

# No evidence for paternal age effects on sons or daughters, when accounting for paternal sperm storage

## Abstract

1. The age at which a father reproduces is predicted to affect not only his own fertility but also the fitness of his offspring. Specifically, offspring born to old fathers are assumed to be of a lower quality than those conceived by young fathers. However, when fathers have low mating rates, paternal age might be confounded with the duration for which mature sperm are stored in fathers prior to ejaculation.
2. Studies that disentangle the confounding effects of paternal sperm storage duration from those of paternal age, on offspring, are lacking. We use *Drosophila melanogaster* to test the separate and interactive effects of paternal age and sperm storage duration (sexual rest) on the survival and lifetime reproduction of offspring.
3. As expected, old fathers produce fewer offspring than young fathers. But surprisingly, paternal age does not influence the survival or lifetime reproductive success of either sons or daughters. Instead, sons conceived by fathers with long durations of sexual rest have lower reproductive success than sons conceived by fathers with short durations of sexual rest.
4. We further discover that daughters of low reproductive quality selectively disappear with age, but sons do not, highlighting that demographic processes need to be accounted for when studying paternal age effects.
5. Overall, our study suggests that paternal age effects might not be as pervasive as previously assumed. We emphasize that a more nuanced understanding of the mechanisms causing paternal age effects is required, so that studies do not misattribute effects of paternal sperm storage to age.

Keywords: abstinence, parental effects, post-meiotic sperm ageing, senescence, sex-specific, trade-offs

## 30 Introduction

31 The influence of parental environments is not limited to the reproductive success of parents  
 32 themselves. Parental environments and phenotypes can influence offspring phenotypes  
 33 (Badyaev and Uller, 2009; Liu and Chen, 2018) via genetic (e.g. mutation accumulation in  
 34 gametes) or epigenetic mechanisms (Bauch et al, 2019; Chen et al, 2016; Heidinger et al,  
 35 2016; Perez and Lehner, 2019; Rando, 2016; Rodgers et al, 2015; Sharma, 2019; Yoshizaki et  
 36 al, 2021), as well as differential resource allocation by parents (Uller, 2008). One parental  
 37 effect that has received considerable attention is the ‘paternal age effect’. Paternal age effects  
 38 are caused when the age at which a father conceives offspring affects the offspring’s  
 39 phenotype (Monaghan and Metcalfe, 2019). These effects have broad implications for  
 40 healthspan (Chan and Robaire, 2022), life-history evolution, and population dynamics  
 41 (Evans, et al, 2019).

42 Paternal age has been hypothesized to be more potent in influencing offspring  
 43 phenotypes than maternal age (de Manuel et al, 2022; Gao et al, 2019). This rationale stems  
 44 from sperm producing more reactive oxygen species, but have poorer DNA repair machinery  
 45 than eggs, and male germlines accumulating more mutations with advancing age than female  
 46 germlines (Crow, 2000; Ellegren, 2007; Girard et al, 2016; Reinhardt and Turnell, 2000;  
 47 Venn et al, 2014). Evidence for deleterious paternal age effects includes old fathers  
 48 producing offspring with poorer development (e.g. Janecka et al, 2017; Preston et al, 2015),  
 49 lower juvenile survival (e.g. Fay et al, 2016), reduced adult lifespans (e.g. Crow, 2003;  
 50 Noguera et al, 2018; Priest et al, 2002; Sharma et al, 2015; Wylde et al, 2019; Xie et al,  
 51 2018), and lower reproductive output (e.g. Arslan, 2017; Schroeder et al, 2015; Vuarin et al,  
 52 2021), compared to offspring conceived by young fathers.

53 In some cases, the effects of paternal age can be confounded by the duration for which  
54 sperm are stored post-meiosis and prior to ejaculation in males (Pizzari et al, 2008; Reinhardt,  
55 2007; Siva-Jothy, 2000). These confounding effects typically arise in studies where fathers  
56 are kept virgins for long durations (reviewed in Sanghvi et al, 2024), have low rates of sperm  
57 loss or resorption, and have life-long spermatogenesis (e.g. most vertebrates and some  
58 insects: Bjork et al, 2007; Demarco et al, 2014; Reinhardt et al, 2011; Santos et al, 2023;  
59 Sepil et al, 2020). In such cases, old, virgin males not only have a more senescent germline,  
60 but also store sperm for longer durations compared to young virgin males, due to longer  
61 periods of sexual rest (Pizzari et al, 2008). Differences in durations of sperm storage between  
62 old and young fathers can also arise when fathers of different ages differ in their mating rates  
63 (Aich et al, 2022). In natural settings for instance, old males might be mating less often, thus  
64 storing sperm for longer durations on average, than young males.

65 Sperm storage post-meiosis and before ejaculation can affect sperm quality, thus the  
66 fertility of a male, as well as his offspring's fitness, independent of the male's age (Pizzari et  
67 al, 2008, Reinhardt, 2007). Prolonged storage of sperm in males or females can deteriorate  
68 sperm quality (Brindle et al, 2023; Cattelan and Gasparini, 2021; Comar et al, 2017;  
69 Gasparini et al, 2014, 2019; Hettyey et al, 2012; Levitas et al, 2005; Radhakrishnan and  
70 Fedorka, 2011), increase the number of mutations in sperm (Agarwal et al, 2016; Rinehart,  
71 1969), and reduce male fertilisation success (Gasparini et al, 2018; Reinhardt and Siva-Jothy,  
72 2005). Sperm storage independently can also negatively affect the development  
73 (Dharmarajan, 1950; Lodge et al, 1971; Pineaux et al, 2019; White et al, 2008), quality  
74 (Tarin, 2000; Wagner et al, 2004; White et al, 2008), and fertility (Gasparini et al, 2017) of  
75 resultant offspring. This deterioration of stored sperm mainly occurs because sperm  
76 accumulate DNA and oxidative damage over prolonged periods of sexual rest (Barbagallo et  
77 al, 2022; Sorensen et al, 2023; Wetzker et al, 2024).

78           When the effects of male age and sexual rest cannot be disentangled, it remains  
79   unclear how these processes independently influence male reproductive output. Studies that  
80   disentangle these effects report contrasting results to each other (Gasparini et al, 2019; Vega-  
81   Trejo et al, 2019). Furthermore, no study has yet tested the separate effects of paternal age  
82   and sexual rest on the reproductive output of the conceived offspring. Previous studies that  
83   measure offspring phenotypes focus mainly on offspring survival (Meunier et al, 2022),  
84   which might not be informative of offspring fitness when offspring survival and reproduction  
85   co-vary negatively. Testing the separate effects of paternal age and sperm storage duration is  
86   necessary to ensure that studies are not incorrectly attributing the effects of paternal sexual  
87   rest to paternal age. Paternal age and sperm storage duration might also interact (Pizzari et al,  
88   2008), for example, if old fathers are worse at repairing damage in stored sperm, than young  
89   fathers (Gorbunova et al, 2007; Selvaratnam et al, 2015; Weirich-Schwaiger et al, 1994).  
90   Studies that manipulate both, paternal sperm storage duration/sexual rest and paternal age,  
91   and simultaneously measuring offspring and paternal fitness components, are lacking, leaving  
92   such hypotheses untested.

93           Here, we experimentally test the independent and interactive effects of paternal age at  
94   conception and paternal duration of sexual rest (henceforth, sperm storage duration), on  
95   paternal fertility, and the age-dependent survival and lifetime reproduction of their sons and  
96   daughters. We use the fruit fly, *Drosophila melanogaster*, a model organism for investigating  
97   parental age effects (Aguilar et al, 2023; Hercus and Hoffmann, 2000; Mossman et al, 2019;  
98   Nystrand and Dowling, 2014; Price and Hansen, 1998; Sanghvi, Pizzari et al, 2024; Sepil et  
99   al, 2020; Tan et al, 2013), owing to their short generation time and absence of parental care.  
100   Fruit flies show life-long spermatogenesis (e.g. Bjork et al, 2007; Sepil et al, 2020) and low  
101   rates of sperm loss (Demarco et al, 2014; Santos et al, 2023), leading to age-dependent  
102   accumulation of mature sperm in unmated males (Pisano et al, 1993; Sepil et al. 2020). In

fruit flies, sperm storage reduces the viability of sperm by 50% over 8 days (Radhakrishnan and Fedorka, 2011), increases oxidative stress by 10% (Wetzker et al, 2024), leads to sperm ejection by females (Snook and Hosken, 2004), and lowers offspring viability (Tan et al, 2013).

We test predictions of five hypotheses (H1-H5). First, paternal sperm storage could interact with paternal age, to influence the reproductive output of fathers, and the phenotypes of their offspring. If previous studies that do not separate these effects, are misattributing the effects of paternal sperm storage to paternal age, we predict that separating these effects will reveal no significant evidence for reproductive senescence in fathers, or for paternal age effects on offspring. Second, old males might be worse at repairing cellular damage than young males (Gorbunova et al, 2007; Weirich-Schwaiger et al, 1994; Witt et al, 2023), causing deleterious effects of sperm storage to be exacerbated in old than young fathers (Zubkova and Robaire, 2006). We thus predict offspring of old fathers with long durations of sexual rest will have lower fitness than offspring of young fathers or of fathers with short sperm storage durations (H2). Third, offspring of old fathers might inherit a higher mutation load than offspring of young fathers (Chen et al, 2023; de Manuel et al, 2022; Girard et al, 2016; Jonsson et al, 2017; Kong et al, 2012; Wang et al, 2020). If paternally inherited mutations are exacerbated as offspring grow older (Bregdahl et al, 2020, 2023; Monaghan et al, 2020; Moorad and Promislow, 2008; Shindyapina et al, 2020), we predict that the effects of old paternal age might be more deleterious when offspring are old than young (H3). Fourth, paternal age effects might be sex-specific (e.g. Aich et al, 2022; Angell et al, 2022; Gasparini et al, 2017; Krishna et al, 2012; Sparks et al, 2022). For instance, advancing paternal age might deteriorate the Y chromosome (Byrne et al, 2003; Carothers et al, 1978) or imprinted genes (Denomme et al, 2020; Paczkowski et al, 2015). Similarly, telomeres or epigenetic markers (which are affected by paternal age) might be sex-specifically inherited

(Bouwhuis et al, 2015; Olsson et al, 2011; Schroeder et al, 2015). In line with these hypotheses, we predict that paternal age and paternal sperm storage duration will have a larger impact on sons compared to daughters fitness (H4). Lastly, fathers might trade-off investment in sperm production versus repair/maintenance of sperm quality (e.g. Koppik et al, 2023). This trade-off between investment in sperm production versus sperm repair might manifest as trade-offs between offspring quantity and quality, therefore modulate paternal age effects (Fischer et al, 2011; Ratikainen et al, 2018; Johnson et al, 2018). In line with these hypotheses, we predict that fathers who produce more offspring would produce poorer quality offspring (H5).

137

138 **Replication statement**

Scale of inference	Scale at which factor of interest is applied	Number of replicates at the appropriate scale
Species	Individuals within blocks	60 fathers per treatment across 4 blocks. 3 sons and 3 daughters per father measured

139

140 **Methods**

141 **Stock and experimental individuals**

142 We used *Dahomey* wild-type *Drosophila melanogaster* flies maintained at a 12:12hr light  
143 cycle, at a constant temperature of 25°C, and fed with Lewis medium (Lewis, 1960)  
144 supplemented with *ad libitum* live yeast (following Sepil et al, 2020). The stock from which  
145 these flies were taken have been reared in the lab since the 1970s. Under these conditions,  
146 flies have an egg-to-adult development of ~10 days, and virgin adult males have median and  
147 maximum lifespans of ~45 and 90 days, respectively (Sepil et al, 2020; also see Fig S1). Our  
148 experiment consisted of two parts: first, fathers were generated and assigned across four  
149 treatments (old or young paternal age, with long or short sperm storage duration) in a fully

balanced design (henceforth “F0 assays”). Then, sons and daughters (F1 individuals) from fathers in each paternal treatment were collected, and their survival and lifetime reproduction measured (henceforth “F1 assays”). Our experiment (Figure 1) was conducted using a total of 60 fathers per treatment (our independent sample size), spread across four replicates (see Table S1 for sample sizes).

## Experimental design

### F0 assays

#### *Paternal treatments*

We first reared experimental flies using a standard larval density method by placing ~200 eggs obtained from our stock population cage, on 50 mL of food in 250-mL bottles (Clancy and Kennington, 2001). We then collected virgin “F0 males” using ice anaesthesia within 7 hours of eclosion from across ~15 of these bottles. F0 males were kept in groups of 10 and haphazardly assigned to one of four paternal treatments. These four paternal treatments were: old fathers with sperm stored for long durations (OO), old fathers with sperm stored for short durations (OY), young fathers with sperm stored for long durations (YO), and young fathers with sperm stored for short durations (YY). To generate fathers with sperm of known storage durations, we manipulated the duration of sexual rest. For this, we “stripped” (i.e. depleted stored ejaculates) virgin young and old F0 males of their stored ejaculates (see “F0 stripping assay” below), and then allowed F0 males to replenish their ejaculates for a known duration, until they were mated to a single young virgin experimental female to obtain offspring (see F0 mating assay below). Specifically, F0 males assigned to the OO treatment were stripped when 37 days old and mated at 45 days old, OY males were stripped when 43 days old and mated at 45 days old, YO males were stripped when 3 days old and mated at 11 days old,

while YY males were stripped when 9 days old and mated at 11 days old (Figure 1). This design gave us F0 males who were young (11 days old) or old (45 days old), and with ejaculates stored for short (2 days) or long (8 days) durations.

# *F0 stripping assay*

To deplete (“strip”) experimental F0 males of their stored ejaculate reserves and create the four paternal treatments, we placed single old or young F0 males with 10 virgin young (3-4 days old) females (henceforth, “stripping females”), and allowed males to mate *ad-libitum* with these stripping females for 24 hours. Mating with 10 females over 24 hours is sufficient to deplete *D. melanogaster* males of their ejaculate reserves (Douglas et al, 2020; Hopkins et al, 2019; Linklater et al, 2007; Loyau et al, 2010; Macartney et al, 2021; also see Appendix 1). After 24 hours of being with the 10 stripping females, F0 males were separated, sexually rested for two or eight days depending on their treatment, and used subsequently for the “F0 mating assay”. Finally, we measured whether the F0 males used in the stripping assay produced offspring with the stripping females, to ensure the stripping assay’s effectiveness (see Appendix 1 for details).

# *F0 mating assay*

After being with the 10 stripping females for 24 hours, all F0 males were transferred to new vials and kept individually. Only F0 males that produced offspring in the “F0 stripping assay”, were used in the “F0 mating assay” (see Appendix 1 for details). Next, old and young F0 males assigned to the short sperm storage treatment (OY and YY respectively) were mated once with a young virgin (3-4 days old) experimental female two days after the F0 stripping assay. Old and young F0 males in the long sperm storage treatment (OO and YO




respectively) were mated once with a young virgin (3-4 days old) experimental female 8 days after the stripping assay. All experimental females (mothers) were obtained from standard stock cages using the standard larval density method described above. F0 males from all four treatments (henceforth called “fathers”) were presented with an experimental female on the same day, given a maximum of 5 hours to mate only once. Each mating event was observed, and mating latency and copulation duration recorded. Following mating, experimental females were left singly in the mating vial for 24h to enable oviposition. The resultant offspring (“F1”) produced by experimental females (mothers) and fathers, over 24 hours of eggs laying in mating vials, were used in the F1 assays (see below).

# F1 assays

The vials with eggs laid from experimental parents in the four treatments were checked every day for eclosing offspring (F1). Within seven hours of eclosion, three male (henceforth “sons”) and three female (henceforth “daughters”) offspring were haphazardly collected from each vial, into individual vials with a unique ID. These six offspring from each parental pair were then used for subsequent “F1 assays” (see below). The remaining eclosed offspring in each parental vial were frozen four days later and counted, to compare the reproductive output of fathers from the four treatments. Overall, we conducted F1 assays on 3 sons and 3 daughters from ~60 fathers in each treatment.

Once every two weeks, surviving sons and daughters were moved to a new vial with a virgin young mate (3-4 days old) of the opposite sex for 24 hours and the resultant offspring (“F2”) were counted. This gave us data on the reproductive ageing patterns of both sons and daughters, from fathers in all four paternal treatments. We checked offspring survival every one to three days. Using an aspirator, sons were transferred to new food vials once a week,

222 while daughters were transferred to new vials twice a week to reduce female mortality caused  
223 by larvae softening the food medium.



224  
225 Figure 1: Experimental design to test how paternal age (Y: young, O: old) and paternal sperm storage  
226 duration/sexual rest (Y: short, O: long) affect lifetime reproduction and survival of sons and  
227 daughters. We first depleted old and young males of their ejaculates by keeping them with 10 females  
228 for 24 hours, then allowed them to replenish their ejaculate reserves for either two days (short sexual  
229 rest) or eight days (long sexual rest), and subsequently mated them to a single female. Three sons and  
230 three daughters produced from this mating (F1) were chosen haphazardly, and used for the F1 assays.  
231 Here, each experimental F1 offspring was mated to an individual of the opposite sex from the stock  
232 population once every two weeks, until death, and offspring reproductive output (number of eclosed  
233 F2 individuals) from eggs laid over 24 hours were counted. In total, each paternal treatment had 60  
234 fathers. Images from PhyloPics by Thomas Hegna and Ramiro Morales Hojas (PD1.0 and CC01.0  
235 licence).

236

## Data analysis

### General modelling approach

We used linear mixed-effects models (LMM) and generalised linear mixed-effects models (GLMM) to understand how paternal age and paternal sperm storage duration affected the reproductive output of fathers and their offspring (Table 1). We included an optimizer (“BFGS”) whenever GLMM models did not converge. We used Cox mixed-effects proportional-hazards models (coxme) to understand how paternal age and paternal sperm storage duration affected the age-dependent mortality of offspring. All analyses were done in R v3.5.2 (R Core team, 2012), using the packages *stats* (R Core team, 2012), *lme4* (Bates et al, 2015), *glmmTMB* (Brooks et al, 2017), and *coxme* (Therneau, 2015). All LMMs were checked for normality and homoscedasticity of residuals using the *stats* package, and GLMMs were checked for overdispersion whenever appropriate, using the *DHARMA* package (Hartig and Hartig, 2017). We analysed data on sons and daughters separately. Marginal variance ( $R^2_{\text{marginal}}$ ) explained by fixed effects in our models, was calculated using the *sjPlot* (Ludecke, 2023) and *CoxR2* (You and Xu, 2020) packages. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons whenever conducted, were done using Hedges’ *g* in the *effectsize* (R Core team, 2012) package ( $\alpha = 0.05$  for significance tests of effect size). Model comparisons were done using AIC function in the *stats* package.

Unless mentioned otherwise, we started with a “full model” that included two-way interactions between paternal sperm storage duration and paternal age. For models on reproductive ageing in offspring, our full model additionally included offspring age in a three-way interaction with paternal age and sperm storage. These full models were used to interpret the highest order interactions only. To then interpret lower order interactions or main-effects whenever higher order-interactions were non-significant, we fitted models with

the highest level of interaction removed (following Engqvist, 2005). Main effects indicated independent effects of variables when averaged across the effects of other variables.

F0 assays

We analysed how paternal age and sperm storage duration affected the reproductive output of fathers. We modelled the number of offspring produced by fathers as our dependent variable, with zero-inflated negative binomial error distribution, because this distribution fit data better than Poisson ( $\Delta AIC = 6624$ ,  $\Delta DF = 2$ ) or zero-inflated Poisson ( $\Delta AIC = 1283$ ,  $\Delta DF = 1$ ) error distributions. We modelled paternal age, sperm storage duration, their interaction, copulation duration, and replicate as fixed effects. Copulation duration was included to account for males who copulate for longer durations transferring more sperm to females, thus producing more offspring.

F1 assays

*Reproductive ageing (Table 1)*

To understand the effects of paternal treatment on age-dependent reproductive output of daughters, we built a GLMM with zero-inflated negative binomial error distribution. This model was a better fit to the data than one with Poisson ( $\Delta AIC = 20967$ ,  $\Delta DF = 3$ ) or zero-inflated Poisson ( $\Delta AIC = 3151$ ,  $\Delta DF = 1$ ) error distribution. We modelled the number of offspring produced over 24 hours by daughters, measured once every two weeks from birth to death, as the dependent variable. We included paternal age, paternal sperm storage duration, the age of daughters, their three-way interaction, and replicate as fixed effects. In the same model, we included a quadratic term for daughter's age (which significantly improved model

fit compared to only a linear term,  $P < 0.001$ ), because reproductive ageing patterns are often curvilinear (Jones et al, 2014; Sanghvi et al, 2024). Effects of paternal age on offspring lifetime reproduction might be biased, if demographic processes such as selective disappearance cause non-random death of offspring over time. In our model, we thus additionally included the lifespan of daughters as a fixed effect, to account for selective disappearance (Bouwhuis et al, 2009; Sanghvi et al, 2022). We further included the number of offspring that fathers produced as a fixed effect, to investigate whether fathers compensate for lower quality offspring by producing more offspring. We modelled daughter ID nested within paternal ID as random effects.

To understand the effects of paternal treatment on age-dependent reproductive output of sons, we built a GLMM with a negative binomial error distribution. This model was a better fit to the data than one with Poisson ( $\Delta AIC = 13177$ ,  $\Delta DF = 1$ ) or zero inflated Poisson ( $\Delta AIC = 4211$ ,  $\Delta DF = 0$ ) error distributions. The fixed and random effects in the model for reproductive output of sons were identical to those in our model for reproductive output of daughters (as described above), except for one difference. Specifically, for sons, we modelled only a linear term for the age at reproduction of sons, because a quadratic term did not improve model fit ( $\Delta AIC = 2$ ,  $\Delta DF = 1$ ,  $P = 0.766$  with L.R.T. under a Chi-sq. distribution).

### *Actuarial ageing (Table 1)*

We used Cox- mixed-effects proportional hazards models to investigate the age-dependent mortality risk to sons and daughters separately. However, our models for both sons and daughters were identically structured. We modelled the lifespan of offspring as the dependent variable. Paternal age, paternal sperm storage duration, their two-way interaction, and replicate were included as fixed effects. The number of offspring sired by fathers was

modelled as a fixed effect, to test whether fathers compensate for low survival of offspring by producing more offspring. We modelled paternal ID as a random effect.

Table 1: Detailed model structure for each statistical model in our study. Model aim, dependent variables, fixed and random effects, and model type for the best-fitting model (determined using AIC comparisons) are reported. Proportion of variance in data explained by fixed effects reported as marginal  $R^2$ .

Generation	Model	Dependent variable	Fixed effects	Random effects	Model type	$R^2_{\text{marginal}}$
F0 (fathers)	Reproductive output	Number of offspring produced	Age*sperm storage + copulation duration + replicate		Zero-inflated negative binomial	3.3%
F1 (offspring)	Reproductive ageing (daughters)	Number of offspring produced in a day of egg laying	Paternal age*paternal sperm storage*age + age^2 + lifespan + paternal fecundity + replicate	1 Paternal ID/daughter ID	Zero-inflated negative binomial	38.8%
	Reproductive ageing (sons)	Number of offspring produced in a day of egg laying	Paternal age*paternal sperm storage*age + lifespan + paternal fecundity + replicate	1 Paternal ID/son ID	Negative binomial	2.6%
	Actuarial ageing (daughters)	Lifespan	Paternal age*paternal sperm storage + paternal fecundity + replicate	1 Paternal ID	Cox-proportional hazards	6.5%
	Actuarial ageing (sons)	Lifespan	Paternal age*paternal sperm storage + paternal fecundity + replicate	1 Paternal ID	Cox-proportional hazards	4.8%

## Results

### F0 assays

We found no interaction between paternal age and sperm storage duration influencing the number of offspring produced by fathers ( $z = 0.343$ ,  $P = 0.731$ , Figure 2B, Table S2). However, paternal age ( $z = 2.130$ ,  $P = 0.033$ ), but not sperm storage duration ( $z = 0.810$ ,  $P = 0.419$ , Figure 2B), independently affected the number of offspring fathers produced, with young fathers producing more offspring than old fathers.




Figure 2: Effects of age and sperm storage treatment, on the number of offspring sired by fathers across the four paternal treatments: old age, long sperm storage (OO); old age, short sperm storage (OY); young age, long sperm storage (YO); young age, short sperm storage (YY). Means and SE shown along with the raw data points.

F1 (offspring) assays

### *Reproductive ageing*

The three- or two- way interaction of paternal age, paternal sperm storage duration, and the age of daughters, had no significant effect on the number of offspring produced by daughters (Figure 3, Table S3). Furthermore, paternal age ( $z = -1.14$ ,  $P = 0.254$ ) or paternal sperm storage duration ( $z = 1.43$ ,  $P = 0.153$ ) did not significantly influence the reproductive output of daughters (Table S3). However, daughters produced fewer offspring when old than when young (daughter age as quadratic:  $z = -3.410$ ,  $P = 0.001$ ; as linear:  $z = -6.050$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). Daughters that lived longer also produced more offspring at a given age, than daughters that lived shorter lives (daughter's lifespan:  $z = 2.710$ ,  $P = 0.007$ , Figure 4A), a result consistent with selective disappearance. Paternal reproductive output did not influence the reproductive output of daughters ( $z = -0.020$ ,  $P = 0.984$ , Figure S3A).

We found no significant effect of three-way or two-way interactions between paternal age, paternal sperm storage duration, and the age of sons, to affect the number of offspring produced by sons (Figure S4, Table S4). Similarly, paternal age did not have a significant effect ( $z = 0.160$ ,  $P = 0.875$ ). However, we found a marginally significant effect of paternal sperm storage duration ( $z = 2.030$ ,  $P = 0.043$ , Figure 5A) on the number of offspring produced by sons. Overall, sons born to fathers who stored sperm for eight days (i.e. long sperm storage) had a 4.2% lower reproductive output than sons born to fathers who stored sperm for two days. Post-hoc tests revealed that the magnitude of this difference was greatest in the early life of sons (Hedge's  $g$  at 4 days old:  $-0.22$ , 6.5% difference; Figure 5A, 5B). The number of offspring sired by fathers was positively correlated with the number of offspring sired by their sons ( $z = 2.930$ ,  $P = 0.003$ , Figure S5). However, unlike in daughters, we did not find significant evidence for selective disappearance in sons (son's lifespan:  $z = 1.660$ ,  $P$



= 0.097; Figure 4B). When averaged across other variables, sons produced fewer offspring with advancing age ( $z = -4.43$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ).

### Actuarial ageing

Paternal age, paternal sperm storage duration, or their two-way interaction, did not significantly influence age-dependent mortality risk of daughters (Figure 6A, Table S5) or sons (Table S6). However, the number of offspring sired by fathers was significantly correlated with the mortality risk of their sons ( $z = -2.260$ ,  $P = 0.024$ , Figure S5), but not daughters ( $z = 0.500$ ,  $P = 0.610$ , Figure S5). Specifically, fathers who produced more offspring conceived sons that had higher rates of survival.




Figure 3: No effect of paternal age or paternal sperm storage duration on the number of offspring produced by daughters. OO: Old paternal age, long paternal sperm storage; OY: Old paternal age, short paternal sperm storage; YO: young paternal age, long paternal sperm storage; YY: young paternal age, short paternal sperm storage. Means and SE shown along with raw data. Each light dot represents measurements on a single daughter for a given age.




Figure 4: A- Daughters who lived longer consistently produced more offspring throughout life, than daughters who lived shorter lives, suggesting selective disappearance. B- We found no significant evidence for selective disappearance in sons. Data binned within 5 lifespan ranges. Curves plotted as glm-poisson. Shaded areas represent 95% C.I.




Figure 5: A- Effect of paternal sperm storage duration on the number of offspring produced by sons, when averaged across effects of other variables. Means and SE shown along with raw data. O: long paternal sperm storage, Y: short paternal sperm storage. Each light dot represents measurements on a single son at a given age. B- Effect of paternal sperm storage duration on reproductive success of sons is significant when sons are 4 days old. Effect sizes (Hedges; g) used for comparisons, and significance tests based on whether the 95% C.I. overlaps with zero or not. Negative effect sizes indicate that sons from fathers with long sperm storage duration, have lower reproductive output than sons from fathers with short sperm storage. Means and C.I. shown.




Figure 6: No significant effect of paternal age or paternal sperm storage duration on the age-dependent survival probability of A- daughters, or B- sons. Dotted lines show age at median survival probability. OO: old paternal age, long paternal sperm storage; OY: old paternal age, short paternal sperm storage; YO: young paternal age, long paternal sperm storage; YY: young paternal age, short paternal sperm storage. “+” shows censoring (lost, accidentally killed, or mislabelled).

## Discussion

Paternal age effects can have far-reaching ramifications for organismal evolution. However, determining the causal effect of paternal age on offspring phenotype and fitness requires experimental control of potential confounds, which is challenging. We investigated how paternal age and paternal sperm storage duration affect the reproductive output of fathers, and the reproductive and actuarial ageing of their offspring. We found older fathers to have lower reproductive output, suggesting reproductive senescence, but found no significant evidence for paternal age effects on offspring (H1). Additionally, we did not find evidence for paternal sperm storage duration interacting with paternal age, to influence offspring phenotypes (H2). Instead, we found weak evidence for an independent effect of paternal sperm storage duration on the reproductive output of sons. Furthermore, the lack of paternal age effects was

consistently observed irrespective of offspring age (H3). We also found no evidence for paternal age to affect sons more than daughters, but observed this pattern for paternal sperm storage duration (H4). Lastly, there were no trade-offs between offspring quantity versus quality produced by fathers. Instead, fathers that produced more offspring also produced higher quality sons (H5).

We found no significant effect of paternal age on offspring, when separated from effects of paternal sperm storage duration (H1). Paternal age effects have been widely reported across taxa (e.g. Crow, 2003; Monaghan et al, 2020; Schroeder et al, 2015; Vuarin et al, 2019), including in humans (Chang and Robaire, 2022), with offspring from old fathers having lower fitness than offspring from young fathers (reviewed in Monaghan and Metcalfe, 2019). However, most studies on paternal age effects do not control for duration of sperm storage. The lack of an effect in our study might suggest some of the previous reports misattributing deleterious effects of paternal sperm storage to paternal age (reviewed in Pizzari et al, 2008, Sanghvi et al, 2024). In fruit flies for example, experimental males are often unmated until they are used to sire progeny (e.g. Aguilar et al, 2023; Mossman et al, 2019; Nystrand and Dowling, 2014; Price and Hansen, 1998; Priest et al, 2002). Male fruit flies are characterised by spermatogenesis throughout their adult life (Bjork et al, 2007; Sepil et al, 2020) and low rates of sperm loss (Demarco et al, 2014; Santos et al, 2023). These might lead to the accumulation of deteriorating sperm within the male reproductive tract, such that old virgin fathers have more deteriorated sperm than young virgin fathers. Only few studies have attempted to separate paternal age versus sperm storage effects, albeit in other species. For example, Gasparini et al (2019) report independent effects of both, paternal age and sperm storage duration, on paternal fertility in guppies; Jones et al (2004) show interactive effects between paternal age and sperm storage duration on paternal fertilisation success, in hide beetles; Vega-Trejo et al (2019) show no effect of paternal age or sperm

storage duration on paternal sperm traits, in mosquitofish; while Meunier et al (2022) show effects of paternal age but not of sperm storage duration on sperm traits and offspring survival, in bustards. None of these studies however, measured offspring lifetime reproductive success (the key metric of evolutionary fitness), as we were able to do in the present study.

The lack of a paternal age effect could also reflect deleterious effects being balanced by beneficial effects of having old fathers (Sanghvi, Pizzari et al, 2024). For instance, fathers who have survived to older ages might represent a biased subset of fathers with alleles that confer longer lifespans (due to viability selection: Brooks and Kemp, 2001; Hansen and Price, 1995; Johnson and Gemmell, 2012; Kokko, 1998; Sanghvi, Pizzari et al, 2024). Similarly, fathers of poor reproductive value could selectively disappear with age (Bouwhuis et al, 2009; Hamalainen et al, 2014; Sanghvi et al, 2022), leading to old surviving fathers having alleles for higher reproductive output. These processes (selective disappearance and viability selection) might have underestimated paternal age effects in our study, due to fathers being sampled-cross sectionally rather than the same fathers being sampled longitudinally. The lack of a paternal age effect in our study could also occur due to female-driven processes. For example, female fruit flies might bias fertilisation toward good quality sperm via cryptic female choice (e.g Hadlow et al, 2023; reviewed in Firman et al, 2017; Sanghvi et al, 2024; Vuarin et al, 2019).

We did not find evidence that old fathers who stored sperm for long durations, produce lower quality offspring than other treatments (H2). Old males are hypothesized to have poorer DNA repair machinery than young males (Chen et al, 2023; Gorbunova et al, 2007; Selvaratnam et al, 2015; Weirich-Schwaiger et al, 1994), which could lead to old fathers being worse at repairing sperm damage than young fathers (Pizzari et al, 2008). The lack of an interaction between paternal age and sperm storage duration in our study could be

due to sperm storage for eight days not being sufficient to increase mutation load in paternal sperm, or old fathers being able to repair DNA damage in mature sperm, well enough to ameliorate deleterious effects of sperm storage.

We found weak evidence for deleterious effects of paternal sperm storage duration on the early-life reproductive output of sons. Several studies have demonstrated that storage of mature spermatozoa can deteriorate sperm quality (Agarwal et al, 2016; Brindle et al, 2023; Cattelan and Gasparini, 2021; Comar et al, 2017; Gasparini et al, 2014, 2019; Hettyey et al, 2012; Levitas et al, 2005; Radhakrishnan and Fedorka, 2011), and lead to offspring having lower fitness (Gasparini et al, 2017; Wagner et al, 2004; White et al, 2008). The likely mechanism causing such deleterious effects is sperm storage increasing oxidative stress in sperm and causing increased sperm DNA fragmentation (Barbagallo et al, 2022; Wetzker et al, 2024). Other studies however, have not obtained evidence for such deleterious effects (Firman et al, 2015; Hotzy et al, 2020; Meunier et al, 2022; Vega-Trejo et al, 2019). There are several explanations for only a weak effect of paternal sperm storage duration on offspring being recorded in our study. First, sperm could be continuously re-absorbed or lost in fathers, leading to low levels of sperm damage despite long durations of sexual rest (Pizzari et al, 2008; Reinhardt and Siva-Jothy, 2005; Reinhardt, 2007). Second, a weak effect could indicate sperm not being stratified in males (Reinhardt, 2007), causing fresh and stored sperm to be mixed in paternal ejaculates. Third, it is possible that not all the sperm stored in male reserves were ejaculated by F0 males in our stripping assay (Sanghvi, Shandilya et al, 2024), leading to less effective sperm storage treatments. Fourth, if sperm haploid genomes are expressed in fruit flies, selection on sperm haplotypes could lead to the death of poor-quality sperm in fathers who stored sperm for long durations (Alavioon et al, 2017; Immler, 2019; Otto et al, 2015). This selective death could buffer deleterious effects of paternal sperm storage duration on offspring. Fifth, females could be actively ejecting sperm stored for

longer durations in males, thus buffering the effects of sperm storage (Reinhardt and Siva-Jothy, 2005; Snook and Hosken, 2004). In our study, the effect of sperm storage on the reproductive output of sons was significant, despite its magnitude being small. This statistical significance could thus be an artefact of having a large sample size (of ~180 sons per treatment) rather than a true biological pattern. We only manipulated sperm storage duration in fathers, but future studies can investigate whether sperm storage in mothers (reviewed in Orr and Brennan, 2015) also influence offspring phenotypes.

We predicted (H3) that deleterious effects of old paternal age would be more severe for old than young offspring (Brengdahl et al, 2023; Moorad and Promislow, 2008; reviewed in Monaghan et al, 2020). Such an interaction could occur if senescence in offspring exacerbated effects of a higher mutation load inherited from old parents (Chen et al, 2023; Girard et al, 2016; Kong et al, 2012; Yatsenko and Turek, 2018). Studies on fruit flies show that male germlines accumulate mutations with age (Garcia et al, 2010; Wang et al, 2022), that age-specific mutation accumulation can lead to accelerated senescence (Brengdahl et al, 2020; Yampolsky et al, 2000), and that old fathers have a higher germline mutation load than young fathers (Witt et al, 2023). A lack of support for the predicted interactive effect in our study might indicate that inherited mutations in fruit flies are mostly selectively neutral (reviewed in de Jong et al, 2023) in their fitness effects. Selective disappearance could have also masked such an interactive effect in daughters, where daughters of worse reproductive quality selectively died with age. Overall, we encourage future studies to not only quantify age-dependent mutation rates and epigenetic changes in old paternal sperm (e.g. Oakes et al, 2003; Suvorov et al, 2020), but also investigate their inter-generational phenotypic effects.

We did not find paternal age to have sex-specific effects on offspring (H4), likely due to an overall absence of paternal age effects in our study. This lack of evidence also suggests that mechanisms of inheritance causing sex-specific paternal age effects, might be absent in



fruit flies. Lastly, we did not find evidence that fathers who produced more offspring also produced offspring of poorer quality due to a trade-off between these traits (H5). Instead, paternal fecundity co-varied positively with the survival and reproductive output of their sons. These results might be explained by heterogeneity in paternal condition, such that fathers who can acquire more resources are able to invest in both, offspring production (e.g. via higher ejaculate production) and offspring quality (e.g. via sperm repair) without trade-offs (Reznick et al, 2000; Roff and Fairbairn, 2007). Due to these covariances being apparent only in sons but not in daughters, these results might alternatively be explained by sex-specific heritability of fitness-components (Calsbeek et al, 2015; Connallon, 2012; Weiss et al, 2006) in fruit flies.

## Conclusions

Our study challenges the commonly held prediction that older fathers produce lower quality offspring, and we find no evidence for deleterious paternal age effects. The absence of a paternal age effect persists irrespective of the age of sons and daughters, or the duration of paternal sperm storage. These results call for a re-evaluation of the causes and consequences of paternal age effects, under a framework that incorporates selective disappearance, condition dependence, life-history trade-offs, and variable paternal mating rates. We emphasize that post-meiotic sperm damage during sperm storage/sexual rest might be an under-appreciated modulator of offspring phenotypic variation, especially in species where low male mating rates and long-term female sperm storage are commonplace. The interactive influence of male age and sexual rest on male reproductive output and his offspring's phenotypes, might be crucial in modulating female sperm ejection (Wagner et al, 2004), mate choice (Johnson and Gemmell, 2012), polyandry, and last-male sperm precedence (Snook

and Hosken, 2014). Overall, we highlight the importance of simultaneously understanding various mechanisms by which advancing organismal age might influence offspring directly (e.g. sex-specific inheritance, mutation accumulation) or indirectly (e.g. sperm storage, selective disappearance, trade-offs, condition dependence).

## **Supplementary information statement**

Supplementary information is provided along with this manuscript

## **Data availability statement**

Data and associated code for this study are available at OSF under an anonymous folder: [https://osf.io/gq9j2/?view\\_only=362a13e2bd6f4b958e5fba66e7c75a2e](https://osf.io/gq9j2/?view_only=362a13e2bd6f4b958e5fba66e7c75a2e)

## 54References

- 546garwal, A., Gupta, S., Du Plessis, S., Sharma, R., Esteves, S.C., Cirenza, C., Eliwa, J., Al-Najjar, W., Kumaresan, D., Haroun, N.,  
547 Philby, S., Sabanegh, E., 2016. Abstinence Time and Its Impact on Basic and Advanced Semen Parameters. *Urology* 94,  
548 102–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2016.03.059>
- 549guilar, P., Dag, B., Carazo, P., Sultanova, Z., 2023. Sex-specific paternal age effects on offspring quality in *Drosophila*  
550 *melanogaster*. *J of Evolutionary Biology* jeb.14167. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.14167>
- 551ich, U., Chowdhury, S., Jennions, M.D., 2022. Separating the effects of paternal age and mating history: Evidence for  
552 sex-specific paternal effect in eastern mosquitofish. *Evolution* 76, 1565–1577. <https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.14498>
- 553lavioon, G., Hotzy, C., Nakhro, K., Rudolf, S., Scofield, D.G., Zajitschek, S., Maklakov, A.A., Immler, S., 2017. Haploid  
554 selection within a single ejaculate increases offspring fitness. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 114, 8053–8058.  
555 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1705601114>
- 556ngell, C.S., Janacek, R., Rundle, H.D., 2022. Maternal and Paternal Age Effects on Male Antler Flies: A Field Experiment. *The*  
557 *American Naturalist* 199, 436–442. <https://doi.org/10.1086/718236>
- 558rslan, R.C., Willführ, K.P., Frans, E.M., Verweij, K.J.H., Bürkner, P.-C., Myrskylä, M., Voland, E., Almqvist, C., Zietsch, B.P.,  
559 Penke, L., 2017. Older fathers' children have lower evolutionary fitness across four centuries and in four populations. *Proc.*  
560 *R. Soc. B.* 284, 20171562. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.1562>
- 561adyaev, A.V., Uller, T., 2009. Parental effects in ecology and evolution: mechanisms, processes and implications. *Phil. Trans. R.*  
562 *Soc. B* 364, 1169–1177. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0302>
- 563ates, D., Kliegl, R., Vasishth, S., Baayen, H., 2015. Parsimonious Mixed Models. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1506.04967>
- 564auch, C., Boonekamp, J.J., Korsten, P., Mulder, E., Verhulst, S., 2019. Epigenetic inheritance of telomere length in wild birds.  
565 *PLoS Genet* 15, e1007827. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1007827>
- 566arbagallo, F., Cannarella, R., Crafa, A., Manna, C., La Vignera, S., Condorelli, R.A., Calogero, A.E., 2022. The Impact of a Very  
567 Short Abstinence Period on Conventional Sperm Parameters and Sperm DNA Fragmentation: A Systematic Review and  
568 Meta-Analysis. *JCM* 11, 7303. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm11247303>
- 569jork, A., Dallai, R., Pitnick, S., 2007. Adaptive modulation of sperm production rate in *Drosophila bifurca*, a species with giant  
570 sperm. *Biol. Lett.* 3, 517–519. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2007.0219>
- 571ouwhuis, S., Sheldon, B.C., Verhulst, S., Charmantier, A., 2009. Great tits growing old: selective disappearance and the  
572 partitioning of senescence to stages within the breeding cycle. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* 276, 2769–2777.  
573 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2009.0457>
- 574ouwhuis, S., Vedder, O., Becker, P.H., 2015. Sex-specific pathways of parental age effects on offspring lifetime reproductive  
575 success in a long-lived seabird: SEX-SPECIFIC PARENTAL EFFECTS ON OFFSPRING FITNESS. *Evolution* 69, 1760–  
576 1771. <https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.12692>
- 577rengdahl, M.I., Kimber, C.M., Elias, P., Thompson, J., Friberg, U., 2020. Deleterious mutations show increasing negative effects  
578 with age in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *BMC Biol* 18, 128. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-020-00858-5>
- 579rengdahl, M.I., Kimber, C.M., Sheno, V.N., Dumea, M., Mital, A., Friberg, U., 2023. Age-specific effects of deletions:  
580 implications for aging theories. *Evolution* 77, 254–263. <https://doi.org/10.1093/evolut/qpac027>
- 581rindle, M., Ferguson-Gow, H., Williamson, J., Thomsen, R., Sommer, V., 2023. The evolution of masturbation is associated with  
582 postcopulatory selection and pathogen avoidance in primates. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* 290, 20230061.  
583 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2023.0061>
- 584rooks, M.E., Kristensen, K., van Benthem, K.J., Magnusson, A., Berg, C.W., Nielsen, A., Skaug, H.J., Mächler, M., Bolker,  
585 B.M., 2017. Modeling zero-inflated count data with glmmTMB (preprint). *Ecology*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/132753>
- 586rooks, R., Kemp, D.J., 2001. Can older males deliver the good genes? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 16, 308–313.  
587 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(01\)02147-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(01)02147-4)
- 588yrne, M., Agerbo, E., Ewald, H., Eaton, W.W., Mortensen, P.B., 2003. Parental Age and Risk of Schizophrenia: A Case-control  
589 Study. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 60, 673. <https://doi.org/10.1001/archpsyc.60.7.673>
- 590alsbeek, R., Duryea, M.C., Goedert, D., Bergeron, P., Cox, R.M., 2015. Intralocus sexual conflict, adaptive sex allocation, and the  
591 heritability of fitness. *J of Evolutionary Biology* 28, 1975–1985. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.12713>
- 592arnes, B.A., Riesch, R., Schlupp, I., 2012. The Delayed Impact of Parental Age on Offspring Mortality in Mice. *The Journals of*  
593 *Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences* 67A, 351–357. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gerona/glr116>

- 594 Carothers, A.D., Collyer, S., Mey, R., Frackiewicz, A., 1978. Parental age and birth order in the aetiology of some sex chromosome  
595 aneuploidies. *Ann Human Genet* 41, 277–287. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-1809.1978.tb01895.x>
- 596 Battelan, S., Gasparini, C., 2021. Male sperm storage impairs sperm quality in the zebrafish. *Sci Rep* 11, 16689.  
597 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-94976-x>
- 598 Han, P.T.K., Robaire, B., 2022. Advanced Paternal Age and Future Generations. *Front. Endocrinol.* 13, 897101.  
599 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fendo.2022.897101>
- 600 Hen, H., Krieg, T., Mautz, B., Jolly, C., Scofield, D., Maklakov, A.A., Immler, S., 2023. Germline mutation rate is elevated in  
601 young and old parents in *Caenorhabditis remanei*. *Evolution Letters* grad052. <https://doi.org/10.1093/evlett/grad052>
- 602 Hen, Q., Yan, W., Duan, E., 2016. Epigenetic inheritance of acquired traits through sperm RNAs and sperm RNA modifications.  
603 *Nat Rev Genet* 17, 733–743. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg.2016.106>
- 604 Clancy, Kennington, 2001. A simple method to achieve consistent larval density in bottle cultures. *Dros. Inf. Serv.* 84.
- 605 Omar, V.A., Petersen, C.G., Mauri, A.L., Mattila, M., Vagnini, L.D., Renzi, A., Petersen, B., Nicoletti, A., Dieamant, F., Oliveira,  
606 J.B.A., Baruffi, R.L.R., Franco Jr, J.G., 2017. Influence of the abstinence period on human sperm quality: analysis of 2,458  
607 semen samples. *JBRA Assisted Reproduction*. <https://doi.org/10.5935/1518-0557.20170052>
- 608 Connallon, T., 2010. Genic Capture, Sex Linkage, and the Heritability of Fitness. *The American Naturalist* 175, 564–576.  
609 <https://doi.org/10.1086/651590>
- 610 Riscuolo, F., Zahn, S., Bize, P., 2017. Offspring telomere length in the long lived Alpine swift is negatively related to the age of  
611 their biological father and foster mother. *Biol. Lett.* 13, 20170188. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2017.0188>
- 612 Row, J.F., 2003. There's Something Curious About Paternal-Age Effects. *Science* 301, 606–607.  
613 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1088552>
- 614 Row, J.F., 2000. The origins, patterns and implications of human spontaneous mutation. *Nat Rev Genet* 1, 40–47.  
615 <https://doi.org/10.1038/35049558>
- 616 Jong, M.J., Van Oosterhout, C., Hoelzel, A.R., Janke, A., 2023. Moderating the neutralist–selectionist debate: exactly which  
617 propositions are we debating, and which arguments are valid? *Biological Reviews* brv.13010.  
618 <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.13010>
- 619 Manuel, M., Wu, F.L., Przeworski, M., 2022. A paternal bias in germline mutation is widespread in amniotes and can arise  
620 independently of cell division numbers. *eLife* 11, e80008. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.80008>
- 621 Demarco, R.S., Eikenes, Å.H., Haglund, K., Jones, D.L., 2014. Investigating spermatogenesis in *Drosophila melanogaster*.  
622 *Methods* 68, 218–227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymeth.2014.04.020>
- 623 Benomme, M.M., Parks, J.C., McCallie, B.R., McCubbin, N.I., Schoolcraft, W.B., Katz-Jaffe, M.G., 2020. Advanced paternal age  
624 directly impacts mouse embryonic placental imprinting. *PLoS ONE* 15, e0229904.  
625 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0229904>
- 626 Harmarajan, M., 1950. Effect on the Embryo of Staleness of the Sperm at the Time of Fertilization in the Domestic Hen. *Nature*  
627 165, 398–398. <https://doi.org/10.1038/165398a0>
- 628 Douglas, T., Anderson, R., Saltz, J.B., 2020. Limits to male reproductive potential across mating bouts in *Drosophila melanogaster*.  
629 *Animal Behaviour* 160, 25–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2019.11.009>
- 630 Illegren, H., 2007. Characteristics, causes and evolutionary consequences of male-biased mutation. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* 274, 1–10.  
631 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2006.3720>
- 632 Engqvist, L., 2005. The mistreatment of covariate interaction terms in linear model analyses of behavioural and evolutionary  
633 ecology studies. *Animal Behaviour* 70, 967–971. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2005.01.016>
- 634 Evans, J.P., Wilson, A.J., Pilastro, A., Garcia-Gonzalez, F., 2019. Ejaculate-mediated paternal effects: evidence, mechanisms and  
635 evolutionary implications. *Reproduction* 157, R109–R126. <https://doi.org/10.1530/REP-18-0524>
- 636 Bay, R., Barbraud, C., Delord, K., Weimerskirch, H., 2016. Paternal but not maternal age influences early-life performance of  
637 offspring in a long-lived seabird. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* 283, 20152318. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.2318>
- 638 Birman, R.C., Gasparini, C., Manier, M.K., Pizzari, T., 2017. Postmating Female Control: 20 Years of Cryptic Female Choice.  
639 *Trends Ecol Evol* 32, 368–382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2017.02.010>
- 640 Birman, R.C., Young, F.J., Rowe, D.C., Duong, H.T., Gasparini, C., 2015. Sexual rest and post-meiotic sperm ageing in house  
641 mice. *J. Evol. Biol.* 28, 1373–1382. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.12661>

- 642ischer, B., Taborsky, B., Kokko, H., 2011. How to balance the offspring quality–quantity tradeoff when environmental cues are  
643 unreliable. *Oikos* 120, 258–270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2010.18642.x>
- 644ao, Z., Moorjani, P., Sasani, T.A., Pedersen, B.S., Quinlan, A.R., Jorde, L.B., Amster, G., Przeworski, M., 2019. Overlooked  
645 roles of DNA damage and maternal age in generating human germline mutations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 116, 9491–  
646 9500. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1901259116>
- 647arcia, A.M., Calder, R.B., Dollé, M.E.T., Lundell, M., Kapahi, P., Vijg, J., 2010. Age- and Temperature-Dependent Somatic  
648 Mutation Accumulation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *PLoS Genet* 6, e1000950.  
649 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1000950>
- 650asparini, C., Daymond, E., Evans, J.P., 2018. Extreme fertilization bias towards freshly inseminated sperm in a species exhibiting  
651 prolonged female sperm storage. *R. Soc. open sci.* 5, 172195. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.172195>
- 652asparini, C., Devigili, A., Pilastro, A., 2019. Sexual selection and ageing: interplay between pre- and post-copulatory traits  
653 senescence in the guppy. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* 286, 20182873. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.2873>
- 654asparini, C., Dosselli, R., Evans, J.P., 2017. Sperm storage by males causes changes in sperm phenotype and influences the  
655 reproductive fitness of males and their sons. *Evol Lett* 1, 16–25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evl3.2>
- 656asparini, C., Kelley, J.L., Evans, J.P., 2014. Male sperm storage compromises sperm motility in guppies. *Biol Lett* 10, 20140681.  
657 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2014.0681>
- 658irard, S.L., Bourassa, C.V., Lemieux Perreault, L.-P., Legault, M.-A., Barhdadi, A., Ambalavanan, A., Brendgen, M., Vitaro, F.,  
659 Noreau, A., Dionne, G., Tremblay, R.E., Dion, P.A., Boivin, M., Dubé, M.-P., Rouleau, G.A., 2016. Paternal Age Explains a  
660 Major Portion of De Novo Germline Mutation Rate Variability in Healthy Individuals. *PLoS ONE* 11, e0164212.  
661 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0164212>
- 662orbunova, V., Seluanov, A., Mao, Z., Hine, C., 2007. Changes in DNA repair during aging. *Nucleic Acids Res* 35, 7466–7474.  
663 <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkm756>
- 664adlow, J.H., Lymbery, R.A., Evans, J.P., 2023. Paternal environment effects are driven by female reproductive fluid but not  
665 sperm age in an external fertiliser. *Biol. Lett.* 19, 20230368. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2023.0368>
- 666ämäläinen, A., Dammhahn, M., Aujard, F., Eberle, M., Hardy, I., Kappeler, P.M., Perret, M., Schliehe-Diecks, S., Kraus, C.,  
667 2014. Senescence or selective disappearance? Age trajectories of body mass in wild and captive populations of a small-  
668 bodied primate. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* 281, 20140830. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.0830>
- 669ansen, T.F., Price, D.K., 1995. Good genes and old age: Do old mates provide superior genes? *J Evolution Biol* 8, 759–778.  
670 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1420-9101.1995.8060759.x>
- 671artig, F., Hartig, M.F., 2017. Package ‘DHARMA’. R package. <https://cran.r-hub.io/web/packages/DHARMA/DHARMA.pdf>
- 672eidinger, B.J., Herborn, K.A., Granroth-Wilding, H.M.V., Boner, W., Burthe, S., Newell, M., Wanless, S., Daunt, F.,  
673 Monaghan, P., 2016. Parental age influences offspring telomere loss. *Funct Ecol* 30, 1531–1538.  
674 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12630>
- 675ercus, M.J., Hoffmann, A.A., 2000. Maternal and grandmaternal age influence offspring fitness in *Drosophila*. *Proc. R. Soc.*  
676 *Lond. B* 267, 2105–2110. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2000.1256>
- 677ettyey, A., Vági, B., Penn, D.J., Hoi, H., Wagner, R.H., 2012. Post-Meiotic Intra-Testicular Sperm Senescence in a Wild  
678 Vertebrate. *PLoS ONE* 7, e50820. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0050820>
- 679opkins, B.R., Sepil, I., Thézénas, M.-L., Craig, J.F., Miller, T., Charles, P.D., Fischer, R., Kessler, B.M., Bretman, A., Pizzari, T.,  
680 Wigby, S., 2019. Divergent allocation of sperm and the seminal proteome along a competition gradient in *Drosophila*  
681 *melanogaster*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 116, 17925–17933. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1906149116>
- 682otzy, C., Xuhui, B., Larva, T., Immler, S., 2020. Intrinsic post-ejaculation sperm ageing does not affect offspring fitness in  
683 Atlantic salmon. *J Evol Biol* 33, 576–583. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.13590>
- 684mmler, S., 2019. Haploid Selection in “Diploid” Organisms. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 50, 219–236.  
685 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110218-024709>
- 686necka, M., Mill, J., Basson, M.A., Goriely, A., Spiers, H., Reichenberg, A., Schalkwyk, L., Fernandes, C., 2017. Advanced  
687 paternal age effects in neurodevelopmental disorders—review of potential underlying mechanisms. *Transl Psychiatry* 7,  
688 e1019–e1019. <https://doi.org/10.1038/tp.2016.294>
- 689hnson, S.L., Gemmell, N.J., 2012. Are old males still good males and can females tell the difference?: Do hidden advantages of  
690 mating with old males off-set costs related to fertility, or are we missing something else? *Bioessays* 34, 609–619.  
691 <https://doi.org/10.1002/bies.201100157>

- 692 Johnson, S.L., Zellhuber-McMillan, S., Gillum, J., Dunleavy, J., Evans, J.P., Nakagawa, S., Gemmell, N.J., 2018. Evidence that  
693 fertility trades off with early offspring fitness as males age. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* 285, 20172174.  
694 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.2174>
- 695 Jones, O.R., Scheuerlein, A., Salguero-Gómez, R., Camarda, C.G., Schaible, R., Casper, B.B., Dahlgren, J.P., Ehrlén, J., García,  
696 M.B., Menges, E.S., Quintana-Ascencio, P.F., Caswell, H., Baudisch, A., Vaupel, J.W., 2014. Diversity of ageing across the  
697 tree of life. *Nature* 505, 169–173. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12789>
- 698 Jones, T.M., Elgar, M.A., 2004. The role of male age, sperm age and mating history on fecundity and fertilization success in the  
699 hide beetle. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* 271, 1311–1318. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2004.2723>
- 700 Jonsson, H., Sulem, P., Kehr, B., Kristmundsdottir, S., Zink, F., Hjartarson, E., Hardarson, M.T., Hjorleifsson, K.E., Eggertsson,  
701 H.P., Gudjonsson, S.A., Ward, L.D., Arnadottir, G.A., Helgason, E.A., Helgason, H., Gylfason, A., Jonasdottir, Adalbjorg,  
702 Jonasdottir, Aslaug, Rafnar, T., Frigge, M., Stacey, S.N., Th. Magnusson, O., Thorsteinsdottir, U., Masson, G., Kong, A.,  
703 Halldorsson, B.V., Helgason, A., Gudbjartsson, D.F., Stefansson, K., 2017. Parental influence on human germline de novo  
704 mutations in 1,548 trios from Iceland. *Nature* 549, 519–522. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature24018>
- 705 Kokko, H., 1998. Good genes, old age and life-history trade-offs. *Evolutionary Ecology* 12, 739–750.  
706 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006541701002>
- 707 Koppik, M., Baur, J., Berger, D., 2023. Increased male investment in sperm competition results in reduced maintenance of gametes.  
708 *PLoS Biol* 21, e3002049. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002049>
- 709 Long, A., Frigge, M.L., Masson, G., Besenbacher, S., Sulem, P., Magnusson, G., Gudjonsson, S.A., Sigurdsson, A., Jonasdottir,  
710 Aslaug, Jonasdottir, Adalbjorg, Wong, W.S.W., Sigurdsson, G., Walters, G.B., Steinberg, S., Helgason, H., Thorleifsson, G.,  
711 Gudbjartsson, D.F., Helgason, A., Magnusson, O.Th., Thorsteinsdottir, U., Stefansson, K., 2012. Rate of de novo mutations  
712 and the importance of father's age to disease risk. *Nature* 488, 471–475. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11396>
- 713 Krishna, M.S., Santhosh, H.T., Hegde, S., 2012. Offspring of Older Males Are Superior in *Drosophila Bipectinata*. *Zoological*  
714 *Studies* 51.
- 715 Evtas, E., Lunenfeld, E., Weiss, N., Friger, M., Har-Vardi, I., Koifman, A., Potashnik, G., 2005. Relationship between the  
716 duration of sexual abstinence and semen quality: analysis of 9,489 semen samples. *Fertility and Sterility* 83, 1680–1686.  
717 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fertnstert.2004.12.045>
- 718 Inklater, J.R., Wertheim, B., Wigby, S., Chapman, T., 2007. EJACULATE DEPLETION PATTERNS EVOLVE IN RESPONSE  
719 TO EXPERIMENTAL MANIPULATION OF SEX RATIO IN *DROSOPHILA MELANOGASTER*. *Evolution* 61, 2027–  
720 2034. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.2007.00157.x>
- 721 Liu, Y., Chen, Q., 2018. 150 years of Darwin's theory of intercellular flow of hereditary information. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 19,  
722 749–750. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41580-018-0072-4>
- 723 Bodge, J.R., Fechheimer, N.S., Jaap, R.G., 1971. The Relationship of in Vivo Sperm Storage Interval to Fertility and Embryonic  
724 Survival in the Chicken. *Biology of Reproduction* 5, 252–257. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biolreprod/5.3.252>
- 725 Boyau, A., Blanchet, S., Van Laere, P., Clobert, J., Danchin, E., 2012. When not to copy: female fruit flies use sophisticated public  
726 information to avoid mated males. *Sci Rep* 2, 768. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep00768>
- 727 Zudecke, D., 2023. sjPlot: Data Visualization for Statistics in Social Science.
- 728 Macartney, E.L., Zeender, V., Meena, A., De Nardo, A.N., Bonduriansky, R., Lüpold, S., 2021. Sperm depletion in relation to  
729 developmental nutrition and genotype in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Evolution* 75, 2830–2841.  
730 <https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.14373>
- 731 Meunier, L., Sorci, G., Abi Hussein, H., Hingrat, Y., Rehspringer, N., Saint-Jalme, M., Lesobre, L., Torres Carreira, J., 2022. Pre-  
732 but not post-meiotic senescence affects sperm quality and reproductive success in the North African houbara bustard. *Front.*  
733 *Ecol. Evol.* 10, 977184. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2022.977184>
- 734 Monaghan, P., Maklakov, A.A., Metcalfe, N.B., 2020. Intergenerational Transfer of Ageing: Parental Age and Offspring Lifespan.  
735 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 35, 927–937. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2020.07.005>
- 736 Monaghan, P., Metcalfe, N.B., 2019. The deteriorating soma and the indispensable germline: gamete senescence and offspring  
737 fitness. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* 286, 20192187. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.2187>
- 738 Moorad, J.A., Promislow, D.E.L., 2008. A Theory of Age-Dependent Mutation and Senescence. *Genetics* 179, 2061–2073.  
739 <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.108.088526>
- 740 Mossman, Jim A., Mabeza, R.M.S., Blake, E., Mehta, N., Rand, D.M., 2019a. Age of Both Parents Influences Reproduction and  
741 Egg Dumping Behavior in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Journal of Heredity* 110, 300–309.  
742 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jhered/esz009>



- 743oguera, J.C., Metcalfe, N.B., Monaghan, P., 2018. Experimental demonstration that offspring fathered by old males have shorter  
744 telomeres and reduced lifespans. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* 285, 20180268. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.0268>
- 745strand, M., Dowling, D.K., 2014. Transgenerational interactions involving parental age and immune status affect female  
746 reproductive success in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* 281, 20141242. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2014.1242>
- 747akes, C.C., Smiraglia, D.J., Plass, C., Trasler, J.M., Robaire, B., 2003. Aging results in hypermethylation of ribosomal DNA in  
748 sperm and liver of male rats. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 100, 1775–1780. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0437971100>
- 749lsson, M., Pauliny, A., Wapstra, E., Uller, T., Schwartz, T., Blomqvist, D., 2011. Sex Differences in Sand Lizard Telomere  
750 Inheritance: Paternal Epigenetic Effects Increases Telomere Heritability and Offspring Survival. *PLoS ONE* 6, e17473.  
751 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0017473>
- 752rr, T.J., Brennan, P.L.R., 2015. Sperm storage: distinguishing selective processes and evaluating criteria. *Trends in Ecology &*  
753 *Evolution* 30, 261–272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.03.006>
- 754tto, S.P., Scott, M.F., Immler, S., 2015. Evolution of haploid selection in predominantly diploid organisms. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*  
755 *U.S.A.* 112, 15952–15957. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1512004112>
- 756aczowski, M., Schoolcraft, W.B., Krisher, R.L., 2015. Dysregulation of methylation and expression of imprinted genes in  
757 oocytes and reproductive tissues in mice of advanced maternal age. *J Assist Reprod Genet* 32, 713–723.  
758 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10815-015-0463-9>
- 759erez, M.F., Lehner, B., 2019. Intergenerational and transgenerational epigenetic inheritance in animals. *Nat Cell Biol* 21, 143–  
760 151. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41556-018-0242-9>
- 761ineaux, M., Blanchard, P., Danchin, É., Hatch, S.A., Helfenstein, F., Mulard, H., White, J., Leclaire, S., Wagner, R.H., 2019.  
762 Behavioural avoidance of sperm ageing depends on genetic similarity of mates in a monogamous seabird. *Biological Journal*  
763 *of the Linnean Society* 128, 170–180. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biolinnean/blz079>
- 764isano, C., Bonaccorsi, S., Gatti, M., 1993. The kl-3 loop of the Y chromosome of *Drosophila melanogaster* binds a tektin-like  
765 protein. *Genetics* 133, 569–579. <https://doi.org/10.1093/genetics/133.3.569>
- 766izzari, T., Dean, R., Pacey, A., Moore, H., Bonsall, M.B., 2008. The evolutionary ecology of pre- and post-meiotic sperm  
767 senescence. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 23, 131–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2007.12.003>
- 768reston, B.T., Saint Jalme, M., Hingrat, Y., Lacroix, F., Sorci, G., 2015. The sperm of aging male bustards retards their offspring's  
769 development. *Nat Commun* 6, 6146. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms7146>
- 770rice, D.K., Hansen, T.F., 1998. How Does Offspring Quality Change with Age in Male *Drosophila Melanogaster*? *Behavior*  
771 *Genetics* 28, 395–402. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021677804038>
- 772riest, N.K., Mackowiak, B., Promislow, D.E.L., 2002. sch. *Evolution* 56, 927–935. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0014-3820.2002.tb01405.x>
- 773
- 774adhakrishnan, P., Fedorka, K.M., 2011. Influence of female age, sperm senescence and multiple mating on sperm viability in  
775 female *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Journal of Insect Physiology* 57, 778–783. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinsphys.2011.02.017>
- 776ando, O.J., 2016. Intergenerational Transfer of Epigenetic Information in Sperm. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med* 6, a022988.  
777 <https://doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a022988>
- 778atikainen, I.I., Haaland, T.R., Wright, J., 2018. Differential allocation of parental investment and the trade-off between size and  
779 number of offspring. *Proc. R. Soc. B.* 285, 20181074. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.1074>
- 780einhardt, K., 2007. Evolutionary Consequences of Sperm Cell Aging. *The Quarterly Review of Biology* 82, 375–393.  
781 <https://doi.org/10.1086/522811>
- 782einhardt, K., Naylor, R., Siva-Jothy, M.T., 2011. Male Mating Rate Is Constrained by Seminal Fluid Availability in Bedbugs,  
783 *Cimex lectularius*. *PLoS ONE* 6, e22082. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0022082>
- 784einhardt, K., Siva-Jothy, M.T., 2005. An Advantage for Young Sperm in the House Cricket *Acheta domesticus*. *The American*  
785 *Naturalist* 165, 718–723. <https://doi.org/10.1086/430010>
- 786einhardt, K., Turnell, B., 2019. Sperm ageing: A complex business. *Funct Ecol* 33, 1188–1189. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13350>
- 787
- 788eznick, D., Nunney, L., Tessier, A., 2000. Big houses, big cars, superfleas and the costs of reproduction. *Trends in Ecology &*  
789 *Evolution* 15, 421–425. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(00\)01941-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(00)01941-8)
- 790inehart, R.R., 1969. Spontaneous sex-linked recessive lethal frequencies from aged and non-aged spermatozoa of *Drosophila*  
791 *melanogaster*. *Mutation Research/Fundamental and Molecular Mechanisms of Mutagenesis* 7, 417–423.  
792 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0027-5107\(69\)90112-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0027-5107(69)90112-2)

- 798 Rodgers, A.B., Morgan, C.P., Leu, N.A., Bale, T.L., 2015. Transgenerational epigenetic programming via sperm microRNA  
799 recapitulates effects of paternal stress. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 112, 13699–13704.  
800 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1508347112>
- 796 Hoff, D.A., Fairbairn, D.J., 2007. The evolution of trade-offs: where are we? J of Evolutionary Biology 20, 433–447.  
797 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2006.01255.x>
- 798 Core Team, 2012. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R foundation for statistical computing, Vienna,  
799 Austria. <https://www.r-project.org/>
- 800 Singhvi, K., Iglesias-Carrasco, M., Zajitschek, F., Kruuk, L.E.B., Head, M.L., 2022. Effects of developmental and adult  
801 environments on ageing. Evolution 76, 1868–1882. <https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.14567>
- 802 Singhvi, K., Vega-Trejo, R., Nakagawa, S., Gascoigne, S.J.L., Johnson, S.L., Salguero-Gómez, R., Pizzari, T., Sepil, I., 2024.  
803 Meta-analysis shows no consistent evidence for senescence in ejaculate traits across animals. Nat Commun 15, 558.  
804 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-44768-4>
- 805 Singhvi, K., Pizzari, T., Sepil, I., 2024. What doesn't kill you makes you stronger? Effects of paternal age at conception on fathers  
806 and sons. Evolution qpa097. <https://doi.org/10.1093/evolut/qpae097>
- 807 Singhvi, K., Shandilya, S., Brown, A., Todorova, B., Jahn, M., Gascoigne, S.J.L., Camilleri, T.-L., Pizzari, T., Sepil, I., 2024.  
808 Reproductive output of old polygynous males is limited by seminal fluid, not sperm number.  
809 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.02.601670>
- 810 Santos, I.B., Wainman, A., Garrido-Maraver, J., Pires, V., Riparbelli, M.G., Kovács, L., Callaini, G., Glover, D.M., Tavares, Á.A.,  
811 2023. Mob4 is essential for spermatogenesis in *Drosophila melanogaster* (preprint). Developmental Biology.  
812 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.05.527206>
- 813 Schroeder, J., Nakagawa, S., Rees, M., Mannarelli, M.-E., Burke, T., 2015. Reduced fitness in progeny from old parents in a  
814 natural population. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 112, 4021–4025. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1422715112>
- 815 Selvaratnam, J., Paul, C., Robaire, B., 2015. Male Rat Germ Cells Display Age-Dependent and Cell-Specific Susceptibility in  
816 Response to Oxidative Stress Challenges. Biology of Reproduction 93. <https://doi.org/10.1095/biolreprod.115.131318>
- 817 Sepil, I., Hopkins, B.R., Dean, R., Bath, E., Friedman, S., Swanson, B., Ostridge, H.J., Harper, L., Buehner, N.A., Wolfner, M.F.,  
818 Konietzny, R., Thézénas, M.-L., Sandham, E., Charles, P.D., Fischer, R., Steinhauer, J., Kessler, B.M., Wigby, S., 2020.  
819 Male reproductive aging arises via multifaceted mating-dependent sperm and seminal proteome declines, but is postponable  
820 in *Drosophila*. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 117, 17094–17103. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2009053117>
- 821 Sharma, R., Agarwal, A., Rohra, V.K., Assidi, M., Abu-Elmagd, M., Turki, R.F., 2015. Effects of increased paternal age on sperm  
822 quality, reproductive outcome and associated epigenetic risks to offspring. Reprod Biol Endocrinol 13, 35.  
823 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12958-015-0028-x>
- 824 Sharma, U., 2019. Paternal Contributions to Offspring Health: Role of Sperm Small RNAs in Intergenerational Transmission of  
825 Epigenetic Information. Front. Cell Dev. Biol. 7, 215. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcell.2019.00215>
- 826 Shindyapina, A.V., Zenin, A.A., Tarkhov, A.E., Santesmasses, D., Fedichev, P.O., Gladyshev, V.N., 2020. Germline burden of rare  
827 damaging variants negatively affects human healthspan and lifespan. eLife 9, e53449. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.53449>
- 828 Sirot, L.K., Buehner, N.A., Fiumera, A.C., Wolfner, M.F., 2009. Seminal fluid protein depletion and replenishment in the fruit fly,  
829 *Drosophila melanogaster*: an ELISA-based method for tracking individual ejaculates. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 63, 1505–1513.  
830 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-009-0806-6>
- 831 Iiva-Jothy, 2000. The young sperm gambit. Ecol Letters 3, 172–174. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1461-0248.2000.00146.x>
- 832 Hook, R.R., Hosken, D.J., 2004. Sperm death and dumping in *Drosophila*. Nature 428, 939–941.  
833 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02455>
- 834 Ørnsen, F., Melsen, L.M., Fedder, J., Soltanizadeh, S., 2023. The Influence of Male Ejaculatory Abstinence Time on Pregnancy  
835 Rate, Live Birth Rate and DNA Fragmentation: A Systematic Review. JCM 12, 2219. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm12062219>
- 836 Parks, A.M., Hammers, M., Komdeur, J., Burke, T., Richardson, D.S., Dugdale, H.L., 2022. Sex-dependent effects of parental  
837 age on offspring fitness in a cooperatively breeding bird. Evolution Letters evl3.300. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evl3.300>
- 838 Uvorov, A., Pilsner, J.R., Naumov, V., Shtratnikova, V., Zheludkevich, A., Gerasimov, E., Logacheva, M., Sergeyev, O., 2020.  
839 Aging Induces Profound Changes in sncRNA in Rat Sperm and These Changes Are Modified by Perinatal Exposure to  
840 Environmental Flame Retardant. Int J Mol Sci 21, 8252. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms21218252>
- 841 Fan, C.K.W., Pizzari, T., Wigby, S., 2013. PARENTAL AGE, GAMETIC AGE, AND INBREEDING INTERACT TO  
842 MODULATE OFFSPRING VIABILITY IN *DROSOPHILA MELANOGASTER*: BRIEF COMMUNICATION. Evolution  
843 n/a-n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.12131>



- 844arin, J.J., 2000. Consequences on offspring of abnormal function in ageing gametes. *Human Reproduction Update* 6, 532–549.  
845 <https://doi.org/10.1093/humupd/6.6.532>
- 846herneau, T., 2105. Mixed effects Cox models. CRAN Repository.
- 847iller, T., 2008. Developmental plasticity and the evolution of parental effects. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 23, 432–438.  
848 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2008.04.005>
- 849ega□Trejo, R., Fox, R.J., Iglesias□Carrasco, M., Head, M.L., Jennions, M.D., 2019. The effects of male age, sperm age and  
850 mating history on ejaculate senescence. *Funct Ecol* 33, 1267–1279. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13305>
- 851ega□Trejo, R., Kruuk, L.E.B., Jennions, M.D., Head, M.L., 2018. What happens to offspring when parents are inbred, old or had  
852 a poor start in life? Evidence for sex□specific parental effects. *J of Evolutionary Biology* 31, 1138–1151.  
853 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jeb.13292>
- 854enn, O., Turner, I., Mathieson, I., De Groot, N., Bontrop, R., McVean, G., 2014. Strong male bias drives germline mutation in  
855 chimpanzees. *Science* 344, 1272–1275. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.344.6189.1272>
- 856uarin, P., Bouchard, A., Lesobre, L., Levêque, G., Chalah, T., Jalme, M.S., Lacroix, F., Hingrat, Y., Sorci, G., 2019. Post-  
857 copulatory sexual selection allows females to alleviate the fitness costs incurred when mating with senescing males. *Proc. R.*  
858 *Soc. B.* 286, 20191675. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.1675>
- 859uarin, P., Lesobre, L., Levêque, G., Saint Jalme, M., Lacroix, F., Hingrat, Y., Sorci, G., 2021. Paternal age negatively affects  
860 sperm production of the progeny. *Ecology Letters* 24, 719–727. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13696>
- 861Wagner, R.H., Helfenstein, F., Danchin, E., 2004. Female choice of young sperm in a genetically monogamous bird. *Proc Biol Sci*  
862 271 Suppl 4, S134–137. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2003.0142>
- 863Wang, R.J., Thomas, G.W.C., Raveendran, M., Harris, R.A., Doddapaneni, H., Muzny, D.M., Capitanio, J.P., Radivojac, P.,  
864 Rogers, J., Hahn, M.W., 2020. Paternal age in rhesus macaques is positively associated with germline mutation  
865 accumulation but not with measures of offspring sociability. *Genome Res.* 30, 826–834.  
866 <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.255174.119>
- 867Wang, Y., McNeil, P., Abdulazeez, R., Pascual, M., Johnston, S.E., Keightley, P.D., Obbard, D.J., 2022. Variation in mutation,  
868 recombination, and transposition rates in *Drosophila melanogaster* and *Drosophila simulans* (preprint). *Evolutionary*  
869 *Biology*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.12.507595>
- 870eirich-Schwaiger, H., Weirich, H.G., Gruber, B., Schweiger, M., Hirsch-Kauffman, M., 1994. Correlation between senescence  
871 and DNA repair in cells from young and old individuals and in premature aging syndromes. *Mutation Research/DNAging*  
872 316, 37–48. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0921-8734\(94\)90006-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0921-8734(94)90006-X)
- 873eiss, L.A., Pan, L., Abney, M., Ober, C., 2006. The sex-specific genetic architecture of quantitative traits in humans. *Nat Genet*  
874 38, 218–222. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ng1726>
- 875etzker, C., Froschauer, C., Massino, C., Reinhardt, K., 2024. *Drosophila melanogaster* sperm turn more oxidative in the female.  
876 *Journal of Experimental Biology* 227, jeb247775. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.247775>
- 877White, J., Wagner, R.H., Helfenstein, F., Hatch, S.A., Mulard, H., Naves, L.C., Danchin, E., 2008. Multiple deleterious effects of  
878 experimentally aged sperm in a monogamous bird. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 105, 13947–13952.  
879 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0803067105>
- 880itt, E., Langer, C.B., Svetec, N., Zhao, L., 2023. Transcriptional and mutational signatures of the *Drosophila* ageing germline.  
881 *Nat Ecol Evol*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-022-01958-x>
- 882ylde, Z., Spagopoulou, F., Hooper, A.K., Maklakov, A.A., Bonduriansky, R., 2019. Parental breeding age effects on  
883 descendants' longevity interact over 2 generations in matriline and patriline. *PLoS Biol* 17, e3000556.  
884 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000556>
- 885ie, K., Ryan, D.P., Pearson, B.L., Henzel, K.S., Neff, F., Vidal, R.O., Hennion, M., Lehmann, I., Schleif, M., Schröder, S., Adler,  
886 T., Rathkolb, B., Rozman, J., Schütz, A.-L., Prehn, C., Mickael, M.E., Weiergräber, M., Adamski, J., Busch, D.H., Ehninger,  
887 G., Matynia, A., Jackson, W.S., Wolf, E., Fuchs, H., Gailus-Durner, V., Bonn, S., Hrabě de Angelis, M., Ehninger, D., 2018.  
888 Epigenetic alterations in longevity regulators, reduced life span, and exacerbated aging-related pathology in old father  
889 offspring mice. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 115. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1707371115>
- 890ampolsky, L.Yu., Pearse, L.E., Promislow, D.E.L., 2000. Age-specific Effects of Novel Mutations in *Drosophila Melanogaster* I.  
891 *Mortality*. *Genetica* 110, 11–29. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1017582625191>
- 892oshizaki, K., Kimura, R., Kobayashi, H., Oki, S., Kikkawa, T., Mai, L., Koike, K., Mochizuki, K., Inada, H., Matsui, Y., Kono,  
893 T., Osumi, N., 2021. Paternal age affects offspring via an epigenetic mechanism involving REST/NRSF. *EMBO Rep* 22.  
894 <https://doi.org/10.15252/embr.202051524>

895 ou, H., Xu, R., 2020. R-Squared Measure Based on Partial LR Statistic, for the Cox PH Regression Model. CRAN Repository.

896 ubkova, E.V., Robaire, B., 2006. Effects of ageing on spermatozoal chromatin and its sensitivity to in vivo and in vitro oxidative  
897 challenge in the Brown Norway rat. Human Reproduction 21, 2901–2910. <https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/del193>