2019

Drivers of sociality in *Gobiodon* fishes: An assessment of phylogeny, ecology and life-history

Martin Hing

University of Wollongong, mlh913@uowmail.edu.au

Oya S. Klanten

University of Technology Sydney, oklanten@uow.edu.au

Marian Y. L. Wong

University of Wollongong, marianw@uow.edu.au

Mark P. Dowton

University of Wollongong, mdowton@uow.edu.au

Publication Details

Hing, M. L., Klanten, O. Selma., Wong, M. Y.L. & Dowton, M. (2019). Drivers of sociality in *Gobiodon* fishes: An assessment of phylogeny, ecology and life-history. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 137 263-273.

Drivers of sociality in *Gobiodon* fishes: An assessment of phylogeny, ecology and life-history

Abstract

What drives the evolution of sociality in animals? Many robust studies in terrestrial organisms have pointed toward various kinship-based, ecological and life-history traits or phylogenetic constraint which have played a role in the evolution of sociality. These traits are not mutually exclusive and the exact combination of traits is likely taxon-specific. Phylogenetic comparative analyses have been instrumental in identifying social lineages and comparing various traits with non-social lineages to give broad evolutionary perspectives on the development of sociality. Few studies have attempted this approach in marine vertebrate systems. Social marine fishes are particularly interesting because many have a pelagic larval phase and non-conventional life-history strategies (e.g. bi-directional sex-change) not often observed in terrestrial animals. Such strategies provide novel insights into terrestrially-derived theories of social evolution. Here, we assess the strength of the phylogenetic signal of sociality in the *Gobiodon* genus with Pagel's lambda and Blomberg's K parameters. We found some evidence of a phylogenetic signal of sociality, but factors other than phylogenetic constraint also have a strong influence on the extant social state of each species. We then use phylogenetic generalized least squares analyses to examine several ecological and life-history traits that may have influenced the evolution of sociality in the genus. We found an interaction of habitat size and fish length was the strongest predictor of sociality. Sociality in larger species was more dependent on coral size than in smaller species, but smaller species were more social overall, regardless of coral size. Finally, we comment on findings regarding the validity of the species *G. spilophthalmus* which arose during the course of our research. These findings in a group of marine fishes add a unique perspective on the evolution of sociality to the excellent terrestrial work conducted in this field.

Publication Details

Hing, M. L., Klanten, O. Selma., Wong, M. Y.L. & Dowton, M. (2019). Drivers of sociality in *Gobiodon* fishes: An assessment of phylogeny, ecology and life-history. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 137 263-273.

Drivers of sociality in *Gobiodon* fishes: An assessment of phylogeny, ecology and life-history

Martin L. Hing^a, O. Selma Klanten^b, Marian Y.L. Wong^a, Mark Downton^c

^a Centre for Sustainable Ecosystems Solutions, School of Earth, Atmospheric and Life Sciences, University of Wollongong, Australia

^b Fish Ecology Laboratory, School of Life Sciences, University of Technology Sydney, Australia

^c Molecular Horizons, School of Chemistry and Molecular Bioscience, University of Wollongong, Australia

* Corresponding author

E-mail: martinhing@gmail.com (MH)

Highlights

- A phylogeny for the genus *Gobiodon* was inferred from seven molecular markers and resolved several previously unresolved nodes
- There is some evidence for a phylogenetic signal of sociality in the genus *Gobiodon*
- A combination of ecological and life-history factors best predicts sociality in the genus *Gobiodon*
- Phylogenetic analysis reveals potential issues surrounding the identification and validity of *Gobiodon spilophthalmus*

Abstract

What drives the evolution of sociality in animals? Many robust studies in terrestrial organisms have pointed toward various kinship-based, ecological and life-history traits or phylogenetic constraint which have played a role in the evolution of sociality. These traits are not mutually exclusive and the exact combination of traits is likely taxon-specific. Phylogenetic comparative analyses have been instrumental in identifying social lineages and comparing various traits with non-social lineages to give broad evolutionary perspectives on the development of sociality. Few studies have attempted

this approach in marine vertebrate systems. Social marine fishes are particularly interesting because many have a pelagic larval phase and non-conventional life-history strategies (e.g. bi-directional sex-change) not often observed in terrestrial animals. Such strategies provide novel insights into terrestrially-derived theories of social evolution. Here, we assess the strength of the phylogenetic signal of sociality in the *Gobiodon* genus with Pagel's lambda and Blomberg's *K* parameters. We found some evidence of a phylogenetic signal of sociality, but factors other than phylogenetic constraint also have a strong influence on the extant social state of each species. We then use phylogenetic generalized least squares analyses to examine several ecological and life-history traits that may have influenced the evolution of sociality in the genus. We found an interaction of habitat size and fish length was the strongest predictor of sociality. Sociality in larger species was more dependent on coral size than in smaller species, but smaller species were more social overall, regardless of coral size. Finally, we comment on findings regarding the validity of the species *G. spilophthalmus* which arose during the course of our research. These findings in a group of marine fishes add a unique perspective on the evolution of sociality to the excellent terrestrial work conducted in this field.

Keywords

Gobiodon; Sociality; Phylogeny; Ecological factors; Life-history factors; *Gobiodon spilophthalmus* c.f.

1. Introduction

The question of how sociality first arose in animals has attracted much attention in the fields of evolutionary ecology and animal behaviour. Many mechanisms are thought to contribute to the evolution of sociality including ecological factors, life-history traits and phylogeny (Arnold and Owens, 1998; Emlen, 1982; Hamilton, 1964; Hatchwell and Komdeur, 2000; reviewed in Hing et al., 2017; Kokko and Ekman, 2002). These features are not mutually exclusive and may be highly dependent on each other (Arnold and Owens, 1998; Chapple, 2003). Hamilton's rule predicts that sociality should evolve under certain combinations of relatedness and costs and benefits of social actions and is widely regarded as a universal framework to study social evolution (Bourke, 2014; Hamilton, 1964). Ecology, life-history and relatedness change the costs and benefits conferred to individuals within the group. Under this framework, individuals should receive greater inclusive fitness benefits if they form social groups with close relatives (Briga et al., 2012; Hughes et al., 2008). Groups consisting of unrelated individuals are also possible if ecological or life-history factors alter the direct costs and benefits of group living such that the benefits outweigh the costs (e.g. Buston et al., 2007; Riehl, 2011). Phylogenetic relationships among taxa can constrain the evolution of sociality which may predispose species to sociality (e.g. Agnarsson, 2002; Nowicki et al., 2018; Schneider and Kappeler, 2014; Smorkatcheva and Lukhtanov, 2014). However, the extant state of sociality may depend on various ecological and life-history conditions (Chapple, 2003; Rubenstein and Lovette, 2007; Schürch et al., 2016). For example, altered environmental conditions and extreme weather events could reduce habitat sizes for a normally social species, increasing animal density and increasing conflict within the group ultimately leading to a reduction in sociality (Hing et al., 2018). On the other hand, some species in which sociality has a strong phylogenetic signal (that is, sociality is highly constrained), may maintain their sociality regardless of other factors (Kruckenhauser et al., 1999; Nowicki et al., 2018; Shultz et al.,

2011). In either case, understanding the strength of the relationship between phylogeny and sociality can help us to understand what role phylogeny played in the evolution of sociality. The majority of studies of sociality have been conducted on birds, mammals and invertebrates wherein subordinates are usually related to dominants and display natal philopatry (Bourke, 2011; Hing et al., 2017; Jennions and Macdonald, 1994; Jetz and Rubenstein, 2011; Rubenstein and Abbot, 2017). Habitat specialist fishes on the other hand provide a unique opportunity to study social evolution as they often reside in groups with low relatedness due to a pelagic larval phase (contrary to most terrestrial species; Avise and Shapiro, 1986; Buston et al., 2007; but see Buston et al., 2009). In particular, coral gobies of the genus *Gobiodon* are ideal for testing hypotheses about sociality as they display a wide variety of social phenotypes (Thompson et al., 2007; Wong et al., 2007), are easily observed because they occupy discrete habitat patches (Wong and Buston, 2013) and their phylogenetic relationships are reasonably well established (Duchene et al., 2013; Hing et al., 2017).

Several previous studies have examined phylogenetic relationships among species of *Gobiodon* (Agorreta et al., 2013; Duchene et al., 2013; Harold et al., 2008; Herler et al., 2009; Thacker and Roje, 2011). However, these studies have focused on relationships within the genus or more broadly at the family level (Gobiidae). To date, no studies have investigated the phylogenetic patterns of sociality in this genus. Duchene et al. (2013) examined the coevolution of *Gobiodon* species with their host corals and provides the most recent and comprehensive phylogeny of the *Gobiodon* genus. Likewise, there have been a number of studies investigating the causes and consequences of sociality in coral gobies (*Gobiodon* and *Paragobiodon*), but these studies have often focussed on a single species or a subset of species within the genus (Hing et al., 2018; Hobbs and Munday, 2004; Hobbs et al., 2004; Munday et al., 2006; Thompson et al., 2007; Wong, 2010, 2011; Wong et al., 2007). Furthermore, no studies so far have examined the relationship between sociality and ecological and life history traits across the genus *Gobiodon* while controlling for phylogeny, and hence tested key hypotheses of social evolution.

In this study we resolved the phylogenetic relationships within the genus *Gobiodon* at Lizard Island (Great Barrier Reef, Queensland, Australia) using seven molecular markers. Our reconstruction builds on the inferred phylogeny of Duchene et al. (2013) by increasing the number of molecular markers used, thereby inferring a phylogenetic tree with greater confidence. We then assessed the phylogenetic signal of sociality in the genus. Given previous work on *Gobiodon* demonstrated plasticity in social organization in response to extreme weather events (Hing et al., 2018), we expected to find a relatively weak phylogenetic signal of sociality. However, we did not know *a priori* what the strength of the signal would be and hence the extent to which shared evolutionary history of species would contribute to present day patterns of sociality. We therefore tested a range of ecological and life-history characteristics with phylogenetic structure in the models to assess the role these factors might have played in the evolution of sociality in *Gobiodon*.

Previous studies have shown significant relationships between group size and the factors of habitat size and body size in closely related species of coral gobies and more broadly in other species of habitat specialist fish (*Amphiprion percula*, Buston, 2003; *Paragobiodon*, *Gobiodon* and *Eviota*, Thompson et al., 2007; *Paragobiodon xanthosoma*, Wong, 2011). Most of the species in these previous studies form size based social hierarchies and habitat size and body size have been shown to predict group size in these species. A similar relationship has also been demonstrated between sociality and ecological generalism in snapping shrimp (Brooks et al., 2017). Coral gobies are generally considered to be highly specialized in their choice of corals (Munday et al., 1997). However, we observed considerable variation in coral choice for some species, especially after extreme weather events (Hing et al., 2018). We also observed some variation in social structure and therefore aimed to investigate whether a relationship existed between sociality and host generalization. Hence, we specifically focused on two ecological variables: i) host-coral size and ii) host coral generalization (the ability to inhabit a broad range of host coral species), and one life-history variable iii) body size, and assessed their relationship with sociality.

Finally, we present findings on *Gobiodon spilophthalmus* concerning its phylogenetic placement, which arose during our analyses. This is the first study to assess the phylogenetic basis and ecological and life history correlates of sociality in *Gobiodon* and therefore provides an important starting point for understanding the evolution of sociality in marine fishes.

2. Methods

2.1. Ethics approvals and research permits

All research activities for this study were conducted with the approval of the University of Wollongong Animal Ethics Committee (AE14-04, AE14-29). We conducted our research in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park under permits G13/36197.1 and G15/37533.1.

2.2. Field Sampling

Tissue samples of fifteen species of *Gobiodon* were collected from 23 sites around Lizard Island between February - March 2014 and January – February 2016 (Table 1, Fig 1). However, *G. spilophthalmus* was removed from the analyses as barcoding analysis of the CO1 gene demonstrated the individuals collected were likely juvenile specimens of *G. acicularis* and *G. ceramensis* (Section 3.4). We searched all species of *Acropora*, *Stylophora*, *Seratopora* and *Echinopora* known to host *Gobiodon* fishes along 30 m transects in the study area (Munday et al., 1999). Transects were placed haphazardly at each site and only used as a reference to aid in the relocation of tagged corals (i.e. transects were not used for any kind of spatial analysis). In total, 21 species of coral were recorded.

90

91 **Fig 1.** Map of study sites at Lizard Island, Australia. Dotted lines indicate reef structure. Site names are in

92 regular font. Numbered sites are: Big Vickey's Reef (1); Vickey's Reef (2); Horse Shoe Reef (3); Palfrey

Reef (4 – 4a); Loomis Reef (5); Trawler (6); Picnic Beach (7); Ghost Beach (8); Bird Island Reef (9); Entrance Bommie (10); Bird Bommie (11); Lizard Head Reef (12).

Corals were searched by divers with the aid of an underwater light for the presence of gobies. Corals hosting gobies were identified to species and measured along three axes (length, width and height: Hing et al., 2018). Gobies were removed from the corals by anaesthetising them with a clove oil solution and creating a current by hand (Munday and Wilson, 1997). The species and number (group size) of captured fish was recorded and brought to a boat for processing. On the boat, fish were placed into a large container of regularly refreshed seawater to maintain constant temperature and aeration. Each fish was anaesthetised and measured to the nearest 0.01 cm with vernier callipers and a small caudal fin clip (~1-2 mm) of each individual was preserved in ethanol. After processing, fish were released back to their original coral of capture.

2.3. Ecological and life-history factors

Coral size was calculated as the simple average diameter, $(L + W + H)/3$ as it provides a good representation of the major axis of the coral (Kuwamura et al., 1994). Ecological generalisation was assessed as the number of host-coral species each goby species was observed to occupy. We added observations from three subsequent field trips between August 2014 and February 2016 for the ecological generalisation analyses as two cyclones impacted the study site over this period (Hing et al., 2018). We reasoned that these impacts had the potential to alter normal patterns of residency and species adhering to a 'specialist' strategy would possibly broaden their host-species range under extreme circumstances. We therefore wished to capture any variation these disturbances caused for this analysis.

Body size was chosen as a life-history trait of interest for this study. We measured the standard length (tip of the snout to caudal peduncle) of each individual. Standard length was used rather than total length as many individuals had sustained damage to the caudal fin and an accurate measure of total length could not be obtained.

2.4. *Sociality index*

We used a sociality index proposed by Avilés and Harwood (2012). The index is an average for each species, of the proportion of groups in the study population, proportion of subordinates in the study population and proportion of the life-cycle spent in a group. The proportion of the life-cycle spent in a group may be an important indicator of delayed dispersal in some species. However, coral gobies undergo a pelagic larval phase prior to joining a group where they typically remain in a social queue to obtain breeding status (i.e. they do not delay dispersal, but do tend to remain in a group once settled). Therefore, we assumed the proportion of the life-cycle spent in the group was 1 for all species and the main variation in sociality in coral gobies was caused by the remaining two components of the sociality index. The proportion of groups in the study population is indicative of a species' tendency to form groups, while the proportion of subordinates in the study population (associated with the proportion of groups) is an indication of behaviour in terms of the subordinate's willingness to join a group and the dominant member's willingness to tolerate them. The social index ranges from 0 to 1. Raw index values were used in the Generalized Least Squares analyses (Section 2.9).

Table 1.

Goby species observed at Lizard Island with number of tissue samples obtained. Number of host-coral species was used as a measure of host-generalization. Mean standard length (SL) and host-coral size (CS) were calculated for each species.

Goby spp	Tissue Samples (n)	Coral species inhabited (n)	Mean SL (cm)	Mean CS (cm)
<i>G. acicularis</i>	3	1	1.91	55.20
<i>G. aoyagii</i> [†]	3	2	2.49	26.41
<i>G. axillaris</i>	3	4	3.09	23.76
<i>G. brochus</i>	4	9	2.54	16.50
<i>G. ceramensis</i>	6	2	2.69	27.23
<i>G. citrinus</i>	3	3	2.79	91.49
<i>G. erythrospilus</i>	3	11	2.60	23.31
<i>G. fuscoruber</i> ^{††}	4	10	2.75	29.95
<i>G. histrio</i>	3	10	2.80	23.22
<i>G. oculolineatus</i>	3	9	2.44	23.86
<i>G. okinawae</i>	3	11	2.12	43.95
<i>G. quinquestrigatus</i>	6	11	2.49	21.33
<i>G. rivulatus</i>	3	8	1.65	21.70
<i>G. spilophthalmus c.f.</i> [‡]	6	-	-	-
<i>G. species D</i>	3	1	2.84	27.33
<i>P. xanthosoma</i>	1	1	1.72	26.53

[†] *G. aoyagii* was previously referred to as *G. species A* as a placeholder but has now been formally described by Shibukawa et al. (2013).

^{††} *G. unicolor* (sensu Munday et al., 1999) was reassigned as *G. fuscoruber* by Herler et al. (2013).

[‡] Measurements of ecological and life-history factors were not obtained for *G. spilophthalmus c.f.* as they were determined to be juveniles of other species and excluded from analyses.

2.5. DNA extraction, amplification and sequencing

DNA was extracted from fin clips for two to three individuals of each species of *Gobiodon* and one individual *Paragobiodon xanthosoma* which was used as an outgroup to the *Gobiodon* genus (Table 1). We used a standard Proteinase-K salting out procedure to extract DNA (Aljanabi and Martinez, 1997). DNA was resuspended in 20-50 µl of TE solution (1 mM Tris-HCl, 0.1 mM ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid [pH 8]) and stored at 4 °C. We amplified nuclear recombination activating gene 1 (RAG1), nuclear zinc finger protein of the cerebellum 1 (ZIC1) and the mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase subunit 1 (CO1) gene using generic fish primers for each gene (primer sequences available in Supplementary Table S1; Holcroft, 2005; Li et al., 2007; Ward et al., 2005 respectively). Where weak amplification occurred, goby specific primers were designed using an alignment of the appropriate gene region made up of sequences obtained from species which showed strong amplification (Supplementary Table S1). Polymerase Chain Reactions (PCRs) were performed using MyTAQ Polymerase (Bioline, Australia) in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. The PCR conditions consisted of 2 minutes at 95 °C, 35 cycles of 1 minute at 94 °C, 1 minute at 45 - 65 °C (optimised for each gene and species), 1 minute at 72 °C and a final elongation of 5 minutes at 72 °C. PCR products were checked for length and strength of amplification using 1% agarose gel electrophoresis. ExoSAP-IT (GE Healthcare, Bucks, UK) was used to treat each PCR product prior to sequencing using the ABIPRISM BigDye Terminator v3.1 Cycle Sequencing Kit (Applied Biosystems, Australia). Each PCR product was sequenced in both the forward and reverse direction.

2.6. Sequence Alignment

Alignment of RAG1, ZIC1 and CO1 genes was trivial, because there were no internal indels in the alignment – both ClustalW and MUSCLE (within MEGA7; Kumar et al., 2016) produced alignments with only leading and trailing gaps, where the length of reliable sequence was slightly different. The default settings for both ClustalW and MUSCLE were used.

Once COI, RAG1 and ZIC1 sequences had been obtained for 2 to 3 individuals of each species, consensus sequences were established using Bioedit (Hall, 1999). We then constructed additional consensus sequences for 12S and 16S rRNA genes (obtained from GenBank, accession numbers available in Supplementary Table S2) for the species in our study and obtained further consensus sequences for the nuclear ribosomal protein S7 Intron 1 chromosome 2 (S7I1) gene and mitochondrial cytochrome *b* (cytb) from GenBank (Supplementary Table S2; Duchene et al., 2013; Harold et al., 2008; Herler et al., 2009). All seven genes (RAG1, ZIC1, S7I1, COI, cytochrome *b*, 12S and 16S) were concatenated for each species.

2.7. *Phylogenetic analysis*

Partitioning schemes and nucleotide substitution models were established with PartitionFinder version 1.1.1 (Lanfear et al., 2012) using the corrected Akaike Information Criterion (AICc) and a heuristic search algorithm with branch lengths unlinked. We performed the analysis on 7 datablocks, one for each gene. Priors for the branching process and times were set as follows: the tree prior was a Yule model, the birth rate had a uniform prior, as did the clock rates for each of the gene partitions. A strict clock was set for each partition, but the clock rate was unlinked between partitions. Phylogenetic trees were then inferred from Bayesian analysis conducted on BEAST2 v2.4.2 (Bouckaert et al., 2014; Drummond et al., 2012) in which unlinked partitions and a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) process with a chain length of 100 million was specified. No calibration information was used as we only wished to examine relative estimates of branching times. Separate BEAST analyses were also conducted on the concatenated mitochondrial data (since the mitochondrial genes represent a single, linked locus), and each nuclear gene fragment. These trees are reported in the supplementary material. The trees recovered from the individual nuclear gene analyses were generally poorly resolved, with many nodes having low posterior probability support. This is not surprising given the relatively small size of these datasets. The mitochondrial tree was well resolved (with high posterior probability support), but differed in the

189 placement of one clade (i.e. Fig 3, clade B) when compared with the ‘full data’ set. We focus here on the
190 ‘full data’ set, because it is larger and contains information from multiple (mitochondrial and nuclear)
191 sources.

192 Stationarity was assessed with Tracer v1.6 (Rambaut et al., 2018). In initial BEAST analyses, stationarity
193 was not reached after 100 million generations (expected sample sizes (ESS) values generally less than
194 200), primarily because some parameter values were very close to zero. However, when the nucleotide
195 substitution model for 6 of the 7 gene partitions was simplified (from GTR to HKY; in one of the gene
196 partitions, PartitionFinder suggested JC69, and this was kept as JC69), stationarity was reached after 100
197 million generations, with all EES values greater than 200. A maximum likelihood analysis was also
198 conducted using “Randomized Axelerated Maximum Likelihood” (RAxML) version 8 (Stamatakis, 2014).
199 The Gamma model of rate heterogeneity was used with branch lengths optimized per gene and the
200 proportion of invariable sites estimated. A maximum likelihood search was then applied to find the best
201 scoring tree.

202 2.8. *Phylogenetic signal*

203 Phylogenetic signal of sociality was calculated in R using the `phylosig()` function of the `phytools` package
204 (Revell, 2012). We used the social index for each species and the Bayesian summary tree for the
205 analyses. We calculated both Pagel’s lambda (Pagel, 1999) and Blomberg’s K (Blomberg et al., 2003)
206 statistics and produced tests against a null hypothesis of no phylogenetic signal using a likelihood ratio
207 test and randomization test respectively.

208 2.9. *Phylogenetic Generalized Least Squares models*

209 Phylogenetic Generalized Least Squares was used to assess relationships between sociality and
210 ecological and life-history traits while taking into account phylogenetic non-independence between
211 species. Sociality index was the dependent variable and the ecological and life-history traits were

included as main and interacting effects. We used a summary of the Bayesian inferred phylogenetic tree for this analysis. All pGLS analyses were conducted using the nlme package in R (Pinheiro et al., 2018). Four models of trait evolution (Brownian motion, Pagel's Lambda, Blomberg AICDC and Ornstein-Uhlenbeck) available in the ape package (Paradis et al., 2004) were applied to each of the relationships. As we had no *a priori* expectations of the type of selection sociality might be under, we chose the best model to present by comparing Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC). An analysis of deviance was conducted using the Car package (Fox and Weisberg, 2011) on the best model to identify factors that significantly deviated from the null model.

2.10. *Gobiodon spilophthalmus*

Gobiodon spilophthalmus was first described by Fowler (1944). However this description was based upon a single preserved specimen. We therefore based our identification on Munday et al. (1999) who provide a live specimen photo and describe *G. spilophthalmus* as uniform black in colour and only distinguishable from *G. ceramensis* (also uniform black as adults) in the juvenile phase. The juveniles of *G. spilophthalmus* are white with black stripes along the body and black spots on the head (Fig 2 (i)). We collected specimens morphologically similar to those depicted in Munday et al. (1999) as *G. spilophthalmus*. During collection, we noted a small *G. ceramensis* changed colour upon capture from uniform black to the black and white stripes and spots similar to that described for juvenile *G. spilophthalmus*. This was observed again in 2019 by colleagues at One Tree Island, Australia (Froehlich pers. comm.; Fig 2 (v)). These observations prompted a closer examination of our *G. spilophthalmus c.f.* specimens. *G. spilophthalmus c.f.* specimens were found on the coral species *Seriatopora hystrix* and *Echionopora horrida* which are also inhabited (almost exclusively) by *G. ceramensis* and *G. acicularis* respectively (Fig 2 (iii, iv) photos). Other *G. spilophthalmus c.f.* specimens were sometimes observed associating with groups of *G. ceramensis* or *G. acicularis*. To investigate this further, we sequenced the

235 barcoding region (COI) of individuals resembling *G. spilophthalmus* from independent colonies of *S.*
236 *hystrix* and *E. horrida*, and compared them with individuals of *G. ceramensis* and *G. acicularis*. First, we
237 conducted an Automatic Barcode Gap Discovery (ABGD) analysis which groups COI sequences into
238 hypothetical species based on automatic detection of the 'barcode gap', the natural break in sequence
239 divergence that occurs when within-species divergence is compared to between-species sequence
240 divergence (Puillandre et al., 2012). We used the default settings and Kimura 2-P (K80) distances. We
241 then conducted a Bayesian phylogenetic analysis of the COI gene of *G. acicularis*, *G. ceramensis* and *G.*
242 *spilophthalmus* c.f. using BEAST2. In this analysis we coded each individual with the species of coral it
243 was collected from. We used the same methods described above (sections 2.6 and 2.7) for sequence
244 alignment and Bayesian analysis to infer a gene tree for this species group using *G. okinawae* as an
245 outgroup. Furthermore, *Gobiodon heterospilos* is described as similar in appearance to *G.*
246 *spilophthalmus* but lacking the black body stripes (presumably in the juvenile phase; Munday et al.,
247 1999). Steinke et al. (2017) deposited three COI sequences on the BOLD database for *G. heterospilos*
248 from Lizard Island, however the photo attached to the only juvenile in their collection (BOLD record
249 LIFS847-08) clearly possesses black body stipes. We therefore conducted a second Bayesian
250 phylogenetic analysis using the same methods described above (sections 2.6 and 2.7) of our specimens
251 of *G. acicularis*, *G. ceramensis*, *G. spilophthalmus* c.f. and the *G. heterospilos* sequences deposited by
252 Steinke et al. (2017) in order to determine if *G. heterospilos* c.f. could be differentiated from species
253 identified in our collection.

(i)

© Roger Steene

(ii)

Steinke et al. (2017)

(iii)

(iv)

(v)

Catheline Froehlich

Fig 2. *Gobiodon spilophthalmus* as depicted by Munday et al. (1999) (i) and *G. heterospilos* sample deposited by Steinke et al. (2017) on the BOLD database, record LIFS847-08 (ii). Specimens from our collection matching descriptions of juvenile *G. spilophthalmus* collected in 2014 from *Seriatopora hystrix* (ii) and *Echinopora horrida* (iv). A small *G. ceramensis* transitioning from the suspected juvenile spots and stripes pattern to the uniform black adult phase (v).

3. Results

Our results suggest a combination of ecological and life-history factors contributed to the evolution of sociality in the *Gobiodon* genus, but sociality by itself also has some evidence of a phylogenetic signal. Phylogenetic analyses by two methods inferred identical species composition of four clades giving high confidence in the phylogenetic tree used for pGLS analyses. Phylogenetic generalized least squares analyses then demonstrated coral size and mean body size of the species likely have a strong influence on the extant social state of a species (Section 3.3).

3.1. Phylogenetic inference

Both analyses; Bayesian and maximum likelihood, produced four clades (A-D; Fig 3) containing exactly the same *Gobiodon* species within each clade. The main difference between both analyses was the Bayesian tree inferred 2 main sister groups (A/B and C/D sister clades) with strong support (posterior probability 1.00) while the maximum likelihood tree was unresolved at the base of each sister clade (bootstrap support <50). However it still produced the same 4 clades with the same configuration. The two main sister groups inferred with the Bayesian tree each in turn formed two sister clades: clade A and B with moderate support (posterior probability 0.79) and the sister clades of C and D with strong support (posterior probability 0.99). Clade A resolved *G. acicularis* and *G. ceramensis* as sister species

277 (posterior probability 1.00), and contained two other species, *G. okinawae* (posterior probability 1.00)
 278 and *G. citrinus* (posterior probability 1.00) (Fig 3). The species *G. oculolineatus*, *G. quinquestrigatus*, *G.*
 279 *species D* and *G. rivulatus* made up clade B with *G. quinquestrigatus* and *G. species D* as sister taxa
 280 (posterior probability 1.00) (Fig 3). Clade C contained a single sister species group made up of *G. aoyagii*
 281 and *G. brochus* (posterior probability 0.99) (Fig 3). Clade D contained two sister species groups, the first
 282 consisting of *G. histrio* and *G. erythrospilus* (posterior probability 1.00) and the second consisting of *G.*
 283 *fuscoruber* and *G. axillaris* (posterior probability 1.00) (Fig 3).

284
 285 **Fig 3.** Phylogeny of *Gobiodon* present at Lizard Island based on 7 molecular markers (4 mtDNA; COI,
 286 cytb, 12S, 16S and 3 nuclear DNA; RAG1, ZIC1, S7I1) produced with Bayesian (i) and maximum likelihood

(ii) methods. Node values in (i) are posterior probability where * indicates a value of 1. Node values in (ii) are bootstrap percentages where * indicates a value of 100.

In the maximum likelihood analysis, the node giving rise to the A/B/C group could not be resolved with any certainty (bootstrap support <50). However the configuration of the species within each clade was identical to the Bayesian analysis and resolved with moderate to strong bootstrap support (75 – 100). The strong support for the nodes within each clade in both analyses signifies reasonable confidence in the species composition of each clade. The Bayesian analysis produced a tree with very high posterior probabilities (with the exception of the node relating clades A and B). We therefore based all further analyses on the Bayesian analysis.

3.2. *Phylogenetic signal*

There was some evidence of a phylogenetic signal of sociality in the *Gobiodon* genus. We found little evidence of a phylogenetic signal of sociality in the genus using Pagel's lambda ($\lambda = 0.614$, $P = 0.349$). However, Blomberg's K displayed some evidence of a phylogenetic signal of sociality ($K = 0.802$, $P = 0.035$). Although the value of K represents a relatively low signal, the significant test result indicates it was stronger than expected under a random distribution of the trait (sociality).

3.3. *Phylogenetic generalized least squares*

There was a significant interaction between coral size and mean fish length in the pGLS model predicting sociality (analysis of deviance, $df = 1$, $\chi^2 = 4.845$, $\lambda = 1.043$, $P = 0.028$). The model predicted coral size would have little impact on sociality for smaller species, but smaller species would generally be more social (social index approximately 0.75, Fig. 4). On the other hand, sociality in larger species was much more dependent on host-coral size (Fig 4). In other words, smaller species overall are predicted to be

more social than larger species regardless of the size of coral they inhabit, whereas larger species are predicted to exhibit sociality only when corals are large.

Fig 4. Model predictions for the interacting effects of host-coral size and fish length on sociality index. Raw data are pair-forming species (circles) and group-forming species (triangles). Modelled species sizes, indicated by different line types (figure legend), range from 1.5 cm (solid) to 3.5 cm (dotted).

There were no significant interactions between coral size and host generalization or mean fish-length and host generalization on sociality in the respective models ($df = 1$, $\chi^2 = 0.781$, $\lambda = 1.073$, $P = 0.377$; $df = 1$, $\chi^2 = 0.024$, $\lambda = 1.073$, $P = 0.878$ respectively, Fig 5). This means there was no significant difference in the relationship between sociality and host-coral size between species that adhere to either specialist or generalist host strategies. Likewise, there was no significant difference in the relationship between sociality and fish-length between host-specialist and -generalist species. The main effect of host

322 generalization alone was also non-significant ($df = 1$, $\chi^2 = 0.063$, $P = 0.803$) indicating that the ability to
323 occupy a greater host-range is not likely to facilitate sociality in these species.

Fig 5. Interacting effects of mean coral size and host-generalization (a) and mean fish length and host-generalization (b) on sociality. Lines in a) are different average coral sizes from 10 cm (solid line) to 75 cm (dotted line). Lines in b) are different mean fish length from 1.5 cm (solid line) to 3.5 cm (dotted line). Both (a) and (b) raw data are individual species conforming to group-forming (triangles) or pair-forming (circles) strategies.

While the detection of a phylogenetic signal of sociality was somewhat unconvincing in the test of Pagel's Lambda and Blomberg's K (Section 3.2), the pGLS analyses showed a strong indication of phylogenetic signal ($\lambda > 1$). Taken together these results indicate there is some phylogenetic signal of sociality, but other effects (such as ecology and life-history) are probably equally, if not more important in determining the extant social state of a species.

3.4. *Gobiodon spilophthalmus*

Our analyses revealed the *G. spilophthalmus* c.f. specimens were likely juveniles of *G. acicularis* or *G. ceramensis* depending on which coral species they were collected from. The ABGD analysis revealed two distinct species groups, with the *G. spilophthalmus* c.f. specimens collected from *S. hystrix* grouping with *G. ceramensis* and those collected from *E. horrida* grouping with *G. acicularis*. This pattern was also supported in the Bayesian analysis of these COI sequences (Fig 6). This phylogeny showed *G. spilophthalmus* c.f. grouping with both *G. ceramensis* and *G. acicularis*, depending on their respective host corals. *Gobiodon ceramensis* did split into two groups in this analysis, but HKY distances ranged from 0.2% to 0.7% indicating extremely low divergence in the COI sequences, a strong indication they should be considered a single species. When we included the *G. heterospilos* sequences deposited by Steinke et al. (2017) into a Bayesian phylogenetic analysis with our *G. spilophthalmus* c.f., *G. ceramensis* and *G. acicularis* specimens, the *G. heterospilos* samples were placed in the same groups as *G.*

348 *spilophthalmus* c.f. (collected from *S. hystrix*) and *G. ceramensis* (posterior probability 0.999). We
 349 therefore suspect Steinke et al. (2017) understandably misidentified these specimens in their study and
 350 we did not include them in further analyses. These analyses indicate the specimens we collected, which
 351 were morphologically similar to *G. spilophthalmus*, were most likely juveniles of either *G. ceramensis* or
 352 *G. acicularis* and could be reliably differentiated by the species of coral they were collected from. We
 353 therefore did not include *G. spilophthalmus* in our broader phylogenetic analyses.

354
 355 **Fig 6:** Phylogenetic tree produced with Bayesian analysis showing *G. acicularis* grouping with specimens
 356 resembling *G. spilophthalmus*, and the two groups of *G. ceramensis* also recovered with specimens
 357 resembling *G. spilophthalmus*. Node values are posterior probabilities. Values for internal nodes of each
 358 species group are not displayed as the placement of individuals within each group is irrelevant. Species

names are abbreviated to acic (*G. acicularis*), spil (*G. spilophthalmus c.f.*), cera (*G. ceramensis*) and the outgroup, oki (*G. okinawae*). Letters immediately following each species abbreviation indicates the coral species the specimen was collected from; *Echinopora horrida* (E), *Seriatopora hystrix* (h) and *Stylophora pistillata* (p). The last three characters are an individual identifier. The outgroup was a consensus sequence (cons) of the COI gene.

4. Discussion

Our analyses provide evidence of some phylogenetic signal of sociality in the coral-gobies, *Gobiodon*. In contrast to several other vertebrate groups which display strong phylogenetic signals of sociality, our findings suggest factors such as ecology, life-history or both, likely have a stronger impact on which species display sociality at any given time (Kruckenhauser et al., 1999; Nowicki et al., 2018; Shultz et al., 2011). In support of this, Hing et al. (2018) showed the mean group size of social species of *Gobiodon* displayed plastic responses following multiple major ecological disturbances, suggesting sociality may be quite flexible in *Gobiodon* species rather than phylogenetically constrained.

While Hing et al. (2018) did not delve into any species-specific trends, it is possible the observed social plasticity was driven by a few key species (e.g. *G. acicularis*, *G. erythrospilus*, *G. fuscoruber*, *G. histrio* and *G. okinawae*). These particular species have social indices close to 0.5 (the value exactly half-way between theoretically perfect sociality and completely solitary) because there was a relatively even proportion of groups and pairs in the study population (Hing et al., 2018). This indicates a certain level of social plasticity in these species – when conditions allow, they will form groups, but they are also able to survive as a breeding pair. These species are therefore prime candidates for further study of social plasticity.

381 Like many cryptobenthic fishes, *Gobiodon* species have a pelagic larval phase where the larvae are
382 mixed with other nektonic organisms (Brandl et al., 2018). It therefore seems likely that relatedness
383 within the group would be low, as for other marine fishes (Awise and Shapiro, 1986; Buston et al., 2007;
384 but see Buston et al., 2009), although this is yet to be empirically tested. Low relatedness reduces the
385 value of 'r' in Hamilton's rule and hence the likelihood of sociality evolving, all else being equal (Bourke,
386 2014; Hamilton, 1964). For sociality to evolve in such groups, there must therefore be other factors
387 which alter the direct costs and benefits of group living. This was recently demonstrated in freshwater
388 cichlids by Dey et al. (2017) who found direct benefits provided from group living, biparental care and
389 diet type, were more influential than relatedness (associated with social monogamy) in the evolution of
390 cooperative breeding, a complex form of sociality. This contrasts with many other vertebrate lineages
391 which often form groups of closely related individuals and in which indirect (kin) benefits are likely to
392 have heavily influenced the evolution of social groups (Bourke, 2014; Halliwell et al., 2017; Lukas and
393 Clutton-Brock, 2012; While et al 2009; but see Riehl, 2013). This emphasis on direct costs and benefits
394 represents an alternate pathway to complex sociality to the kinship-based pathway often proposed in
395 the vertebrate literature. Alternatives such as this are worthy of further exploration as they offer novel
396 insights into the evolution of sociality (Dey et al. 2017; Riehl, 2013).

397 We tested factors known to provide direct fitness benefits in other closely related species, namely the
398 effects of host coral size, host coral generalization (ecological factors) and body size (life-history factor)
399 on sociality (Buston, 2003; Thompson et al., 2007; Wong, 2011). We found there was a significant
400 interaction between host coral size and body size on the degree of sociality when phylogenetic
401 correlation was accounted for. The relationship between host coral size and sociality was stronger for
402 larger species. This makes intuitive sense as individuals of larger species would presumably take up more
403 physical space in a coral. Hence, for larger bodied species to form groups, they would need to inhabit
404 larger corals on average. On the other hand, smaller species could potentially form larger groups in a

much larger size-range of corals before the habitat becomes saturated and group members are forced to disperse from the group. Group sizes of various social fish species are not only influenced by habitat size, however, and are instead related to size differences maintained between adjacent ranked individuals (Mitchell & Dill, 2005; Buston et al. 2006; Ang & Manica 2010; Wong 2011). Thus, it is also possible that smaller bodied species of *Gobiodon* maintain larger size ratios (smaller size differences) between adjacent ranked group members than larger bodied species, which would be an important avenue of future research.

Although smaller species showed less of a relationship between sociality and host-coral size, they were more social overall than larger species. This may indicate that smaller species obtain greater direct fitness benefits from social living or face greater constraints of dispersal or greater costs of solitary living. For example, smaller species might be more prone to predation or less competitive for vacant habitat compared to larger species, thus limiting dispersal opportunities and enhancing the benefits of remaining within a group (Helfman and Winkelman, 1997; Munday and Jones, 1998). This finding is again at odds with other terrestrial vertebrate systems which generally exhibit a positive relationship between sociality and body size (Armitage, 1981; Bekoff et al., 1981). This discrepancy between terrestrial and marine vertebrates highlights the importance of studying animal groups with varying life-history strategies.

While host generalization has been proposed as a driver of sociality in some habitat specialist marine species (Brooks et al., 2017), we found no evidence that it played a role in *Gobiodon* sociality. There was considerable variation in the number of host-coral species inhabited by each species of *Gobiodon* but this variation showed no discernable pattern in association with sociality. Munday et al. (1997) demonstrated *Gobiodon* species have distinct coral preferences. However, our research suggests some species appear to be more capable of relaxing this preference than others (especially during intense

ecological disturbance; e.g. Hing et al., 2018). This ability does not however, appear to be related to sociality. The coral preferences displayed by many *Gobiodon* species may be due to properties of particular coral species such as complexity, branch length or inter-branch distances (Untersteggaber et al., 2014). Sociality might therefore be influenced by coral properties, not measured in this study rather than variation in host-preference. For example more complex corals might increase the benefits of remaining in the group (for example by offering greater protection from predators) and thereby promote sociality. A similar pattern of increasingly complex habitat and a higher density of lizard aggregations has been documented by Michael et al. (2010). Untersteggaber et al. (2014) demonstrated that coral occupancy by *G. histrio* and *G. rivulatus* was related to coral size and branch length. Given our findings on sociality and coral size, coral architecture would be an interesting factor to consider in future studies of *Gobiodon* sociality.

To date, there have been few comparative studies of marine fishes looking at phylogenetic, ecological and life-history correlates of sociality across multiple species (Hing et al., 2017; but see Nowicki et al., 2018). In contrast, numerous studies in other vertebrate systems have been instrumental in developing our current understanding of how ecology (Brown, 1974; Emlen, 1982; Kokko et al., 2002; Kokko and Ekman, 2002; Stacey and Ligon, 1991) and life-history (Arnold and Owens, 1998; Hatchwell and Komdeur, 2000; Rowley and Russell, 1990) have influenced the evolution of sociality in these systems (reviewed in Hing et al., 2017). For example, phylogenetic reconstructions of sociality in other vertebrate systems have revealed non-random clustering in birds and mammals (Arnold and Owens, 1998; Briga et al., 2012; Edwards and Naeem, 1993). Closer examination at the genus level has revealed likely ecological and life-history correlates of sociality (e.g. Armitage, 1981; Faulkes et al., 1997). We have now added a comparatively understudied group of vertebrates with non-conventional life-histories (marine fishes) to this knowledge base. Unconventional life-history strategies (such as bi-directional sex change observed in several species of *Gobiodon*; Cole, 2011; Cole and Hoese, 2001; Munday et al., 1998;

Nakashima et al., 1996) likely alter the costs and benefits of group living in these social systems and therefore represent a unique perspective on social evolution (Buston and Wong, 2014; Hing et al., 2017; Wong and Buston, 2013).

4.1. *Comparison of taxonomic structure*

We built upon the phylogeny of Duchene et al. (2013) by adding additional molecular markers. Our Bayesian analysis inferred similar species composition (albeit with fewer species as we did not sample from the Red Sea) of each clade to that of Duchene et al. (2013), but the placement of the clades relative to each other varied between the two studies. Both studies inferred two sister species groups with high posterior probability. However, the sister clades C/D in our study, inferred with strong support, were not sister to each other in Duchene et al. (2013). Instead clade C was sister to clade A and the other group consisted of clades B/D in Duchene et al. (2013). Our tree provides very strong support for the sister group C/D while the node relating clades C and A in Duchene et al. (2013) is inferred with moderate support. However the A/B group in our study was not strongly supported. It seems there is broad agreement in the species composition of each clade. However, further research into the relationships between the clades is clearly required to discern the true genetic structure of the genus.

4.2. *Gobiodon spilophthalmus*

We determined our *G. spilophthalmus* c.f. specimens were in fact juveniles of either *G. ceramensis* or *G. acicularis* depending on the host-coral they were collected from. To our knowledge this is the first record of these species having juveniles of similar appearance to each other and to those described as *G. spilophthalmus* (Fowler, 1944; Munday et al., 1999). Our findings raise several possibilities. First, *G. spilophthalmus* may not be a valid species. The phylogeny produced by Duchene et al. (2013) shows very low support for the node relating *G. spilophthalmus* to *G. ceramensis* indicating there was difficulty delineating these samples as separate species. Harold et al. (2008) recognise *G. spilophthalmus* as a valid

species, but do not include it in their phylogeny of Indo-Pacific *Gobiodon* species. Second, *G. spilophthalmus* could be a valid species but is not present at Lizard Island. We cannot rule this possibility out with our data, but we find it unlikely that a species described from the New Hebrides (Vanuatu) would not be present at Lizard Island especially given the broad distribution of its congeners (Fowler, 1944; Munday et al., 1999). Additionally, Munday et al. (1999) describe *G. spilophthalmus* as occurring throughout the range of their collections which includes the Great Barrier Reef and Papua New Guinea. Third, *G. spilophthalmus* is a valid species and is present at Lizard Island, but we did not sample any. Although we sampled as many reefs as possible at Lizard Island, fourteen goby colonies may not be representative of the whole Lizard Island population, especially if *G. spilophthalmus* is rare. Additionally, there is clearly confusion around the identification of *G. heterospilos* and *G. spilophthalmus* in the literature (Fowler, 1944; Munday et al., 1999; Steinke et al., 2017), assuming both are indeed valid species as recognized by Harold et al. (2008).

Assuming *G. spilophthalmus* is a valid species, it appears to have diverged very recently and is therefore very closely related to its sister species, *G. ceramensis* (Duchene et al., 2013). It is likely the genetic markers used in our analysis (COI) and other studies featuring *G. spilophthalmus*, are evolving more slowly than this clade is speciating and thus not capable of fully capturing the true genetic structure of these species. The conflicting possibilities presented above and this issue of recent speciation outpacing divergence in the COI marker, highlight the need for a full genomic study of this clade to determine the validity of these species. Detailed ecological observations would also be highly desirable to establish field identification guidelines for each species, if indeed they can be reliably differentiated in the field.

5. Conclusion

The phylogenetic signal of sociality in *Gobiodon* could not be conclusively resolved. However, we found a combination of life-history and ecological effects best predicted sociality in these species. Previous

research suggests that sociality is probably quite plastic in *Gobiodon* and supports the idea of phylogenetic independence of sociality (Hing et al., 2018). Our study revealed a relationship between sociality and the interaction between ecological and life-history factors. This provides good evidence for a link between these correlates and sociality in this genus, which should now be tested experimentally in order to demonstrate causality. We also highlight the need for full genomic studies of *G. spilophthalmus*, *G. acicularis* and *G. ceramensis* which have caused substantial confusion in the literature at the time of writing. With continued advances in genomic sequencing we anticipate this study will encourage future research to resolve the validity of these species. Issues of species identification aside, this study complements the admirable body of research conducted on terrestrial organisms by presenting a novel perspective of ecological and life-history traits which have likely influenced the evolution of sociality. Work on terrestrial organisms has been instrumental in developing theories of social evolution. However, these terrestrially derived theories have only recently been tested against organisms displaying non-conventional life-history strategies.

6. Acknowledgments

We thank Phil Munday and Rick Winterbottom for discussion on the identification of *G. spilophthalmus*. We are also grateful for assistance in the field provided by Kylie Brown, Grant Cameron and Karen Hing and for guidance in the laboratory offered by Tracey Gibson. We thank the staff and volunteers at the Lizard Island Research Station for their support. We also thank Roger Steene, Dirk Steinke, and Catheline Froehlich for allowing us to make use of their photographs (Fig 2 (i), (ii), (v) respectively). We also wish to acknowledge the two anonymous reviewers and the editor, Alex Dornburg, for their helpful comments on the manuscript.

7. Funding

520 This work was supported by the Hermon Slade Foundation [grant number HSF13/8] and the Australian
521 Government Post Graduate Award.

522 **8. References**

523 Ackerly, D.D., Donoghue, M.J., 1995. Phylogeny and ecology reconsidered. *Journal of Ecology* 83, 730-
524 733.

525 Agnarsson, I., 2002. Sharing a web - On the relation of sociality and kleptoparasitism in theridiid spiders
526 (Theridiidae, Araneae). *J. Arachnol.* 30, 181-188.

527 Agorreta, A., San Mauro, D., Schliwen, U., Van Tassell, J.L., Kovacic, M., Zardoya, R., Ruber, L., 2013.
528 Molecular phylogenetics of Gobioidae and phylogenetic placement of European gobies. *Mol. Phylogenet.*
529 *Evol.* 69, 619-633.

530 Aljanabi, S.M., Martinez, I., 1997. Universal and rapid salt-extraction of high quality genomic DNA for
531 PCR-based techniques. *NUCLEIC ACIDS RES.* 25, 4692-4693.

532 Armitage, K.B., 1981. Sociality as a life-history tactic of ground squirrels. *Oecologia* 48, 36-49.

533 Arnold, K.E., Owens, I.P.F., 1998. Cooperative breeding in birds: a comparative test of the life history
534 hypothesis. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* 265, 739-745.

535 Avilés, L., Harwood, G., 2012. A Quantitative Index of Sociality and Its Application to Group-Living
536 Spiders and Other Social Organisms. *Ethology* 118, 1219-1229.

537 Avise, J.C., Shapiro, D.Y., 1986. Evaluating kinship of newly settled juveniles within social groups of the
538 coral reef fish *Anthias squamipinnis*. *Evolution* 40, 1051-1059.

539 Bekoff, M., Diamond, J., Mitton, J.B., 1981. Life-history patterns and sociality in canids: Body size,
540 reproduction, and behavior. *Oecologia* 50, 386-390.

541 Blomberg, S.P., Garland Jr, T., Ives, A.R., 2003. Testing for phylogenetic signal in comparative data:
542 Behavioral traits are more labile. *Evolution* 57, 717-745.

543 Bouckaert, R., Heled, J., Kühnert, D., Vaughan, T., Wu, C.-H., Xie, D., Suchard, M.A., Rambaut, A.,
544 Drummond, A.J., 2014. BEAST 2: A Software Platform for Bayesian Evolutionary Analysis. PLOS
545 Computational Biology 10, e1003537.

546 Bourke, A.F.G., 2011. Principles of social evolution. Oxford University Press Oxford.

547 Bourke, A.F.G., 2014. Hamilton's rule and the causes of social evolution. Philosophical Transactions of
548 the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences 369, 10.

549 Brandl, S.J., Goatley, C.H.R., Bellwood, D.R., Tornabene, L., 2018. The hidden half: Ecology and evolution
550 of cryptobenthic fishes on coral reefs. Biological Reviews.

551 Briga, M., Pen, I., Wright, J., 2012. Care for kin: within-group relatedness and allomaternal care are
552 positively correlated and conserved throughout the mammalian phylogeny. Biology Letters 8, 533-536.

553 Brooks, K.C., Maia, R., Duffy, J.E., Hultgren, K.M., Rubenstein, D.R., 2017. Ecological generalism facilitates
554 the evolution of sociality in snapping shrimps. Ecology Letters 20, 1516-1525.

555 Brown, J.L., 1974. Alternate Routes to Sociality in Jays—With a Theory for the Evolution of Altruism and
556 Communal Breeding. American Zoologist 14, 63-80.

557 Buston, P., 2003. Forcible eviction and prevention of recruitment in the clown anemonefish. Behavioral
558 Ecology 14, 576-582.

559 Buston, P.M., Bogdanowicz, S.M., Wong, A., Harrison, R.G., 2007. Are clownfish groups composed of
560 close relatives? An analysis of microsatellite DNA variation in *Amphiprion percula*. Mol. Ecol. 16, 3671-
561 3678.

562 Buston, P.M., Fauvelot, C., Wong, M.Y.L., Planes, S., 2009. Genetic relatedness in groups of the humbug
563 damselfish *Dascyllus aruanus*: small, similar-sized individuals may be close kin. Mol. Ecol. 18, 4707-4715.

564 Buston, P.M., Wong, M.Y.L., 2014. Why Some Animals Forgo Reproduction in Complex Societies
565 Behaviors of coral reef fishes provide strong support for some major new ideas about the evolution of
566 cooperation. Am. Scientist 102, 290-297.

567 Chapple, D.G., 2003. Ecology, life-history, and behavior in the Australian Scincid genus *Egernia*, with
568 comments on the evolution of complex sociality in lizards. *Herpetol. Monogr.* 17, 145-180.

569 Cole, K.S., 2011. Patterns of reproductive morphology in the genus *Gobiodon* (Teleostei: Gobiidae).
570 *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 92, 323-335.

571 Cole, K.S., Hoese, D.F., 2001. Gonad morphology, colony demography and evidence for hermaphroditism
572 in *Gobiodon okinawae* (Teleostei, Gobiidae). *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 61, 161-173.

573 Dey, C.J., O'Connor, C.M., Wilkinson, H., Shultz, S., Balshine, S., Fitzpatrick, J.L., 2017. Direct benefits and
574 evolutionary transitions to complex societies. *Nature ecology & evolution* 1, 0137.

575 Drummond, A.J., Suchard, M.A., Xie, D., Rambaut, A., 2012. Bayesian Phylogenetics with BEAUti and the
576 BEAST 1.7. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 29, 1969-1973.

577 Duchene, D., Klanten, S.O., Munday, P.L., Herler, J., van Herwerden, L., 2013. Phylogenetic evidence for
578 recent diversification of obligate coral-dwelling gobies compared with their host corals. *Mol.*
579 *Phylogenet. Evol.* 69, 123-132.

580 Edwards, S.V., Naeem, S., 1993. The Phylogenetic Component of Cooperative Breeding in Perching Birds.
581 *American Naturalist* 141, 754-789.

582 Emlen, S.T., 1982. The evolution of helping 1. An ecological constraints model. *American Naturalist* 119,
583 29-39.

584 Faulkes, C.G., Bennett, N.C., Bruford, M.W., Obrien, H.P., Aguilar, G.H., Jarvis, J.U.M., 1997. Ecological
585 constraints drive social evolution in the African mole-rats. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological*
586 *Sciences* 264, 1619-1627.

587 Fowler, H.W., 1944. Fishes obtained in the New Hebrides by Dr. Edward L. Jackson. *Proceedings of the*
588 *Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* 96, 155-371.

589 Fox, J., Weisberg, S., 2011. An {R} Companion to Applied Regression. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks
590 CA.

591 Hall, T.A., 1999. BioEdit: a user-friendly biological sequence alignment editor and analysis program for
592 Windows 95/98/NT. Nucleic acids symposium series. [London]: Information Retrieval Ltd., c1979-c2000.,
593 pp. 95-98.

594 Halliwell, B., Uller, T., Holland, B.R., While, G.M., 2017. Live bearing promotes the evolution of sociality
595 in reptiles. Nature communications 8, 2030.

596 Hamilton, W.D., 1964. The genetical evolution of social behaviour. II. Journal of Theoretical Biology 7,
597 17-52.

598 Harold, A.S., Winterbottom, R., Munday, P.L., Chapman, R.W., 2008. Phylogenetic relationships of Indo-
599 Pacific coral gobies of the genus *Gobiodon* (Teleostei : Gobiidae), based on morphological and molecular
600 data. Bull. Mar. Sci. 82, 119-136.

601 Harvey, P.H., Pagel, M., Read, A., Nee, S., 1995. Further remarks on the role of phylogeny in comparative
602 ecology. Naturalist 140, 421-446.

603 Hatchwell, B.J., Komdeur, J., 2000. Ecological constraints, life history traits and the evolution of
604 cooperative breeding. Animal Behaviour 59, 1079-1086.

605 Helfman, G.S., Winkelman, D.L., 1997. Threat sensitivity in bicolor damselfish: Effects of sociality and
606 body size. Ethology 103, 369-383.

607 Herler, J., Bogorodsky, S.V., Suzuki, T., 2013. Four new species of coral gobies (Teleostei: Gobiidae:
608 *Gobiodon*), with comments on their relationships within the genus. Zootaxa 3709, 301-329.

609 Herler, J., Koblmüller, S., Sturmbauer, C., 2009. Phylogenetic relationships of coral-associated gobies
610 (Teleostei, Gobiidae) from the Red Sea based on mitochondrial DNA data. Marine Biology 156, 725-739.

611 Hing, M.L., Klanten, O.S., Dowton, M., Brown, K.R., Wong, M.Y.L., 2018. Repeated cyclone events reveal
612 potential causes of sociality in coral-dwelling *Gobiodon* fishes. PLoS One 13, e0202407.

613 Hing, M.L., Klanten, O.S., Dowton, M., Wong, M.Y.L., 2017. The Right Tools for the Job: Cooperative
614 Breeding Theory and an Evaluation of the Methodological Approaches to Understanding the Evolution
615 and Maintenance of Sociality. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 5.

616 Hobbs, J.P.A., Munday, P.L., 2004. Intraspecific competition controls spatial distribution and social
617 organisation of the coral-dwelling goby *Gobiodon histrio*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 278, 253-259.

618 Hobbs, J.P.A., Munday, P.L., Jones, G.P., 2004. Social induction of maturation and sex determination in a
619 coral reef fish. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* 271, 2109-2114.

620 Holcroft, N.I., 2005. A molecular analysis of the interrelationships of tetraodontiform fishes
621 (*Acanthomorpha: Tetraodontiformes*). *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 34, 525-544.

622 Hughes, W.O.H., Oldroyd, B.P., Beekman, M., Ratnieks, F.L.W., 2008. Ancestral monogamy shows kin
623 selection is key to the evolution of eusociality. *Science* 320, 1213-1216.

624 Jennions, M.D., Macdonald, D.W., 1994. Cooperative Breeding in Mammals. *Trends in Ecology &*
625 *Evolution* 9, 89-93.

626 Jetz, W., Rubenstein, D.R., 2011. Environmental Uncertainty and the Global Biogeography of
627 Cooperative Breeding in Birds (vol 21, pg 72, 2011). *Current Biology* 21, 438-438.

628 Kokko, H., Johnstone, R.A., Wright, J., 2002. The evolution of parental and alloparental effort in
629 cooperatively breeding groups: When should helpers pay to stay? *Behavioral Ecology* 13, 291-300.

630 Kokko, H., Ekman, J., 2002. Delayed dispersal as a route to breeding: Territorial inheritance, safe havens,
631 and ecological constraints. *American Naturalist* 160, 468-484.

632 Kruckenhauser, L., Pinsker, W., Haring, E., Arnold, W., 1999. Marmot phylogeny revisited: Molecular
633 evidence for a diphyletic origin of sociality. *J. Zool. Syst. Evol. Res.* 37, 49-56.

634 Kumar, S., Stecher, G., Tamura, K., 2016. MEGA7: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis Version 7.0
635 for Bigger Datasets. *Molecular biology and evolution* 33, 1870-1874.

636 Kuwamura, T., Yogo, Y., Nakashima, Y., 1994. Population dynamics of goby *Paragobiodon*
637 *echinocephalus* and host coral *Stylophora pistillata*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 103, 17-23.

638 Lanfear, R., Calcott, B., Ho, S.Y.W., Guindon, S., 2012. PartitionFinder: Combined Selection of Partitioning
639 Schemes and Substitution Models for Phylogenetic Analyses. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 29, 1695-
640 1701.

641 Li, C., Ortí, G., Zhang, G., Lu, G., 2007. A practical approach to phylogenomics: the phylogeny of ray-
642 finned fish (Actinopterygii) as a case study. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 7, 44.

643 Lukas, D., Clutton-Brock, T., 2012. Cooperative breeding and monogamy in mammalian societies.
644 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 279, 2151-2156.

645 Michael, D.R., Cunningham, R.B., Lindenmayer, D.B., 2010. The social elite: Habitat heterogeneity,
646 complexity and quality in granite inselbergs influence patterns of aggregation in *Egernia striolata*
647 (*Lygosominae: Scincidae*). *Austral Ecol.* 35, 862-870.

648 Munday, P., Harold, A., Winterbottom, R., 1999. Guide to coral-dwelling gobies, genus *Gobiodon*
649 (*Gobiidae*), from Papua New Guinea and the Great Barrier Reef. *Revue française d'aquariologie* 26, 53-
650 58.

651 Munday, P.L., Caley, M.J., Jones, G.P., 1998. Bi-directional sex change in a coral-dwelling goby.
652 *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 43, 371-377.

653 Munday, P.L., Cardoni, A.M., Syms, C., 2006. Cooperative growth regulation in coral-dwelling fishes.
654 *Biology Letters* 2, 355-358.

655 Munday, P.L., Jones, G.P., 1998. The ecological implications of small body size among coral-reef fishes.
656 *Oceanography and Marine Biology* 36, 373-411.

657 Munday, P.L., Jones, G.P., Caley, M.J., 1997. Habitat specialisation and the distribution and abundance of
658 coral-dwelling gobies. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 152, 227-239.

659 Munday, P.L., Wilson, S.K., 1997. Comparative efficacy of clove oil and other chemicals in
660 anaesthetization of *Pomacentrus amboinensis*, a coral reef fish. *Journal of Fish Biology* 51, 931-938.

661 Nakashima, Y., Kuwamura, T., Yogo, Y., 1996. Both-ways sex change in monogamous coral gobies,
662 *Gobiodon spp.* *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 46, 281-288.

663 Nowicki, J.P., O'Connell, L.A., Cowman, P.F., Walker, S.P.W., Coker, D.J., Pratchett, M.S., 2018. Variation
664 in social systems within *Chaetodon* butterflyfishes, with special reference to pair bonding. *PLoS One* 13,
665 e0194465.

666 Pagel, M., 1999. Inferring the historical patterns of biological evolution. *Nature* 401, 877-884.

667 Paradis, E., Claude, J., Strimmer, K., 2004. APE: analyses of phylogenetics and evolution in R language.
668 *Bioinformatics* 20, 289-290.

669 Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., DebRoy, S., Sarkar, D., R Core Team, 2018. nlme: Linear and nonlinear mixed
670 effects models. R package version 3.1-137. Available at <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nlme>.

671 Puillandre, N., Lambert, A., Brouillet, S., Achaz, G., 2012. ABGD, Automatic Barcode Gap Discovery for
672 primary species delimitation. *Mol. Ecol.* 21, 1864-1877.

673 Rambaut, A., Drummond, A., Xie, D., Baele, G., Suchard, M.A., 2018. Tracer v1.7.
674 <http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/tracer/>.

675 Revell, L.J., 2012. phytools: an R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other things).
676 *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 3, 217-223.

677 Riehl, C., 2011. Living with strangers: direct benefits favour non-kin cooperation in a communally nesting
678 bird. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* 278, 1728-1735.

679 Riehl, C., 2013. Evolutionary routes to non-kin cooperative breeding in birds. *Proceedings of the Royal*
680 *Society B-Biological Sciences* 280, 7.

681 Rowley, I., Russell, E., 1990. Splendid fairy-wrens: demonstrating the importance of longevity. In: Stacey,
 682 P.K., WD (Ed.), Cooperative breeding in birds: long-term studies of ecology and behavior. Cambridge
 683 University Press, Cambridge, pp. 3-30.
 684 Rubenstein, D.R., Abbot, P., 2017. Comparative social evolution. Cambridge University Press.
 685 Rubenstein, D.R., Lovette, I.J., 2007. Temporal environmental variability drives the evolution of
 686 cooperative breeding in birds. *Current Biology* 17, 1414-1419.
 687 Schneider, T.C., Kappeler, P.M., 2014. Social systems and life-history characteristics of mongooses.
 688 *Biological Reviews* 89, 173-198.
 689 Schürch, R., Accleton, C., Field, J., 2016. Consequences of a warming climate for social organisation in
 690 sweat bees. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 70, 1131-1139.
 691 Shibukawa, K., Suzuki, T., Aizawa, M., 2013. *Gobiodon aoyagii*, a new coral goby (Actinopterygii,
 692 Gobiidae, Gobiinae) from the west Pacific, with redescription of a similarly-colored congener *Gobiodon*
 693 *erythrospilus* Bleeker, 1875. *Bulletin of the National Museum of Nature and Science, Series A* 39, 143-
 694 165.
 695 Shultz, S., Opie, C., Atkinson, Q.D., 2011. Stepwise evolution of stable sociality in primates. *Nature* 479,
 696 219-U296.
 697 Smorkatcheva, A.V., Lukhtanov, V.A., 2014. Evolutionary association between subterranean lifestyle and
 698 female sociality in rodents. *Mamm. Biol.* 79, 101-109.
 699 Stacey, P.B., Ligon, J.D., 1991. The benefits-of-philopatry hypothesis for the evolution of cooperative
 700 breeding - variation in territory quality and group-size effects. *American Naturalist* 137, 831-846.
 701 Stamatakis, A., 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of large
 702 phylogenies. *Bioinformatics* 30, 1312-1313.
 703 Steinke, D., de Waard, J.R., Gomon, M.F., Johnson, J.W., Larson, H.K., Lucanus, O., Moore, G.I., Reader,
 704 S., Ward, R.D., 2017. DNA barcoding the fishes of Lizard island (Great Barrier Reef). *Biodivers. Data J.* 5.

705 Thacker, C.E., Roje, D.M., 2011. Phylogeny of Gobiidae and identification of gobiid lineages. *Systematics*
706 and *Biodiversity* 9, 329-347.

707 Thompson, V.J., Munday, P.L., Jones, G.P., 2007. Habitat patch size and mating system as determinants
708 of social group size in coral-dwelling fishes. *Coral Reefs* 26, 165-174.

709 Untersteeggaber, L., Mitteroecker, P., Herler, J., 2014. Coral architecture affects the habitat choice and
710 form of associated gobiid fishes. *Marine Biology* 161, 521-530.

711 Ward, R.D., Zemlak, T.S., Innes, B.H., Last, P.R., Hebert, P.D.N., 2005. DNA barcoding Australia's fish
712 species. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 360, 1847-1857.

713 Westoby, M., Leishman, M.R., Lord, J.M., 1995. On misinterpreting the 'phylogenetic correction'. *Journal*
714 *of Ecology* 83, 531-534.

715 Westoby, M., Leishman, M., Lord, J., 1995. Further remarks on phylogenetic correction. *Journal of*
716 *Ecology* 83, 727-729.

717 While, G.M., Uller, T., Wapstra, E., 2009. Family conflict and the evolution of sociality in reptiles.
718 *Behavioral Ecology* 20, 245-250.

719 Wong, M.Y.L., 2010. Ecological constraints and benefits of philopatry promote group-living in a social
720 but non-cooperatively breeding fish. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* 277, 353-
721 358.

722 Wong, M.Y.L., 2011. Group Size in Animal Societies: The Potential Role of Social and Ecological
723 Limitations in the Group-Living Fish, *Paragobiodon xanthosomus*. *Ethology* 117, 638-644.

724 Wong, M.Y.L., Buston, P.M., 2013. Social Systems in Habitat-Specialist Reef Fishes: Key Concepts in
725 *Evolutionary Ecology*. *Bioscience* 63, 453-463.

726 Wong, M.Y.L., Buston, P.M., Munday, P.L., Jones, G.P., 2007. The threat of punishment enforces
727 peaceful cooperation and stabilizes queues in a coral-reef fish. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-*
728 *Biological Sciences* 274, 1093-1099.