chance of a disperser mating with relative is negligible. The argument for why the same asymmetry does not apply for males is clearest in the case of “winner takes all”, an extreme case of polygyny where one male mates with all the local females. While the fitness expectation of a male will differ between the natal patch and elsewhere (as inbreeding only occurs at the natal site; this is equally true for males as for females), a male who mates with everyone experiences much less fitness variation than a female does. Since selection can favor strategies that reduce fitness variance (bet-hedging, see Starrfelt & Kokko (2012b) for a review), there is scope for females, but not males, to benefit from reduced variance by dispersing.

Our arguments above, however, create an interesting dilemma: up to now we have only discussed work that predicts (1) little difference between the two sexes (e.g. Guillaume & Perrin, 2006) or (2) bistability where random fluctuations determine which sex ends up being the dispersive one (e.g. Gandon, 1999), or (3) a model that predicts female-biased dispersal under polygyny (Guillaume & Perrin, 2009) – a prediction that is not reflected in natural systems where males generally disperse more often under polygyny (Lawson Handley & Perrin, 2007; Mabry *et al.*, 2013; Trochet *et al.*, 2016).

So why is dispersal often male-biased under polygyny? In the following sections we will return to this question, as considering inbreeding alone seems to have difficulties explaining this pattern; but it is important first to understand that this difficulty arises not because of a failure to match empirical data with predictions that follow the logic “the sex who suffers more from inbreeding should disperse”. The reason is subtler: a surprising frailty of the logic in the sentence itself. Intuition may fail when predicting who “suffers more”. While we highlighted above how variances may behave differently between males and females under polygyny, intuition might also suggest, to some, that expectations (means) should differ because inbreeding is costlier for a female who has fewer reproductive opportunities than a male residing in the same deme. However, this is not necessarily the case, because the same level of mating success in the natal patch leads to reduced fitness for the male too, compared with equivalent performance in an outbreeding context.

The logic is perhaps easiest to see for the hypothetical top male who wins all fertilizations. He also exhausted his reproductive potential by the time he has mated with all the local females (and thus swapping some of them to unrelated ones would have improved fitness). Consider a natal patch with four philopatric individuals (2 males, 2 females) and four unrelated immigrants (again 2 males, 2 females); and consider that inbreeding halves offspring survival rate from S to $S/2$. We use one offspring in this example, but the reasoning works the same way when there is an entire clutch, and for any level of inbreeding depression. If the female mates randomly in her natal patch, her expected number of offspring is $\frac{1}{4} S/2 + \frac{1}{4} S/2 + \frac{1}{4} S + \frac{1}{4} S = \frac{3}{4} S$. If she disperses successfully and outbreeds, her expected number of offspring is S . For a male who fertilises all the four females in a patch, the expected offspring production is $3S$ if he stays at home, and $4S$ if he has dispersed. For both sexes, dispersal boosts fitness by a factor of $4/3$. If one additionally takes into account that a male cannot predict if he is going to be the local winner or not, the absolute value of expected fitness becomes identical across the two sexes (in each deme the male wins with probability $1/4$).

Thus, models considering inbreeding asymmetries should not be straightforwardly summarized as “inbreeding avoidance causing stronger selection for females to disperse than for males”. But why is it not correct to apply classic results such as Parker (1979), which, after all, predicted greater inbreeding

tolerance in males than in females, when the question is about dispersal? This is because classic results ask whether an individual (male or female) benefits from rejecting a current mating opportunity, with females losing opportunities to use unrelated sperm to fertilize the same egg, and a male not necessarily losing anything more than some time or energy, keeping his other mating opportunities relatively unaffected. Choice of one's own location, which is by definition changed by dispersal, does not obey the same logical structure. A male who stays in the natal patch truly foregoes opportunities to participate in mating competition elsewhere, and these (outbred) mating opportunities are lost for him, which is equally detrimental consequences as the loss of outbred mating opportunities that a philopatric female experiences.

The toy example above, like most models of sex-biased dispersal, assumed that the choice of the sire is random. It is clear that expected fitness values should change if mating is not random, e.g. if females and/or males reject mating opportunities with kin. Here, a sexual asymmetry can get established more easily, with females choosier than males, because of an asymmetry in the costs of choice becomes re-established: a female who rejects a mating usually does not mean her egg remains unfertilized (as long as she accepts some other local matings), while a male rejecting a mating represents a breeding opportunity that he truly loses. (Lehmann & Perrin, 2003) use mate choice by females to provide an interesting alternative explanation for the paradox of female-biased inbreeding cost and male-biased dispersal. The authors pointed out that females do not need to disperse to avoid inbreeding if they can recognize and reject related males as mates. This, in turn, creates selection for male dispersal because males suffer low mating success in their natal patch.

Lehmann & Perrin (2003) also point out that although inbreeding has a cost on the fecundity and thus should be avoided, it also increases the inclusive fitness of an individual through the fecundity gains of its related mating partner. Therefore, at high inbreeding cost, females should reject kin matings and thereby cause male-biased dispersal, but at low inbreeding cost, inclusive fitness benefits should induce females to prefer related males, thereby promoting male philopatry (Lehmann & Perrin, 2003). The situation has further twists if cooperation among kin can also influence sex-biased dispersal through the avoidance or tolerance of inbreeding. If one sex benefits more from kin cooperation than the other sex, it can be selected

to become more philopatric, and the feedback will then make the other sex disperse more to avoid inbreeding (Perrin & Goudet, 2001; Perrin & Lehmann, 2001).

The above causalities show how many factors can interact to produce the net outcome. Although difficult, it is valuable to tease out the effect of each single factor as much as possible. Perrin & Goudet (2001) provide us with a beautiful example. The authors study the joint effect of inbreeding avoidance and kin competition on the evolution of sex-biased dispersal. They first study a model that includes only local competition but has no inbreeding load, and then a model that includes inbreeding but excludes kin competition. After showing the effect of the two factors separately, the authors built a third model that include the joint effect of both and calculated the evolutionarily stable dispersal probability for each sex. The result shows that the effect of kin competition and inbreeding avoidance are not simply additive, because dispersal, even if it is induced by competition, prevents inbreeding, and makes “extra” dispersal largely pointless. In a fourth model, they then incorporate social interactions, with effects as explained above.

(3) Asymmetric limiting resources and their spatiotemporal variations

In many environmental and social settings, the most fitness limiting resource differs between males and females. Kin competition over mates and other resources have been referred to in literature as “local mate competition (LMC)” (Hamilton, 1967) and “local resource competition (LRC)” (Clark, 1978), respectively. Above, we already described that an asymmetry in the intensity of local competition can make the sex under stronger competition generally more likely to disperse (Perrin & Mazalov, 2000; Wild & Taylor, 2004). For example, male-biased dispersal becomes explicable for polygynous species if the intensity of mate competition between males exceeds all other types of competition, including the competition between females for food and territories (Dobson, 1982; Lawson Handley & Perrin, 2007; Brom *et al.*, 2016). However, the argument of the strength of competition should be evoked with care. A common model formulation is to assume that female reproductive output is limited by the number of sites in a local patch (e.g. N females can breed per site), and there are equally many females as there are males in the population as a whole. Then local males compete over precisely N reproductive opportunities, i.e. local mate competition, LMC, is equally strong as local resource competition, LRC. It is possible to make

one type of competition become stronger than the other — e.g. Perrin & Mazalov (2000) discuss that a female’s “own rate of processing resources” might limit her output, rather than local resources per se — but the bottom line is that $LMC > LRC$ is not an automatic result of male reproduction being limited by female availability.

Greenwood’s verbal accounts (1980, 1983) summarised the evidence that different mating systems can associate with different dispersal patterns. He pointed out that monogamous birds often have female-biased dispersal whereas promiscuous mammals often exhibit male-biased dispersal. Although exceptions exist (reviewed in Lawson Handley & Perrin, 2007), the general pattern appears to hold for these taxa (Mabry *et al.*, 2013; Trochet *et al.*, 2016). Despite the commonly acknowledged association between mating systems and sex-biased dispersal, it is interesting that Greenwood’s arguments differ rather substantially from those assumed by theoretical models. For cases where males are philopatric (territorial birds), he envisaged that it is easier for a male to establish a territory at, or near, his natal site than to achieve the same elsewhere. For polygynous, dispersive males (as found in a typical mammal), his argument is actually somewhat less clear; the home advantage may be absent if it is females rather than local sites that are being defended, but his work does not articulate very clearly why male-biased (rather than unbiased) dispersal becomes the norm, except if one assumes similarly strong familiarity-based competition arguments to apply to females as to monogamous territorial males. There is also a section of Greenwood (1980) that has gained little subsequent attention, where he essentially extrapolates an argument that is based on mate-searching. Males should move more whenever this helps them to find more fertilization opportunities (this obviously requires polygyny), and this extra movement ultimately leads to a pattern with male-biased dispersal. Later in the paper he then turns to species-specific mechanisms of mate acquisition and defence, elucidating when a male bias may or may not be realized.

Interestingly, while very much of empirical work takes mate and resource acquisition as key determinants of sex-biased dispersal (often citing Greenwood, e.g. Liebgold, Brodie, & Cabe, 2011; Paris *et al.*, 2016; Zhang *et al.*, 2017), modelling efforts have largely ignored “Greenwoodian” causalities that require specifying differences between dispersers and non-dispersers in resource and mate acquisition success. For example, although it would be ready to do so, we are unaware of a model that includes a parameter that

specifies how much easier it is for a philopatric individual to gain access to a resource compared with an immigrant (either in the list of Johnson & Gaines (1990) or later), a key component of Greenwood's arguments (though some models derive, as an emergent property, an elevated success for *emigrant* males, as females evolve to avoid philopatric mates due to inbreeding avoidance (Lehmann & Perrin, 2003). Instead, models tend to track genetic consequences of local competition, evaluating how it affects the relatedness structure among the offspring and modulates the intensity of kin competition (e.g. Perrin & Goudet, 2001). Very often, females are assumed to compete over a fixed number of breeding opportunities per site, and males compete solely for the fertilization opportunities that these females provide. It is worth re-emphasizing that this as such does not necessarily produce male-biased dispersal, even under polygyny, because the total number of breeding opportunities then equals N for individuals of either sex (Perrin & Mazalov, 2000), and the fact that variances in breeding success differ between the sexes has only minor and rather subtle effects on dispersal (see above for Guillaume & Perrin, 2009 on this topic). It is possible to remove all competition between females (e.g. the second model of Perrin & Goudet, 2001) which then causes female philopatry with open-ended geometric population growth, but while conceptually illuminating, no author has ever claimed this to be realistic.

The problem of the "identical N " leads us to an important point: a strict deme structure with discrete generations is not necessarily capturing all there is to mate and resource competition in nature. For example, the idea that males might benefit from being highly mobile, as they can then exploit fertilization opportunities in more than one patch, can be traced all the way back to Greenwood (1980) and references therein; any model that forces all matings of an individual to occur in one discrete deme only automatically excludes such effects from operating. Some models exist that consider more flexible settings, avoiding the assumption of discrete steps from dispersal to mating to reproduction, and the details indeed turn out to matter. For example, Hirota (2005) showed that female-biased dispersal can evolve even if they mate with multiple males, as long as female remating is not synchronised with dispersal or they do not only use the sperm from their last mate. Other models allow individuals to assess their current prospects using indirect cues such as local density of competitors or opposite-sex individuals. Once emigration decisions are allowed to depend on local densities of males and/or females (Hovestadt *et al.*, 2014), male-biased

dispersal becomes easier to explain than in the classic models, while female-biased exceptions also become explicable under special circumstances.

Shaw & Kokko (2014) additionally considered that individuals on the move do not necessarily follow a predefined dispersal kernel that forces them to land and settle irrespective of local conditions. Animals with sufficient cognitive capacities might instead evaluate each habitat patch for key fitness indicators, a very relevant indicator being the number of males and females already present in each patch. If individuals continue searching for new patches as long as the most recently encountered sex ratio is an unfavourable one (e.g. for males, a male-biased one), but accept to settle probabilistically in non-ideal settings too (as each step moved has costs), the outcome turns out to depend not only on monogamy *vs.* polygyny but also whether mating happens before, during or after dispersal.

Such work (Shaw & Kokko, 2014) also provides a potential resolution to an apparent contradiction when two relatively disconnected sets of literature – that of mate searching and that of dispersal – are considered jointly. If one sex is highly mobile in its mate-search efforts, then, in the mate-search literature, it is often found that the other sex can save the effort and move very little or not at all, as it “will be found” in any case (Hammerstein & Parker, 1987; Shaw & Kokko, 2014). But if sex-specific dispersal is allowed to evolve in a setting where densities and local sex ratios are not artificially kept constant for analytical purposes, the opposite is found: elevating female dispersal will also make males disperse more (Meier, Starrfelt, & Kokko, 2011). Philopatry now becomes a poor option when individuals of the other sex often disperse, because the philopatric individuals are above-average often born in patches that just had high breeding success in the previous generation, and this makes them lose more opposite-sex emigrants than they on average receive, via immigration from other patches, as potential mates. This asymmetry is an automatic consequence of demography itself (non-dispersers happen to be particularly numerous in sites that are above-average productive in the previous generation), but if the model ignored temporal variation in breeding success, the effect would vanish. In Shaw & Kokko (2014) the dispersal of the two sexes can be either positively or negatively correlated, and the details depend on the extent to which female movement is interpretable as mate-searching (i.e. when matings happen relative to movement). They recover the prediction that it is difficult to find a sex bias in dispersal if mating and reproduction occur

after dispersal in the final settlement patch, even if matings are promiscuous; mating *en route* on the other hand favours male-biased dispersal (with details that depend on first or last male sperm precedence), while pre-dispersal mating favours female-biased dispersal.

The above highlights that it can be important to understand mobility in the context of variable population densities, Allee effects (low reproduction at low densities, potentially because of mate-finding difficulties) and individual decision-making rules (Gilroy & Lockwood, 2012). The abundance of limiting resources on different habitats can fluctuate due to environmental and/or demographic stochasticity. Mobile individuals can increase encounter rates with others beyond simple deme-structure assumptions, thus future models could consider the evolving sex-specificity of scales over which competition for resources or mates occurs (for a spectacular empirical example, consider male pectoral sandpipers that can move through a considerable part of the species' breeding range, up to 13000 km, during one mating season (Kempnaers & Valcu, 2017)). While we have separated our exposition of environmental or demographic fluctuations to this section, separate from inbreeding or kin competition, it is clear that modelling fluctuations in environmental conditions, population densities or sex ratios can also strongly affect the intensity of kin competition and inbreeding avoidance (Guillaume & Perrin, 2006; for more works in a non-sex-specific context, see Cadet *et al.*, 2003; Blanquart & Gandon, 2011; North, Cornell, & Ovaskainen, 2011). In extreme cases, one may have to consider extinction and recolonization dynamics (Gandon & Michalakis, 1999; Bonte *et al.*, 2009; Henry *et al.*, 2016).

By incorporating environmental and demographic stochasticity, the work of Gros, Poethke, & Hovestadt (2009) and Henry *et al.* (2016) shed new light on why precisely males may evolve to be the more dispersive sex; in the case of Henry *et al.* (2016), this combines with a consideration of inbreeding avoidance. Stochasticity can promote male-biased dispersal under polygyny, as it helps to decouple the strength of local mate competition and local resource competition. Once male density is allowed to vary between patches, a randomly chosen male is more likely to be in a "male-dense" patch than in a patch with few males; the benefit of moving (to a patch that potentially offers lighter competition) can therefore exceed the cost – with this net effect being more likely if demographic and/or environmental stochasticity were strong. The between-patch variance in success has to be greater for males than for females, which

importantly differs from a mere within-patch expectation (e.g. one male siring all offspring in a patch, which does not on its own suffice to make males disperse more than females).

In Henry *et al.* (2016), the exact magnitude and direction of sex-biased dispersal also depended on whether dispersal regulation was applied separately for the two sexes or jointly, and whether inbreeding load was incorporated in the model or not; these new studies thus echo one of our main messages, which is a call to investigate, more broadly, how kin selection, inbreeding and the spatial scale of resource use can all interact to produce overall patterns of male- or female-biased dispersal, given that most systems probably do not follow simplistic assumptions of birth–dispersal–(local) mating–reproduction–death with males needing no other resource to succeed than access to females.

IV. A special integrative case: haplodiploidy, kin competition and metapopulation structure

Above, following most of the literature, we have operated under the tacit assumption that the species in question is diploid (see Saastamoinen *et al.* (2018) for a general discussion of assumptions made regarding the genetic architecture in dispersal models). If the relevant relatedness calculations differ between males and females, e.g. because of haplodiploidy, there are obvious new routes how kin competition can induce sex-biased dispersal (Taylor, 1988). Females of haplodiploid species in the same habitat are often more related to each other than to the males, or the males to each other.

Under special conditions, asymmetries can also become important in diploid species, for example, in systems where a proportion of individuals is infected by male-killing endosymbionts (Hurst & Jiggins, 2000). Once a female is infected, she can only produce infected daughters, whereas all male offspring are killed. Therefore, as modelled by Bonte *et al.* (2009), relatedness becomes higher among males than among females in a partly infected habitat (there are only few males being produced, and these are more likely to share a mother compared with two randomly chosen local female offspring). The elevated relatedness among males leads to higher kin competition, which in turn induces female philopatry and male-biased dispersal.

Interestingly, the consequences of such male-biased dispersal negatively feed back to its underlying cause, especially under conditions of high dispersal cost and low environmental stochasticity. Because of reduced female dispersal, the infected local populations tend to go extinct, and recolonised by uninfected populations. The coevolution of sex ratio, kin competition and sex-biased dispersal provide a fortuitous way for a metapopulation to “cure” itself, escaping from the spread of parasites; local extinctions help avoid global extinction in this case. Such relatedness asymmetry induced dispersal bias in diploid populations might seem surprising, but in principle, any process that “clumps” individuals into kin groups in one sex more than the other could cause selection to “de-clump” them, assuming that kin competition plays a role and can be alleviated by dispersal. Although exciting in its dynamic richness, the model of Bonte *et al.* (2009) can also be seen to be a complex example of a more general, and simpler, principle: if one sex currently disperses little and therefore “clumps” and competes a lot with same-sex conspecifics, it is selected to disperse more (Perrin & Goudet, 2001). This feedback makes it perhaps understandable why we generally speak of dispersal biases – both sexes disperse, one more than the other – rather than completely unisexual dispersal patterns where one sex is the sole dispersal specialist.

V. Conclusions

- (1) The link between mating system and sex-biased dispersal is harder to establish as a theoretical expectation than one might have expected. A parallel work to ours (Trochet *et al.*, 2016) documenting empirical patterns (as opposed to theoretical expectations), also highlighted this point. Importantly, the fact that *within* a patch male mating success can vary more than female reproductive success is not sufficient to make males disperse more. Between-patch stochasticity, on the other hand, as well as more “flexible” spatial arrangements (e.g. mating *en route*) can provide more robust causalities towards male-biased dispersal.
- (2) The causalities that Greenwood’s classic study (1980) considered, and the large body of theoretical literature on sex-biased dispersal, are largely treated separately in the literature. The sex-specific home advantage of individuals (the ability to succeed in the natal habitat versus elsewhere) and the possibility for them to evolve, are typically not included in models at all.

Although the results of such a model might appear *a priori* too obvious (the sex with a sufficiently greater home advantage being selected to be philopatric under a wider range of conditions), we believe that a modelling exercise is still valuable, if only to re-establish how difficult it is to find consistent predictions linking polygyny to male-biased dispersal. A largely neglected part of Greenwood's writing, namely that of mate searching by males extending to a pattern of dispersal where males move more than females, might be an easier way to associate polygyny with male-biased dispersal.

- (3) While models have commented on the order of life cycle events (which can be used to modify whether the presence of a related individual matters in the context of population regulation), they very rarely consider that both males and females might partially depend on the same resources, even though the feeding niches of males and females typically overlap greatly, and the resource intake rates of males often exceeds that of females, at least in cases of male-biased sexual size dimorphism. Especially in iteroparous species (only rarely modelled), both male and female fitness will depend on current reproduction and also survival, thus emigration decisions can have an impact on kin interactions not only within a sex, but also (to a great degree) across the sexes.
- (4) There are surprising gaps in the literature where researchers appear to have jumped to study an exciting coevolutionary process (that of habitat-specific sex ratio evolution interacting with competition that occurs either within a sex or jointly between the sexes) without looking, explicitly, at the simpler step that ignores adaptive sex ratio responses. Obviously, this does not make such work less valuable; it simply highlights that there is still space to work out the basics, hopefully linking them with predictions that can be tested with ease in nature, such as the degree to which a male's presence harms or helps a local female's reproductive success or survival.
- (5) Given that dispersal is a complex trait with aspects including the rate, distance distribution, and timing, models understandably vary in the relevant assumptions and emphases, bringing along associated upsides and downsides, that we have outlined in section (II). It is, however, always advisable to be conscious of the likely effects that the modelling choices have on the findings; we hope our review to help form an overview of the probable effects, e.g. why the timing of dispersal relative to mating is so often of crucial importance (Hirota, 2004, 2005; Wild & Taylor, 2004; Shaw & Kokko, 2014).

(6) It is worth highlighting that our chosen focus on exposing the mathematical logic of the evolutionary causes of sex-biased dispersal has made us not only leave the relevant empirical evidence to be outside the scope of this review (we direct the reader to Trochet *et al.*, 2016 for a recent review), but also to omit mention of many interesting models that mainly study the consequences, rather than causes, of sex-specific dispersal. Sex differences in dispersal can have an influence on sex ratio evolution, the evolution of social behaviours such as helping and harming, and the evolution of adaptive parental effects. Sex biases in dispersal rates or distances clearly also impacts invasion and conservation biology. We hope that filling the gaps that currently exist in understanding the causes behind varying dispersal patterns will co-occur with a better understanding of the consequences.

References

- ANDERSEN, N.M. (1997) Phylogenetic tests of evolutionary scenarios: the evolution of flightlessness and wing polymorphism in insects. In *The Origin of Biodiversity in Insects: Phylogenetic Tests of Evolutionary Scenarios* (ed P. GRANDCOLAS), pp. 91–108. Memoires du Museum National D'Histoire Naturelle.
- ANSEEUW, D., MAES, G.E., BUSSELEN, P., KNAPEN, D., SNOEKS, J. & VERHEYEN, E. (2008) Subtle population structure and male-biased dispersal in two *Copadichromis* species (Teleostei, Cichlidae) from Lake Malawi, East Africa. *Hydrobiologia* **615**, 69–79.
- BACH, L.A., THOMSEN, R., PERTOLDI, C. & LOESCHCKE, V. (2006) Kin competition and the evolution of dispersal in an individual-based model. *Ecological Modelling* **192**, 658–666.
- BARBOSA, P., KRISCHIK, V. & LANCE, D. (1989) Life-history traits of forest-inhabiting flightless Lepidoptera. *American Midland Naturalist* **122**, 262–274.
- BENGTSSON, B.O. (1978) Avoiding inbreeding: at what cost? *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **73**, 439–444.
- BLANQUART, F. & GANDON, S. (2011) Evolution of migration in a periodically changing environment. *The American Naturalist* **177**, 188–201.
- BONTE, D., VAN DYCK, H., BULLOCK, J.M., COULON, A., DELGADO, M., GIBBS, M., LEHOUCQ, V., MATTHYSEN, E., MUSTIN, K., SAASTAMOINEN, M., SHTICKZELLE, N., STEVENS, V.M., VANDEWOESTIJNE, S., BAGUETTE, M., BARTON, K., ET AL. (2012) Costs of dispersal. *Biological Reviews* **87**, 290–312.
- BONTE, D., HOVESTADT, T. & POETHKE, H.-J. (2009) Sex-specific dispersal and evolutionary rescue in

- metapopulations infected by male killing endosymbionts. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* **9**, 16.
- BOWLER, D.E. & BENTON, T.G. (2005) Causes and consequences of animal dispersal strategies: relating individual behaviour to spatial dynamics. *Biological Reviews* **80**, 205–225.
- BROM, T., MASSOT, M., LEGENDRE, S. & LALOI, D. (2016) Kin competition drives the evolution of sex-biased dispersal under monandry and polyandry, not under monogamy. *Animal behaviour* **113**, 157–166.
- CADET, C., FERRIÈRE, R., METZ, J.A.J. & VAN BAALEN, M. (2003) The evolution of dispersal under demographic stochasticity. *The American Naturalist* **162**, 427–441.
- CANO, J.M., MÄKINEN, H.S. & MERILÄ, J. (2008) Genetic evidence for male-biased dispersal in the three-spined stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*). *Molecular Ecology* **17**, 3234–3242.
- CLARK, A.B. (1978) Sex ratio and local resource competition in a prosimian primate. *Science* **201**, 163–165.
- CLARKE, A.L., SÆTHER, B.-E. & RØSKAFT, E. (1997) Sex biases in avian dispersal: a reappraisal. *Oikos* **79**, 429–438.
- CLOBERT, J., BAGUETTE, M., BENTON, T.G. & BULLOCK, J.M. (eds) (2012) *Dispersal ecology and evolution*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- CLOBERT, J., DANCHIN, E., DHONDT, A.A. & NICHOLS, J.D. (eds) (2001) *Dispersal*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- DOBSON, F.S. (1982) Competition for mates and predominant juvenile male dispersal in mammals. *Animal Behaviour* **30**, 1183–1192.
- DUBEY, S., BROWN, G.P., MADSEN, T. & SHINE, R. (2008) Male-biased dispersal in a tropical Australian snake (*Stegonotus cucullatus*, Colubridae). *Molecular Ecology* **17**, 3506–3514.
- DUPUTIÉ, A. & MASSOL, F. (2013) An empiricist's guide to theoretical predictions on the evolution of dispersal. *Interface Focus* **3**, 20130028.
- DUTHIE, A.B., BOCEDI, G. & REID, J.M. (2016) When does female multiple mating evolve to adjust inbreeding? Effects of inbreeding depression, direct costs, mating constraints, and polyandry as a threshold trait. *Evolution* **70**, 1927–1943.
- DUTHIE, A.B. & REID, J.M. (2016) Evolution of Inbreeding Avoidance and Inbreeding Preference through Mate Choice among Interacting Relatives. *The American Naturalist* **188**, 651–667.
- FISHER, R.A. (1941) Average excess and average effect of a gene substitution. *Annals of Eugenics* **11**, 53–63.
- GANDON, S. (1999) Kin Competition, the Cost of Inbreeding and the Evolution of Dispersal. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **200**, 345–364.

- GANDON, S. & MICHALAKIS, Y. (1999) Evolutionarily stable dispersal rate in a metapopulation with extinctions and kin competition. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **199**, 275–290.
- GHAZOUL, J. (2005) Pollen and seed dispersal among dispersed plants. *Biological Reviews* **80**, 413–443.
- GILROY, J.J. & LOCKWOOD, J.L. (2012) Mate-finding as an overlooked critical determinant of dispersal variation in sexually-reproducing animals. *PLoS One* **7**, e38091.
- GREENWOOD, P.J. (1980) Mating systems, philopatry and dispersal in birds and mammals. *Animal behaviour* **28**, 1140–1162.
- GREENWOOD, P.J. (1983) Mating systems and the evolutionary consequences of dispersal. *The ecology of animal movement*, 116–131. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- GROS, A., HOVESTADT, T. & POETHKE, H.J. (2008) Evolution of sex-biased dispersal: the role of sex-specific dispersal costs, demographic stochasticity, and inbreeding. *Ecological Modelling* **219**, 226–233.
- GROS, A., POETHKE, H.J. & HOVESTADT, T. (2009) Sex-specific spatio-temporal variability in reproductive success promotes the evolution of sex-biased dispersal. *Theoretical Population Biology* **76**, 13–18.
- GUILLAUME, F. & PERRIN, N. (2006) Joint evolution of dispersal and inbreeding load. *Genetics* **173**, 497–509.
- GUILLAUME, F. & PERRIN, N. (2009) Inbreeding load, bet hedging, and the evolution of sex-biased dispersal. *The American Naturalist* **173**, 536–541.
- GUILLAUME, F. & ROUGEMONT, J. (2006) Nemo: an evolutionary and population genetics programming framework. *Bioinformatics* **22**, 2556–2557.
- GUILLOIN, J.-M. & BOTTEIN, J. (2011) A spatially explicit model of sex ratio evolution in response to sex-biased dispersal. *Theoretical Population Biology* **80**, 141–149.
- HAMILTON, W.D. (1964) The genetical evolution of social behaviour. II. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **7**, 17–52.
- HAMILTON, W.D. (1967) Extraordinary sex ratios. *Science* **156**, 477–488.
- HAMILTON, W.D. & MAY, R.M. (1977) Dispersal in stable habitats. *Nature* **269**, 578–581.
- HAMMERSTEIN, P. & PARKER, G.A. (1987) Sexual selection: games between the sexes. In *Sexual selection: testing the alternatives* (eds J.W. BRADBURY & M.B. ANDERSEN), pp. 119–142. John Wiley & Sons.
- HENRY, R.C., COULON, A., TRAVIS, J.M.J., NEUBERT, M.G. & BRONSTEIN, J.L. (2016) The Evolution of Male-Biased Dispersal under the Joint Selective Forces of Inbreeding Load and Demographic and Environmental Stochasticity. *The American Naturalist* **188**, 423–433.
- HERRE, E.A. (1985) Sex ratio adjustment in fig wasps. *Science* **228**, 896–898.

- HIROTA, T. (2004) The evolution of sex-biased dispersal by pre-dispersal copulation and fluctuating environment. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **73**, 1115–1120.
- HIROTA, T. (2005) The effect of female polyandry and sperm precedence on the evolution of sexual difference in dispersal timing. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **18**, 1395–1402.
- HOPKINS, J.P., BAUDRY, G., CANDOLIN, U. & KAITALA, A. (2015) I'm sexy and I glow it: Female ornamentation in a nocturnal capital breeder. *Biology letters* **11**, 8–11.
- HOVESTADT, T., MITESSER, O. & POETHKE, H.-J. (2014) Gender-specific emigration decisions sensitive to local male and female density. *The American Naturalist* **184**, 38–51.
- HURST, G.D. & JIGGINS, F.M. (2000) Male-killing bacteria in insects: mechanisms, incidence, and implications. *Emerging infectious diseases* **6**, 329–336.
- HUTCHINGS, J.A. & GERBER, L. (2002) Sex-biased dispersal in a salmonid fish. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series B: Biological Sciences* **269**, 2487–2493.
- IMS, R.A. & YOCOZO, N.G. (1997) Studying transfer processes in metapopulations: emigration, migration, and colonization. *Metapopulation biology: ecology, genetics, and evolution*. Academic Press, San Diego.
- JOHNSON, M.L. & GAINES, M.S. (1990) Evolution of dispersal: theoretical models and empirical tests using birds and mammals. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* **21**, 449–480.
- JOHNSTONE, R.A., CANT, M.A. & FIELD, J. (2012) Sex-biased dispersal, haplodiploidy and the evolution of helping in social insects. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* **279**, 787–793.
- KEMPENAERS, B. & VALCU, M. (2017) Breeding site sampling across the Arctic by individual males of a polygynous shorebird. *Nature* **541**, 528–531.
- KEOGH, J.S., WEBB, J.K. & SHINE, R. (2007) Spatial genetic analysis and long-term mark--recapture data demonstrate male-biased dispersal in a snake. *Biology Letters* **3**, 33–35.
- KOKKO, H. (2007) *Modelling for field biologists and other interesting people*. Cambridge University press, Cambridge.
- KOKKO, H. & OTS, I. (2006) When not to avoid inbreeding? *Evolution* **60**, 467–475.
- LANDE, R. & SCHEMSKE, D.W. (1985) The evolution of self-fertilization and inbreeding depression in plants. I. Genetic models. *Evolution* **39**, 24–40.
- LAWSON HANDLEY, L.J. & PERRIN, N. (2007) Advances in our understanding of mammalian sex-biased dispersal. *Molecular Ecology* **16**, 1559–1578.

- LEHMANN, L. & PERRIN, N. (2003) Inbreeding avoidance through kin recognition: choosy females boost male dispersal. *The American Naturalist* **162**, 638–652.
- LEHTONEN, J. & KOKKO, H. (2012) Positive feedback and alternative stable states in inbreeding, cooperation, sex roles and other evolutionary processes. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* **367**, 211–221.
- LEHTONEN, J. & KOKKO, H. (2015) Why inclusive fitness can make it adaptive to produce less fit extra-pair offspring. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* **282**, 20142716.
- LETURQUE, H. & ROUSSET, F. (2003) Joint evolution of sex ratio and dispersal: conditions for higher dispersal rates from good habitats. *Evolutionary Ecology* **17**, 67–84.
- LIBERG, O. & VON SCHANTZ, T. (1985) Sex-Biased Philopatry and Dispersal in Birds and Mammals: The Oedipus Hypothesis. *The American Naturalist* **126**, 129–135.
- LIEBGOLD, E.B., BRODIE, E.D. & CABE, P.R. (2011) Female philopatry and male-biased dispersal in a direct-developing salamander, *Plethodon cinereus*. *Molecular Ecology* **20**, 249–257.
- MABRY, K.E., SHELLEY, E.L., DAVIS, K.E., BLUMSTEIN, D.T. & VAN VUREN, D.H. (2013) Social mating system and sex-biased dispersal in mammals and birds: a phylogenetic analysis. *PLoS One* **8**, e57980.
- MACKE, E., OLIVIERI, I. & MAGALHÃES, S. (2014) Local mate competition mediates sexual conflict over sex ratio in a haplodiploid spider mite. *Current Biology* **24**, 2850–2854.
- MASSOL, F. & DÉBARRE, F. (2015) Evolution of dispersal in spatially and temporally variable environments: the importance of life cycles. *Evolution* **69**, 1925–1937.
- MEIER, C.M., STARRFELT, J. & KOKKO, H. (2011) Mate limitation causes sexes to coevolve towards more similar dispersal kernels. *Oikos* **120**, 1459–1468.
- MORALES, J.M., MOORCROFT, P.R., MATTHIOPOULOS, J., FRAIR, J.L., KIE, J.G., POWELL, R.A., MERRILL, E.H. & HAYDON, D.T. (2010) Building the bridge between animal movement and population dynamics. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* **365**, 2289–2301.
- NATHAN, R., GETZ, W.M., REVILLA, E., HOLYOAK, M., KADMON, R., SALTZ, D. & SMOUSE, P.E. (2008) A movement ecology paradigm for unifying organismal movement research. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **105**, 19052–19059.
- NELSON, R.M. & GREEFF, J.M. (2011) Sex ratio dependent dispersal when sex ratios vary between patches. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **290**, 81–87.
- NORTH, A., CORNELL, S. & OVASKAINEN, O. (2011) Evolutionary responses of dispersal distance to landscape

- structure and habitat loss. *Evolution* **65**, 1739–1751.
- OLSSON, M. & SHINE, R. (2003) Female-biased natal and breeding dispersal in an alpine lizard, *Niveoscincus microlepidotus*. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **79**, 277–283.
- PARIS, D., NICHOLLS, A.O., HALL, A., HARVEY, A. & MASSARO, M. (2016) Female-biased dispersal in a spatially restricted endemic island bird. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* **70**, 2061–2069.
- PARKER, G.A. (1979) Sexual selection and sexual conflict. *Sexual selection and reproductive competition in insects*, 123–166. Academic Press, New York.
- PERRIN, N. & GOUDET, J. (2001) Inbreeding, kinship, and the evolution of natal dispersal. *Dispersal*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- PERRIN, N. & LEHMANN, L. (2001) Is sociality driven by the costs of dispersal or the benefits of philopatry? a role for kin-discrimination mechanisms. *The American Naturalist* **158**, 471–483.
- PERRIN, N. & MAZALOV, V. (1999) Dispersal and inbreeding avoidance. *The American Naturalist* **154**, 282–292.
- PERRIN, N. & MAZALOV, V. (2000) Local competition, inbreeding, and the evolution of sex-biased dispersal. *The American Naturalist* **155**, 116–127.
- PIENAAR, J. & GREEFF, J.M. (2003) Maternal control of offspring sex and male morphology in the *Otitessa* fig wasps. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **16**, 244–253.
- POETHKE, H.J., PFENNING, B. & HOVESTADT, T. (2007) The relative contribution of individual and kin selection to the evolution of density-dependent dispersal rates. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* **9**, 41–50.
- RONCE, O. (2007) How does it feel to be like a rolling stone? Ten questions about dispersal evolution. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* **38**, 231–253.
- RONCE, O., PERRET, F. & OLIVIERI, I. (2000) Evolutionarily stable dispersal rates do not always increase with local extinction rates. *The American Naturalist* **155**, 485–496.
- ROZE, D. & ROUSSET, F. (2009) Strong effects of heterosis on the evolution of dispersal rates. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **22**, 1221–1233.
- RUCKELSHAUS, M., HARTWAY, C. & KAREIVA, P. (1997) Assessing the data requirements of spatially explicit dispersal models. *Conservation Biology* **11**, 1298–1306.
- SAASTAMOINEN, M., BOCEDI, G., COTE, J., LEGRAND, D., GUILLAUME, F., WHEAT, C.W., FRONHOFER, E.A., GARCIA, C., HENRY, R., HUSBY, A., BAGUETTE, M., BONTE, D., COULON, A., KOKKO, H., MATTHYSEN, E., ET AL. (2018) Genetics of dispersal. *Biological Reviews*.

- SHAW, A.K. & KOKKO, H. (2014) Mate finding, Allee effects and selection for sex-biased dispersal. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **83**, 1256–1267.
- STARRFELT, J. & KOKKO, H. (2010) Parent-offspring conflict and the evolution of dispersal distance. *The American Naturalist* **175**, 38–49.
- STARRFELT, J. & KOKKO, H. (2012a) The theory of dispersal under multiple influences. *Dispersal ecology and evolution*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- STARRFELT, J. & KOKKO, H. (2012b) Bet-hedging -- a triple trade-off between means, variances and correlations. *Biological Reviews* **87**, 742–755.
- SUZUKI, Y. (1978) Adult longevity and reproductive potential of the small cabbage white, *Pieris rapae crucivora* Boisduval (Lepidoptera: Pieridae). *Applied Entomology and Zoology* **13**, 312–313.
- TAYLOR, M.I., MORLEY, J.I., RICO, C. & BALSHINE, S. (2003) Evidence for genetic monogamy and female-biased dispersal in the biparental mouthbrooding cichlid *Eretmodus cyanostictus* from Lake Tanganyika. *Molecular Ecology* **12**, 3173–3177.
- TAYLOR, P.D. (1988) An inclusive fitness model for dispersal of offspring. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **130**, 363–378.
- TRIVERS, R.L. (1974) Parent-offspring conflict. *American Zoologist* **14**, 249–264.
- TROCHET, A., COURTOIS, E.A., STEVENS, V.M., BAGUETTE, M., CHAINE, A., SCHMELLER, D.S., CLOBERT, J., IRSCHICK, D.J. & WIENS, J.J. (2016) Evolution of Sex-Biased Dispersal. *The Quarterly Review of Biology* **91**, 297–320.
- UJVARI, B., DOWTON, M. & MADSEN, T. (2008) Population genetic structure, gene flow and sex-biased dispersal in frillneck lizards (*Chlamydosaurus kingii*). *Molecular Ecology* **17**, 3557–3564.
- WAHLBERG, N., SNÄLL, N., VIIDALEPP, J., RUOHOMÄKI, K. & TAMMARU, T. (2010) The evolution of female flightlessness among Ennominae of the Holarctic forest zone (Lepidoptera, Geometridae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* **55**, 929–938.
- WASER, P.M., AUSTAD, S.N. & KEANE, B. (1986) When should animals tolerate inbreeding? *The American Naturalist* **128**, 529–537.
- WERREN, J.H. (1980) Sex ratio adaptations to local mate competition in a parasitic wasp. *Science* **208**, 1157–1159.
- WILD, G., GREENWOOD-LEE, J. & TAYLOR, P.D. (2006) Sex allocation and dispersal in a heterogeneous two-patch environment. *Theoretical Population Biology* **70**, 225–235.

- WILD, G. & TAYLOR, P.D. (2004) Kin selection models for the co-evolution of the sex ratio and sex-specific dispersal. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* **6**, 481–502.
- ZHANG, L., QU, J., LI, K., LI, W., YANG, M. & ZHANG, Y. (2017) Genetic diversity and sex-bias dispersal of plateau pika in Tibetan plateau. *Ecology and Evolution* **7**, 7708–7718.