

Behavioral trajectories of aging prairie voles (*Microtus ochrogaster*): Adapting behavior to social context wanes with advanced age

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	PONE-D-22-24891
Article Type:	Research Article
Full Title:	Behavioral trajectories of aging prairie voles (<i>Microtus ochrogaster</i>): Adapting behavior to social context wanes with advanced age
Short Title:	Social behavior changes with advanced age in prairie voles
Corresponding Author:	Aubrey Kelly Emory University UNITED STATES
Keywords:	aggression; aging; prairie vole; social behavior; social context
Abstract:	Several studies using mice have examined the effects of aging on cognitive tasks, as well as sensory and motor functions. However, few studies have examined the influence of aging on social behavior. Prairie voles (<i>Microtus ochrogaster</i>) are a socially monogamous and biparental rodent that live in small family groups and are now among the most popular rodent models for studies examining social behavior. Although the social behavioral trajectories of early-life development in prairie voles have been well-studied, how social behavior may change throughout adulthood remains unknown. Here we examined behavior in virgin male and female prairie voles in four different age groups: postnatal day (PND) 60–80, 140–160, 220–240, and 300–320. All animals underwent testing in a novel object task, a dominance test, a resident-intruder test, and several iterations of social approach and social interaction tests with varying types of social stimuli (i.e., novel same-sex conspecific, novel opposite-sex conspecific, familiar same-sex sibling/cagemate, small group of novel same-sex conspecifics). We found that age influenced neophobia and dominance, but not social approach behavior. Further, we found that young adult, but not older adult, prairie voles adapt prosocial and aggressive behavior relative to social context, and that selective aggression occurs in relation to age even in the absence of a pair bond. Our results suggest that prairie voles calibrate social phenotype in a context-dependent manner in young adulthood and stop adjusting behavior to social context in advanced age, demonstrating that social behavior is plastic not only throughout early development, but also well into adulthood. Together, this study provides insight into age-related changes in social behavior in prairie voles and shows that prairie voles may be a viable model for studying the cognitive and physiological benefits of social relationships and social engagement in advanced age.
Order of Authors:	Jeanne M. Powell Madison M. Garvin Nicholas S. Lee Aubrey M. Kelly
Opposed Reviewers:	
Additional Information:	
Question	Response
Financial Disclosure Enter a financial disclosure statement that describes the sources of funding for the work included in this submission. Review the submission guidelines for detailed requirements. View published research	The authors received no specific funding for this work.

articles from [PLOS ONE](#) for specific examples.

This statement is required for submission and **will appear in the published article** if the submission is accepted. Please make sure it is accurate.

Unfunded studies

Enter: *The author(s) received no specific funding for this work.*

Funded studies

Enter a statement with the following details:

- Initials of the authors who received each award
- Grant numbers awarded to each author
- The full name of each funder
- URL of each funder website
- Did the sponsors or funders play any role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript?
- **NO** - Include this sentence at the end of your statement: *The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.*
- **YES** - Specify the role(s) played.

* typeset

Competing Interests

Use the instructions below to enter a competing interest statement for this submission. On behalf of all authors, disclose any [competing interests](#) that could be perceived to bias this work—acknowledging all financial support and any other relevant financial or non-financial competing interests.

This statement is **required** for submission and **will appear in the published article** if the submission is accepted. Please make sure it is accurate and that any funding sources listed in your Funding Information later in the submission form are also declared in your Financial Disclosure statement.

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

View published research articles from [PLOS ONE](#) for specific examples.

NO authors have competing interests

Enter: *The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.*

Authors with competing interests

Enter competing interest details beginning with this statement:

I have read the journal's policy and the authors of this manuscript have the following competing interests: [insert competing interests here]

* typeset

Ethics Statement

Enter an ethics statement for this submission. This statement is required if the study involved:

- Human participants
- Human specimens or tissue
- Vertebrate animals or cephalopods
- Vertebrate embryos or tissues
- Field research

Write "N/A" if the submission does not require an ethics statement.

General guidance is provided below. Consult the [submission guidelines](#) for detailed instructions. **Make sure that all information entered here is included in the Methods section of the manuscript.**

All procedures related to the use of animals in this study followed ASM guidelines (Sikes et al. 2016) and were approved by the Emory University Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (PROTO201900094).

Format for specific study types

Human Subject Research (involving human participants and/or tissue)

- Give the name of the institutional review board or ethics committee that approved the study
- Include the approval number and/or a statement indicating approval of this research
- Indicate the form of consent obtained (written/oral) or the reason that consent was not obtained (e.g. the data were analyzed anonymously)

Animal Research (involving vertebrate animals, embryos or tissues)

- Provide the name of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) or other relevant ethics board that reviewed the study protocol, and indicate whether they approved this research or granted a formal waiver of ethical approval
- Include an approval number if one was obtained
- If the study involved *non-human primates*, add *additional details* about animal welfare and steps taken to ameliorate suffering
- If anesthesia, euthanasia, or any kind of animal sacrifice is part of the study, include briefly which substances and/or methods were applied

Field Research

Include the following details if this study involves the collection of plant, animal, or other materials from a natural setting:

- Field permit number
- Name of the institution or relevant body that granted permission

Data Availability

Authors are required to make all data underlying the findings described fully available, without restriction, and from the time of publication. PLOS allows rare exceptions to address legal and ethical concerns. See the [PLOS Data Policy](#) and [FAQ](#) for detailed information.

Yes - all data are fully available without restriction

A Data Availability Statement describing where the data can be found is required at submission. Your answers to this question constitute the Data Availability Statement and **will be published in the article**, if accepted.

Important: Stating 'data available on request from the author' is not sufficient. If your data are only available upon request, select 'No' for the first question and explain your exceptional situation in the text box.

Do the authors confirm that all data underlying the findings described in their manuscript are fully available without restriction?

Describe where the data may be found in full sentences. If you are copying our sample text, replace any instances of XXX with the appropriate details.

- If the data are **held or will be held in a public repository**, include URLs, accession numbers or DOIs. If this information will only be available after acceptance, indicate this by ticking the box below. For example: *All XXX files are available from the XXX database (accession number(s) XXX, XXX).*
- If the data are all contained **within the manuscript and/or Supporting Information files**, enter the following:
All relevant data are within the manuscript and its Supporting Information files.
- If neither of these applies but you are able to provide **details of access elsewhere**, with or without limitations, please do so. For example:

Data cannot be shared publicly because of [XXX]. Data are available from the XXX Institutional Data Access / Ethics Committee (contact via XXX) for researchers who meet the criteria for access to confidential data.

The data underlying the results presented in the study are available from (include the name of the third party

After acceptance of the manuscript, data will be directly uploaded to Dryad (or another repository if PLOS ONE has a preference other than Dryad).

<p><i>and contact information or URL).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This text is appropriate if the data are owned by a third party and authors do not have permission to share the data. <p>* typeset</p>	
<p>Additional data availability information:</p>	<p>Tick here if the URLs/accession numbers/DOIs will be available only after acceptance of the manuscript for publication so that we can ensure their inclusion before publication.</p>



EMORY
COLLEGE
OF ARTS AND
SCIENCES

Department of Psychology
Behavioral and Systems Neuroscience Program

September 6, 2022

Dear Editors of PLOS ONE,

I am pleased to submit our manuscript, “**Behavioral trajectories of aging prairie voles (*Microtus ochrogaster*): Adapting behavior to social context wanes with advanced age**” for consideration of publication as a research article in *PLOS ONE*.

Aging has become a difficult public health challenge facing most societies given the increasingly high population of older adults. Indeed, several initiatives are being considered and developed to facilitate healthy aging. To understand factors that influence healthy aging, it is crucial that we examine natural behavioral, cognitive, and physiological trajectories associated with advanced age. While there are several studies in mice that have examined the impact of age on sensory and motor function, as well as performance in cognitive tasks, few studies have examined the influence of age on social behavior (note that the majority of these studies were conducted only in males). In the present study, we use male and female prairie voles to examine social behavioral trajectories throughout adulthood.

Although prairie vole early life development is well-studied, there remains a need to examine whether behavior continues to change with advanced age. Therefore, we examined behavior in virgin male and female prairie voles in four different age groups: postnatal day (PND) 60–80, 140–160, 220–240, and 300–320. All animals underwent testing in a novel object task, a dominance test, a resident-intruder test, and several iterations of social approach and social interaction tests with varying types of social stimuli (i.e., novel same-sex conspecific, novel opposite-sex conspecific, familiar same-sex sibling/cagemate, small group of novel same-sex conspecifics). We found that age influenced neophobia and dominance, but not social approach behavior or behavior in a resident-intruder test. Perhaps most strikingly, we found that young adult, but not older adult, prairie voles adapt prosocial and aggressive behavior relative to social context. Further, we observed that selective aggression occurs in relation to age even in the absence of a pair bond – a finding that may be of particular interest to the growing prairie vole community.

Our results suggest that prairie voles calibrate social phenotype in a context-dependent manner in young adulthood and stop adjusting behavior to social context in advanced age, demonstrating that social behavior is plastic not only throughout early development, but also well into adulthood. We discuss our findings in the context of current research on behavioral aging as well as in the context of the behavioral ecology of prairie voles. Further, we provide a discussion about how prairie voles can serve as a model for studying the cognitive and physiological benefits of social relationships and social engagement in advanced age.

Our study is likely to attract considerable attention from the large scientific communities interested in social behavior, behavioral ecology, aging, and psychology.

We believe our study is well-aligned with the expertise of PLOS ONE editor Andrey E. Ryabinin, whose lab uses prairie voles in neuroscience and behavioral studies. Below we suggest potential reviewers for consideration.

Thank you for your consideration, and we look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Aubrey M. Kelly".

Aubrey M. Kelly, PhD
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology
Emory University

Suggested reviewers:

Zuoxin Wang
zwang@psy.fsu.edu
Florida State University
Expertise in stress buffering effects of bonding in prairie voles

Karen Bales
klbales@ucdavis.edu
University of California Davis
Expertise in prairie vole behavioral development

Tsuyoshi Miyakawa
miyakawa@fujita-hu.ac.jp
Fujita Health University, Japan
Expertise in age-related changes in behavior in mice

Behavioral trajectories of aging prairie voles (*Microtus ochrogaster*): Adapting behavior to social context wanes with advanced age

Jeanne M. Powell¹, Madison M. Garvin¹, Nicholas S. Lee¹, Aubrey M. Kelly^{1*}

¹ Department of Psychology, Emory University, 36 Eagle Row, Atlanta GA 30322 USA

***Correspondence:**

Aubrey M. Kelly

aubrey.kelly@emory.edu

Short title: Social behavior changes with advanced age in prairie voles

Keywords: aggression, aging, prairie vole, social behavior, social context

Abstract

Several studies using mice have examined the effects of aging on cognitive tasks, as well as sensory and motor functions. However, few studies have examined the influence of aging on social behavior. Prairie voles (*Microtus ochrogaster*) are a socially monogamous and biparental rodent that live in small family groups and are now among the most popular rodent models for studies examining social behavior. Although the social behavioral trajectories of early-life development in prairie voles have been well-studied, how social behavior may change throughout adulthood remains unknown. Here we examined behavior in virgin male and female prairie voles in four different age groups: postnatal day (PND) 60-80, 140-160, 220-240, and 300-320. All animals underwent testing in a novel object task, a dominance test, a resident-intruder test, and several iterations of social approach and social interaction tests with varying types of social stimuli (i.e., novel same-sex conspecific, novel opposite-sex conspecific, familiar same-sex sibling/cagemate, small group of novel same-sex conspecifics). We found that age influenced neophobia and dominance, but not social approach behavior. Further, we found that young adult, but not older adult, prairie voles adapt prosocial and aggressive behavior relative to social context, and that selective aggression occurs in relation to age even in the absence of a pair bond. Our results suggest that prairie voles calibrate social phenotype in a context-dependent manner in young adulthood and stop adjusting behavior to social context in advanced age, demonstrating that social behavior is plastic not only throughout early development, but also well into adulthood. Together, this study provides insight into age-related changes in social behavior in prairie voles and shows that prairie voles may be a viable model for studying the cognitive and physiological benefits of social relationships and social engagement in advanced age.

Introduction

Aging has become a difficult public health challenge facing most societies given the increasingly high population of older adults. Indeed, several initiatives are being considered and developed to facilitate healthy aging (Anderson et al. 2012; De Biasi et al. 2020; Olivari et al. 2020). To understand factors that influence healthy aging, it is crucial that we examine natural behavioral, cognitive, and physiological trajectories associated with advanced age. Although studies in humans are highly beneficial, using non-human animal models can provide insight about aging on more rapid timescales and in tightly controlled experimental environments. While there are several studies in mice that have examined the impact of age on sensory and motor function, as well as performance in cognitive tasks, few studies have examined the influence of age on social behavior. Here we characterize behavioral trajectories of social behavior in the prairie vole (*Microtus ochrogaster*), which has emerged as a model organism for studying sociality and relevant underlying mechanisms (Bosch and Young 2018; McGraw and Young 2010; Ryabinin and Hostetler 2016).

Prairie voles are a small arvicoline rodent native to prairie grasslands of central and eastern North America (Getz and Carter 1980; Getz and Hofmann 1986). They are socially monogamous and live in extended family groups. Adult males and females form pair bonds characterized by affiliative and pair-maintenance behaviors including huddling, allogrooming, mate guarding, and mate preference (Bales et al. 2021; DeVries et al. 1997). Pair bonded individuals also exhibit biparental care, in which both mothers and fathers engage in nest construction, food caching, grooming, pup retrievals, and brooding (Thomas and Birney 1979). Additionally, non-parent family group members (i.e., typically offspring) exhibit alloparental care and readily retrieve, groom, and brood young pups (Kenkel et al. 2017).

Given their capacity for pair bonding, parental care, and alloparental care, prairie voles have emerged as a model organism for studying social behavior and relevant underlying neural mechanisms (Kenkel et al.

2021; McGraw and Young 2010). Research using prairie voles has enabled scientists to uncover neural circuitry of monogamous bonds (Walum and Young 2018), develop a more socially-translational model for studying alcoholism and addiction (Ryabinin and Hostetler 2016), elucidate mechanisms underlying socially mediated stress buffering (Smith and Wang 2013), examine the influence of parental variation on development (Kelly et al. 2020), and understand the behavioral and physiological consequences of social isolation (Grippe et al. 2007a), cesarian delivery (Kenkel 2021), and early-life exposure to anti-depressants (Lawrence et al. 2020). Because prairie voles can be readily bred in the lab, many studies take a developmental approach and examine brain and behavior across the lifespan. Indeed, studies range from studying neonatal pups and weanlings to adolescents and adults (Finton and Ophir 2020; Hiura et al. 2018; Kelly et al. 2018a; Prounis et al. 2018; Prounis and Ophir 2019; Greenwood and Hammock 2019).

Several studies have examined developmental trajectories of social behavior in prairie voles. For example, males reared by single mothers and subsequently weaned into social isolation exhibit greater affiliative behavior as juveniles and are more likely to form a partner preference as adults compared to males raised by a mother and a father and weaned with same-sex siblings (Prounis and Ophir 2019). When contrasting female juveniles (postnatal day (PND) 19-20) with female adult (PND60-90) prairie voles, juvenile behavior is characterized by less anxiety-like behavior, greater affiliation toward same-sex conspecifics, and positive interactions with pups (Olazabal and Young 2005). Similarly, male juveniles (PND15) are more prosocial with age-matched, same-sex conspecifics than males that are PND30, PND45, and PND60; aggression toward same-sex conspecifics and social avoidance is also greater in PND30-60 males compared to weanling aged juveniles (i.e., PND15)(Kelly et al. 2018b). Together, these studies show that prairie voles are more prosocial when they are younger and shift toward exhibiting a more aggressive phenotype as they reach adulthood. These shifts in behavior across early development correspond with major life history events and reflect the transition from a period of allopatric cohabitation with siblings to a period of time when voles disperse and prepare to establish territories and compete for mates.

Although prairie vole early life development is well-studied, there remains a need to examine whether behavior continues to change with advanced age. Studying advanced aging will not only provide insight into specific behaviors that may exhibit more plasticity than others throughout the lifespan but, given the popularity of using voles as a model organism for social neuroscience, there is also utility in identifying an age window in which we can use voles as subjects before expecting to have natural behavioral changes associated with age serving as a confound. While, somewhat surprisingly, the majority of studies using prairie voles do not report the age of adult subjects used, many studies simply state that adult subjects were “at least 60 days of age.” In studies where the age is identified in the paper, common age ranges include PND60-90, PND70-120, PND60-180, and PND60-200 (Aragona et al. 2003; Burkett et al. 2016; Grippo et al. 2007b; Hale et al. 2021; Johnson et al. 2016; Kenkel et al. 2014). To our knowledge, whether social behavior in prairie voles undergoes changes associated with aging remains unknown.

To address this gap in the literature, here we examined changes in social and anxiety-like behavior in prairie voles ranging from PND60 to PND320. PND60 indicates the age in which prairie voles are considered adults; sexual maturation occurs by PND55 in males and by PND45 in females (Carter et al. 1980; Mateo et al. 1994). Although prairie voles can live to around 3 years of age in the lab (pers. obs.), field studies suggest an average lifespan of 1 year (Stalling 1990). In the present study, all subjects underwent testing in a novel object task, a dominance test, a resident-intruder test, and several iterations of social approach and social interaction tests with varying types of social stimuli. Because physical health in any animal deteriorates with age, we hypothesized that aggression would decrease with age given that engaging in aggressive acts is energetically costly. Further, we hypothesized that neophobic behavior would be lower at young adult ages, potentially serving to facilitate a phenotype conducive to exploring novel environments to find territories and/or mates.

Materials and Methods

Animals

All prairie voles used in this study were bred in the Kelly Lab at Emory University. Our colony is derived from breeders (offspring of wild caught individuals in Illinois) acquired from the lab of Dr. Alexander Ophir at Cornell University. All subjects were weaned from their parents on post-natal day (PND) 21 and housed in same-sex sibling pairs with access to *ad libitum* food and water in standard rodent polycarbonate cages (29cm L X 18cm W X 13cm H) lined with sanichip bedding. Before behavioral testing, each animal was ear tagged with a unique ID number. The colony room was maintained at an ambient temperature of 24°C +/- 1°C and kept on a 14 h:10 h light/dark cycle. All procedures related to the use of animals in this study followed ASM guidelines (Sikes et al. 2016) and were approved by the Emory University Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (PROTO201900094).

Male and female same-sex sibling pairs were semi-randomly assigned to each age group (PND 60–80, 140–160, 220–240, and 300–320) to ensure mixed genetic heritage within each group. All subjects were sexually naïve. Behavioral data from 5 animals were not included in analyses due to corrupted or lost video files. Sample sizes for data analysis: PND60-80, n = 11 males and 13 females; PND140-160, n = 13 males and 10 females; PND220-240, n = 9 males and 12 females; PND300-320, n = 9 males and 10 females. Total n = 87.

Experimental design

In total, each subject participated in 12 assays; the subject was the focal animal in 10 of the assays and the stimulus animal for their same-sex sibling/cagemate in the remaining 2 assays (i.e., social approach and social interaction with a familiar, same-sex conspecific). All testing took place while the subjects were aged within their assigned age window. The testing order was randomly generated for each prairie vole using a random number generator, and each subject participated in a maximum of three assays per day

with roughly an hour break between each test. All behavioral tests were video recorded using Sony Handycam HDR-CX405 1080p Camcorders (Sony, USA) for subsequent scoring using Behavioral Observation Research Interactive Software (BORIS; Friard & Gamba, 2016). Subjects were not tested at multiple ages because brains were collected at the end of each age window for a different experiment not discussed here.

Novel Object Investigation

To assess neophobia, subjects were acclimated to a clean rodent cage with sanichip bedding for 20 min. After acclimation, a sterilized novel object was placed in the cage. The novel object for all subjects was a clear, purple-capped 50 mL centrifuge tube filled with crumpled cyan sticky notes. Subjects were given 10 min to interact with the object. The first 7 min of the assay was scored to quantify the latency to approach, time spent near, and time spent investigating the object. See **Table 1** for ethogram.

Dominance Tube Test

Subject and stimulus animals were simultaneously placed in opposing ends of a clear, plexiglass tube (30.25cm length with an 8.25cm diameter for smaller voles and 10cm diameter for larger voles) and were video recorded until the more dominant animal pushed the subordinate animal out of the tube. The dominant animal was scored as the winner and the subordinate animal as the loser. If at the end of a 3-min period neither animal had exited the tube, the trial was ended and considered a tie. Stimulus animals were novel, same-sex individuals weighing within 5 g of the subject animal. This assay was repeated for 3 trials. The side of tube entry was counterbalanced to ensure handling did not impact performance.

Resident Intruder Test

Because we tested both animals in a sibling pair that shared a home cage, we used a modified resident-intruder paradigm such that subjects were not tested in their home cage. Instead, subjects were placed in a clean rodent cage lined with sanichip bedding and were able to “establish residence” in a longer

acclimation period of 20 min. Stimulus animals were age- and weight-matched novel, same-sex conspecifics. Stimuli were fitted with a vibrant zip-tie collar to distinguish them from the subject animal and were given 20 min in their homecage to acclimate to the collar before testing. After the subject acclimation period, the stimulus animal was placed into the subject's cage for 6 min. The first 5 min of each interaction was scored to measure prosocial, aggressive, and non-social behaviors. See **Table 1** for ethogram. Because distinct types of behaviors can occur infrequently, we combined all prosocial behaviors into a single prosocial behavior measurement and all aggressive behavior into a single measurement of aggression.

Social Approach Test

The social approach assay allows subject animals to approach and investigate stimulus animals without directly interacting with them by separating the two individuals with a perforated, plexiglass barrier. To do this, subjects and stimulus animals were placed in separate clear, plexiglass chambers (subject chamber, 45cm L X 13cm W X 13cm H; stimulus chamber, 13cm L X 13cm W X 13cm H) and allowed to acclimate to their surroundings for 10 min. At the end of the acclimation period, the subject was placed under a beaker at the unperforated side of their chamber furthest away from the stimulus chamber; the perforated end of the stimulus chamber was then placed adjacent to the perforated wall of the subject chamber. The subject was released from under the beaker and behavior was recorded for 8 min. The first 5 min of the test was scored for the latency to approach, times spent investigating, and time spent near the stimulus animal. This assay was run 4 times for each subject, each time using a different type of stimulus animal. Stimulus animal types included a novel same-sex conspecific, a novel opposite-sex conspecific, a familiar same-sex sibling/cagemate, and a novel same-sex group of 3 stimulus animals (stimuli were co-housed siblings). See **Table 1** for ethogram.

Social Interaction Test

The social interaction assay allows subjects to freely interact with stimulus animals. 20 min prior to the start of testing, stimulus animals were zip-tied for identification purposes and returned to their homecage. To create a neutral environment in which neither animal was a resident of the territory, subject and stimulus animals were concurrently placed in a clean rodent cage with clean sanichip bedding. Behavior was video recorded for 11 min, and videos were scored for prosocial, aggressive, and non-social behaviors (see **Table 1**). This assay was run 3 times for each subject, each time using a different type of stimulus animal. Stimulus animal types included a novel same-sex conspecific, a novel opposite-sex conspecific, and a familiar same-sex sibling/cagemate. Because distinct types of behaviors can occur infrequently, we combined all prosocial behaviors into a single prosocial behavior measurement and all aggressive behavior into a single measurement of aggression.

Statistics

Behavioral data were analyzed using General Linear Models (GLM), repeated measures GLMs (RM GLM), Linear Mixed Models (LMM), and Friedman's test. All posthoc pairwise comparisons were adjusted using the Sidak correction. All data were analyzed using SPSS 28 (IBM Analytics, USA) and graphs were made using Prism 8 (GraphPad, USA).

Results

Here we sought to determine whether distinct aspects of behavior change with advanced age in prairie voles. Additionally, we examined effects of sex on behavior and how sex may interact with age to influence behavior trajectories throughout adulthood. Male and female prairie voles were tested in a novel object investigation task to assess neophobia, a dominance test, a resident-intruder test, and social approach and social interaction tests in varying social contexts.

Novel object investigation

When examining the latency to approach a novel object, a GLM with Sex and Age as fixed factors found a main effect of Age ($F_{(3,86)} = 2.81$; $P = 0.05$; **Fig. 1**). Sidak-corrected posthoc analyses revealed a significant difference between PND60-80 and 220-240 ($P = 0.05$), with PND60-80 animals taking longer to approach the novel object (all other posthoc comparisons $P > 0.13$). We observed no effect of Age on time spent near or time spent investigating the novel object (all $P > 0.14$). Additionally, we found no effects of Sex (all $P > 0.36$) and no significant interaction between Age and Sex (all $P > 0.22$) for the latency to approach, time spent near, or time spent investigating the novel object.

Dominance test

For the dominance test, a GLM with Sex and Age as fixed factors found a main effect of Age on the number of losses out of 3 trials ($F_{(3,86)} = 3.31$; $P = 0.02$; **Fig. 2**). Sidak-corrected posthoc analyses revealed a significant difference in the number of losses only between PND140-160 and PND300-230 ($P = 0.04$), with the younger age group losing less compared to the eldest age group (all other posthoc comparisons $P > 0.07$). However, we found no main effect of Age on the number of wins or ties (all $P > 0.15$). Further, we found no effects of Sex (all $P > 0.95$) and no significant interaction between Age and Sex (all $P > 0.27$) for the number of wins, ties, or losses.

Resident-intruder test

A GLM with Sex and Age as fixed factors yielded no effects or interactions for prosocial behavior, aggressive behavior, or nonsocial behavior (all $P > 0.07$) in the resident-intruder test. To examine the composition of behavior during the resident-intruder test, we compared the duration of test time spent exhibiting prosocial contact, aggressive behavior, and nonsocial behavior using Friedman's test, which revealed a significant difference in the durations of different types of behavior that were exhibited ($\chi^2(2) = 82.55$; $P < 0.01$). Posthoc analyses with Wilcoxon signed-rank tests showed that subjects overwhelmingly exhibited nonsocial behavior, but also exhibited more prosocial contact than aggression. All behavior types significantly differed from each other (all $P < 0.01$).

Social Approach

Each subject underwent 4 social approach tests with a novel opposite-sex conspecific, novel same-sex conspecific, familiar same-sex sibling/cagemate as stimulus animals, and a group of 3 novel same-sex conspecifics. We first used a RM GLM with Sex and Age as fixed factors and Stimulus Type as a within-subjects factor and found no effects or interactions for the latency to approach (all $P > 0.09$), time spent near the stimulus (all $P > 0.39$), or time spent investigating the stimulus (all $P > 0.48$). Because stimulus type did not influence behavior, we then ran LMMs with Sex and Age as fixed factors and Subject ID as a random factor to account for repeated testing to determine whether approach behaviors change with age or vary by sex regardless of social context. Sidak-corrected posthoc analyses revealed a main effect of Sex for the time spent investigating the stimulus animal ($F_{(1,79)} = 4.301$; $P = 0.04$), with males investigating stimuli more than females regardless of Age or Stimulus Type. However, we did not observe a main effect of Sex on the latency to approach or time spent near the stimulus animal (all $P > 0.23$). Further, we found no effects of Age (all $P > 0.63$) and no significant interaction between Age and Sex (all $P > 0.06$) for the latency to approach, time spent near, or time spent investigating the stimulus animal.

Social Interaction

When examining prosocial behavior, a RM GLM with Sex and Age as fixed factors and Stimulus Type as a within-subjects factor yielded a main effect of Stimulus Type ($F_{(2,158)} = 29.59$; $P < 0.01$; **Fig. 3A**). Sidak-corrected posthoc analyses revealed that subjects were significantly more prosocial with their familiar same-sex sibling/cagemate than the novel same-sex or opposite-sex conspecifics (both $P < 0.01$). We observed no effects of Sex or Age (both $P > 0.49$) and no interaction between Sex and Age on prosocial behavior ($P = 0.15$). However, we did find a significant interaction between Stimulus Type and Age for prosocial behavior ($F_{(6,158)} = 2.167$, $P = 0.05$; **Fig. 4A**). Sidak-corrected posthoc analyses showed different patterns of prosocial behavior within age groups. Within age groups, animals aged PND60-80

and PND 140-160 were significantly more prosocial with their same-sex sibling than they were with either novel conspecific (both $P < 0.01$). Meanwhile, for animals in the PND220-240 age group, prosocial behavior did not differ when interacting with the novel opposite-sex conspecific and the same-sex sibling, but subjects were significantly more prosocial with their sibling compared to the novel same-sex conspecific ($P = 0.01$). However, for the eldest age group, PND300-320, prosocial behavior did not differ based on the type of stimulus animal the subjects interacted with (all $P > 0.37$). Further, within social context (i.e., Stimulus Type), posthoc analyses revealed no significant differences between age groups (all $P > 0.07$). Lastly, we did not observe interactions between Stimulus Type x Sex or Stimulus Type x Sex x Age (all $P > 0.54$).

When examining aggressive behavior, a RM GLM with Sex and Age as fixed factors and Stimulus Type as a within-subjects factor yielded a main effect of Stimulus Type ($F_{(2,158)} = 27.11$; $P < 0.01$; **Fig. 3B**). Sidak-corrected posthoc analyses revealed that subjects were significantly less aggressive with their familiar same-sex sibling/cagemate than the novel same-sex or opposite-sex conspecifics (both $P < 0.01$). We observed no effects of Sex or Age (all $P > 0.19$). However, we observed a significant interaction between Stimulus Type and Age ($F_{(6,158)} = 2.96$; $P < 0.01$); **Fig. 4B**). Sidak-corrected posthoc analyses showed different patterns of aggression within age groups, such that subjects aged PND60-80 were significantly more aggressive with novel same-sex conspecifics compared to novel opposite-sex or familiar sibling conspecifics (both $P < 0.01$). Conversely, age groups PND140-160 and PND220-240 exhibited a different pattern of context-specific aggression, with subjects being similarly aggressive with novel opposite-sex and same-sex conspecifics; animals in these age groups were significantly less aggressive with their same-sex sibling compared to the novel conspecifics (both $P < 0.01$). However, in the oldest age group, PND300-320, aggression did not differ across the 3 stimulus types (all $P > 0.36$). Within social context (i.e., Stimulus Type) we did not find any significant posthoc comparisons between age groups (all $P > 0.07$). Furthermore, we observed a significant interaction between Stimulus Type and Sex ($F_{(2,158)} = 5.69$; $P < 0.01$; **Fig. 5**). Sidak-corrected posthoc analyses found that for females, subjects

were significantly less aggressive with their sibling compared to both the opposite- and same-sex novel conspecifics (both $P < 0.01$). However, for males, subjects were significantly more aggressive with novel same-sex conspecifics than with either the opposite-sex conspecific or their sibling (both $P < 0.01$). Additionally, when interacting with an opposite-sex conspecific, we found that females were more aggressive than males ($P < 0.01$). Lastly, we did not observe a higher order interaction between Stimulus Type x Sex x Age ($P = 0.83$).

When examining nonsocial behavior, a RM GLM with Sex and Age as fixed factors and Stimulus Type as a within-subjects factor yielded a main effect of Stimulus Type ($F_{(2,158)} = 15.74$; $P < 0.01$). Sidak-corrected posthoc analyses found that subjects were significantly less nonsocial with their sibling than with the novel opposite- or same-sex conspecifics (both $P < 0.01$). We observed no effects of Sex or Age (both $P > 0.58$) and no interactions including Sex or Age (all $P > 0.13$).

Discussion

In the present study we examined the influence of advanced aging on male and female prairie vole behavior. We found that the latency to approach a novel object, performance in a dominance test, and behavior in social interactions were significantly influenced by age. Perhaps the most striking finding was that prosocial behavior and aggression do not simply increase or decrease with age, but rather behavior changes with age relative to social context, and in advanced age prairie voles cease to significantly alter their behavior based on social context. Here we discuss our findings in relation to advanced aging studies in other species as well as contextualize our results through consideration of prairie vole behavioral ecology.

The impact of age on neophobia

Exhibiting caution to unfamiliar stimuli is common among many animals and likely serves as an adaptable survival mechanism (Hebb 1946; Modlinska et al. 2015). Novel object tests are frequently used to examine consistent individual differences in shyness-boldness, exploration-avoidance, or neophilia/neophobia (Reale et al. 2007). Indeed, a recent meta-analysis found that novel object tests reliably quantify individual differences in behavior and yield a high repeatability of responses (Takola et al. 2021). In the present study, we exposed male and female prairie voles to a novel object and examined the latency to approach the object, as well as the time spent near and investigating the object. We found that the youngest age group (PND60-80) exhibited the longest latency to approach a novel object, but only significantly compared to animals aged PND220-240. Additionally, animals in the youngest age group also yielded the greatest number of subjects (n=10) that failed to approach the novel object before the test was terminated (see **Fig. 1**). This finding suggests that young adult male and female prairie voles may be more neophobic than their older-aged peers. One can speculate that perhaps with age comes more experience and boldness. However, our findings stand in contrast to those of studies conducted in mice and rats. For example, a study in rats found that while weanlings do not exhibit neophobia toward novel food, young adults (PND92-170) and old-age adults (PND680-850) do exhibit neophobic responses (Misanin et al. 1985). Similarly, using a battery of tests to assess anxiety (i.e., novel object, exploration of novel environment, light/dark box, elevated plus maze), aging was associated with increased anxiety-like behavior in rats (Leite-Almeida et al. 2009). Consistent with this, another study found that middle-aged C57BL/6J mice (i.e., ~PND250-365) exhibit increased anxiety-like behavior compared to mice in young adulthood (i.e., PND60-90) in a light/dark box test (Shoji et al. 2016). Although the results in mice and rats do not align with ours, they do show that neophobia can be dependent on age. Theoretical models exist for both increases and decreases of neophobia with age; neophobia may decrease with age in some species as threats become less dangerous, whereas neophobia may increase with age in other species because they have more assets to protect (Clark 1994; Crane and Ferrari 2017). We had hypothesized that we would observe decreased neophobic behavior in young adult prairie voles, potentially serving to facilitate a phenotype conducive to exploring novel environments to find territories and/or mates.

However, our novel object test results do not support this hypothesis and instead suggest that prairie voles may become less neophobic throughout adulthood.

Although younger subjects were more cautious than older individuals in the presence of a novel object, we observed no effects of age on social approach behavior. Therefore, while it may be in the best interest of a young adult prairie vole to exhibit caution with novel *nonsocial* stimuli, potentially until they become more experienced, given the importance of finding a mate and establishing a pair bond to fitness (Blocker and Ophir 2016), it may be critical to not exhibit *social* neophobia early on in adulthood. Our results support this interpretation and show that social neophobia is not influenced by adult age in prairie vole males or females. Interestingly, the type of stimulus also did not influence approach behavior in our animals. We were somewhat surprised that subjects approached the small group of novel, same-sex conspecifics at the same rate as other stimulus types. The small group was intended to [superficially] mimic the potential of encountering a novel prairie vole family while foraging or exploring outside the nest. Because prairie voles are territorial (Lee et al. 2019), we expected subjects to avoid a novel group, however, we found no differences in approach or investigative behavior based on stimulus type, suggesting that a novel, small group of same-sex conspecifics may not induce social neophobia in prairie voles. Field studies have shown that prairie voles have considerable overlap in home range territories (Sabol et al. 2018) and when territorial vacancies arise, at least females, rapidly immigrate to occupy said vacancies (Jacquot and Solomon 2004). Therefore, exhibiting a lack of social neophobia as an adult, at any age, may not only be crucial for finding mates, but also enables success in finding suitable territories.

Despite a lack of age effect on social approach behavior, we did observe an effect of sex on investigative behavior in the social approach test such that, regardless of age or social context, males investigated stimuli more than females. Consistent with this, recent studies demonstrated that while female prairie voles work harder to access a familiar mate over a novel, opposite-sex conspecific or a familiar conspecific over a novel conspecific, males work equally hard to access any kind of stimuli (Beery et al.

2021; Vahaba et al. 2022). Together, these findings suggest that male prairie voles are socially motivated by a more diverse range of social stimuli compared to females. Male prairie voles exhibit multiple mating strategies in the field, including a “resident” pairing strategy (note that paired males still exhibit extra-pair copulations) and a “wanderer” non-monogamous strategy (Madrid et al. 2020), and thus investigating conspecifics regardless of novelty may prove more beneficial to males than females. Additionally, higher investigation rates in males may also reflect that males experience fewer consequences of interactions with opposite-sex individuals compared to females given that males do not give birth to and cannot nurse pups (Royle et al. 2010). Therefore, it may be riskier for females to engage in social contact with novel conspecifics and therefore females exhibit less social investigation compared to males. This could have influenced our results and yielded a sex difference because social novelty was a factor in 3 out of 4 of our stimulus types in the social approach test. Future studies should directly test whether aspects of social neophobia are greater in female than male prairie voles regardless of age.

The impact of age on territoriality

Here we found that dominance varied by age, but only between two age groups, such that the eldest age group (PND300-320) exhibited significantly more losses compared to the second youngest age group (PND140-160). This could be a reflection of extremes in our sample such that PND140-160 aged voles may be closer to a stage of peak territoriality, at least compared to voles in advanced age, where losing competitions could result in infanticide of multiple litters of offspring, loss of a partner, or loss of a territory. Notably, the most losses were observed in the eldest age group and the greatest variation in the number of losses occurred within the two older age groups (see **Fig. 2**), suggesting that dominance phenotypes may become less stable with age. Very few studies have used the dominance tube test in prairie voles. However, one study used this test to examine the relationship between dominance and alcohol intake and found that prairie voles aged PND75-95 exhibited consistent dominance phenotypes, suggesting the tube test has high efficacy in young adulthood (Anacker et al. 2014). Characterization of dominance phenotypes is more common in lab mice (Fulenwider et al. 2022; Lee et al. 2021). Indeed, a

recent study examined the effects of age on dominance in male ChAT-IRES-Cre mice using a social interaction test (e.g., number and duration of follow episodes, number of times the focal mouse placed paws on the head or back of the stimulus animal) and found that male mice aged PND60-90 were more dominant than PND335-365 males. Although our results, along with those found in mice, suggest that social dominance decreases with age, a study that tracked dominance over time in a free roaming group of 20 wild rats in an outdoor enclosure found that age, but not body weight, predicted dominance phenotype, with the older rats winning and maintaining higher ranks in the social hierarchy (Berdoy et al. 1995). Whether these contrary findings in rats reflect a species difference or a methodological difference remains unknown. However, given that prairie voles live in small family groups, with many offspring dispersing to establish their own territories/families (McGuire et al. 2013), it is likely that the parents may be the most dominant individuals in the group. Future studies are required to determine whether age and/or body weight influence dominance among cohabitating siblings and whether dominance phenotypes in the natal home are consistent during encounters with novel individuals outside the nest.

In the present study, we did not observe an effect of age on behavior in the resident-intruder test. Thus, in the context of a territorial intrusion, it may be characteristic of prairie voles to engage in aggression and defend their territory regardless of age. However, we observed that both male and female prairie voles in our study were overwhelmingly nonsocial during the resident-intruder test and primarily avoided the novel, same-sex conspecific intruder. Although some aggression was observed, low levels may reflect the short duration of our resident-intruder test; due to ethical considerations, Emory veterinary staff required a test no longer than 6 min to prevent potential injury. It is also possible that the lack of aggression may reflect the semi-neutral territory in which the subjects were tested. Although the subject was allowed to “establish residency” for 20 min in the test cage prior to the addition of the intruder, our subjects may have lacked sufficient motivation to defend their territory due to the recency of being placed in the novel cage. However, previous studies in prairie voles have shown that aggressive behavior does not differ during interactions with a novel same-sex conspecific in the home cage or a neutral cage (Harper and

Batzli 1997). Further, a recent study in which prairie voles were tested in a neutral cage for 10 min yielded high frequencies of aggressive behavior (Lee et al. 2019). Thus, the low levels of aggression observed in our study may be the result of a shortened test period, and it is possible that we would have observed more aggression had the test been allowed to be carried out for longer. However, the composition of behavior exhibited in the resident-intruder assay in the present study does mirror our previous findings in male prairie voles aged PND30, 45, and 60, which also primarily exhibited nonsocial/avoidant behavior in a 10 min interaction with a novel same-sex conspecific (Kelly et al. 2018b). Notably, when considering the duration of resident-intruder interactions in the wild, such interactions most likely typically last for fewer than 6 min. High levels of aggression in laboratory resident-intruder paradigms may be the result of being tested in a small cage with no opportunity to escape or leave. Therefore, our data may have some ethological-relevance and suggest that aggression and socially avoidant behavior in the context of a territorial intrusion does not differ with age in prairie voles.

Adapting behavior to social context wanes with advanced age

In freely-behaving social interaction tests on neutral territory, we found that male and female prairie voles adjust their behavior accordingly dependent on social context (i.e., who they are interacting with). Not surprisingly, regardless of age or sex, subjects were significantly more prosocial and less aggressive with their familiar, same-sex siblings than they were with either the same- or opposite-sex novel conspecifics (see **Fig. 3**). However, we found that altering behavior relative to social context waned with age (see **Fig. 4**). Subjects in the PND60-80 and PND140-160 age groups exhibited similar prosocial behavior profiles, such that they were more prosocial with their same-sex sibling/cagemate than with either the novel same- or opposite-sex conspecifics. Yet, for PND 220-240 animals, prosocial behavior did not significantly differ between the opposite-sex conspecific and the sibling, and for the eldest age group (PND300-320) prosocial behavior did not differ at all based on social context. Although it *appears* that prosocial behavior with novel conspecifics may have gradually increased with age and prosocial behavior with siblings may have decreased with age, we found no statistically significant interactions between Age and

Stimulus Type, possibly due to the substantial amount of individual variation in our study. Rather, our data suggest that it is not as simple as ‘prairie voles become more or less prosocial with age,’ even within a specific context, but rather that prairie voles calibrate prosocial phenotype in a context-dependent manner in young adulthood and stop adjusting prosocial behavior to social context as they age. We find it somewhat perplexing that male and female prairie voles in young adulthood were not more prosocial with novel opposite-sex conspecifics given that finding a mate and pair bond partner should presumably be a high priority in young adulthood. However, despite our lack of an age effect on approach and investigative behavior in the social approach test, perhaps our results from the social interactions tests indicate that young adult prairie voles are indeed more socially neophobic than their elders. This would align with the object neophobia the youngest age group exhibited in the novel object task.

Similar to our findings for prosocial behavior, we also found that aggression profiles differed with age. PND60-80 prairie voles were more aggressive with a same-sex conspecific compared to a sibling and an opposite-sex conspecific. Although the exhibition of prosocial behavior did not differ in interactions with same- and opposite-sex conspecifics for PND60-80 individuals, it may be highly beneficial for this age group to at least suppress aggression when interacting with potential mates given that this age corresponds to the life history transition when prairie voles should be the most receptive to novel members of the opposite sex as they seek a partner to establish a pair bond and reproduce. Conversely, ages PND140-160 and 220-240 were similarly aggressive toward both same- and opposite- sex novel conspecifics. Even though prairie voles can still sire offspring at this age, it may be more likely that, in the wild, they would have already established a pair bond and therefore the need to suppress aggression with novel opposite-sex conspecifics may be waning. Further, our results suggest that in addition to exhibiting an onset of selective aggression with pairbonding (Gobrogge and Wang 2011), aggressive phenotype relative to social context changes in prairie voles with age regardless of pair bond status. Interestingly, though, the eldest age group (PND300-320) did not exhibit differences in aggression based on social context, suggesting that heightened aggression toward novel conspecifics dissipates with age.

Taken together, our data do not support our original hypothesis that aggression generally decreases with age. In fact, we observed no effect of age (or Age X Stimulus Type interactions) on aggression in free-interactions during the social interaction tests or the resident-intruder tests. Instead, our data suggest that the selectivity of aggression changes with age, with male and female prairie voles becoming less selectively aggressive with advanced age.

Why might prairie voles stop altering their behavior in a context-specific manner as they age? One possibility is senility. Perhaps prairie voles lose the ability to discriminate between individuals in advanced age. Although no studies have specifically examined social discrimination in aging prairie voles, a previous study found that olfactory discrimination abilities are preserved in age and are relatively equivalent in 2-, 10-, and 23-month-old mice (Rey et al. 2012). Indeed, olfactory discrimination abilities are crucial to survival in most rodents (Brennan and Keverne 2004; Rymer 2020), and it is likely highly adaptable to exhibit preserved sensory function throughout the lifespan of a rodent. Although somewhat different from our findings in the present study, two previous studies using C56BL/6J male mice found that PND180-365 mice engaged in less social contact in a social interaction test with a novel, same-sex juvenile compared to mice aged PND60-150 (Boyer et al. 2019; Shoji et al. 2016). Interestingly, reduced levels of social interaction preceded impaired performance in cognitive, sensory, and motor tasks, and the authors speculated that there may be a selective vulnerability of social circuits during aging (Boyer et al. 2019). This could suggest that cognitive, sensory, and motor functions may be spared for longer, possibly at the expense of social interest.

If prairie voles do not exhibit impaired social discrimination with age, then a waning expression of context-specific behavior could potentially be due to a decrease in social motivation. Perhaps social encounters with novel individuals are less important because in advanced age, prairie voles are less likely to form pairbonds and produce offspring. However, in labs, prairie vole breeders are typically used for extended periods of time, often beyond the ages that are chosen for subjects. One meta-analysis reported a

maximum age at which a *first* litter was sired as PND422 for males and the birth of the *first* litter for mothers at a maximum age of 180 (Rogers et al. 2018). This demonstrates that prairie voles are still reproductively viable beyond the age of the subjects in the present study. Thus, it may not be specifically social motivation that declines with age in prairie voles, but instead general motivation. Supporting this, a study in transgenic mice showed that mice's engagement in learning cost-benefit analysis declines with age, suggesting that mice undergo an age-related loss of motivation (Friedman et al. 2020). A similar study observed a steady age-related decrease in cognitive performance on a Choice Serial Reaction Time Task in mice (6-, 18-, and 24-months old), and that older mice still performed less well than younger mice even after controlling for task difficulty, again suggesting that aging is associated with changes in motivation (Bordner et al. 2011). These findings in mice, combined with our results that the eldest prairie voles exhibited the most losses in the dominance tube test and did not adjust social behavior to context in the social interaction tests, suggest that male and female prairie voles may experience a decline in motivation with age. However, further studies that explicitly test motivation are required to determine whether the lack of context-specific behavior in advanced age observed in the present study was due to an age-related decline in motivation rather than a decline in other cognitive capacities.

Better with age? Prairie voles as a model for studying elderly social relationships.

In humans, social relationships tend to improve with age such that older adults generally experience more satisfying and positive social relationships than younger adults (Charles and Piazza 2007). Older adults engage in strategies to maximize positive experiences and actively avoid social conflict (Luong et al. 2011). To overcome interpersonal problems, unlike young and middle-aged adults, older adults choose passive strategies, which have been deemed the most effective way to handle conflict (Blanchard-Fields et al. 2007; Sorkin and Rook 2006). In the present study, one could interpret the waning expression of context-dependent social behavior in the eldest age group as prairie voles taking a more passive approach to social interactions in advanced age, which may be a more stable strategy for maintaining social connections while avoiding injury. As is with humans (Donovan and Blazer 2020; Fratiglioni et al. 2000),

social companionship is crucial to the physical health of prairie voles (McNeal et al. 2014; McNeal et al. 2017). Further, unlike in middle-aged human adults, social activities not only increase positive affect but also decrease negative affect in elderly adults, suggesting that friends and social engagement may act as a buffer against the negative effects of aging (Huxhold et al. 2014). Indeed, being socially engaged well into advanced age reduces the risk of heart disease, dementia, disability, and cognitive decline (Avlund et al. 2004; Barefoot et al. 2005; Fratiglioni et al. 2000). Prairie voles have been successfully used as a model for examining the stress buffering effects of bonding (Donovan et al. 2018; Gobrogge and Wang 2015; Smith and Wang 2013; Burkett et al. 2016). Our data suggest that this line of research could be extended to use prairie voles as a model for studying the cognitive and physiological benefits of social relationships and social engagement in advanced age.

Conclusions

Here we examined behavioral trajectories of aging male and female prairie voles and found that nonsocial neophobia, dominance, and context-dependent social behavior are influenced by adult age. Perhaps most strikingly, our findings suggest that aspects of social behavior (i.e., prosocial behavior and aggression) become less selective with advanced age in prairie voles. Whether the waning expression of context-dependent behavior with age is due to a decline in cognitive and/or sensory abilities or a decrease in social motivation remains to be studied. Regardless, our study demonstrates that social behavior is plastic not only throughout early development, but also well throughout adulthood. The prairie vole community rightfully prides themselves in allowing for natural variation in studies, however, it may be worth considering statistically controlling for age of subjects, and potentially age of parents, as random factors or covariates in analyses. Additionally, given that labs use prairie voles as breeders well into advanced age, it is worth considering that parental behavior toward offspring and/or epigenetic consequences of aging parents may differentially influence offspring behavior and relevant underlying mechanisms. Together our study demonstrates that social behavior continues to change across the lifespan, and future

studies investigating age-related changes in social neural circuitry may be of value in understanding the consequences of aging on social relationships.

Acknowledgements

We thank Ashley Rosenberg and Isabella Lunin for assistance with running behavioral tests, and Zia Huballah for assistance with scoring behavioral assays.

Author Contributions

JMP conducted behavioral tests, scored behavioral videos, and wrote the manuscript. MMG and NSL assisted with conducting behavioral tests and scored behavioral videos. AMK designed the study, conducted statistical analyses, wrote the manuscript, and acquired funding for the study.

Availability of Data and Materials

All data are available on Dryad.

References

- Anacker AM, Smith ML, Ryabinin AE (2014) Establishment of stable dominance interactions in prairie vole peers: relationships with alcohol drinking and activation of the paraventricular nucleus of the hypothalamus. *Soc Neurosci* 9 (5):484-494. doi:10.1080/17470919.2014.931885
- Anderson LA, Goodman RA, Holtzman D, Posner SF, Northridge ME (2012) Aging in the United States: opportunities and challenges for public health. *Am J Public Health* 102 (3):393-395. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2011.300617

- 586 Aragona BJ, Liu Y, Curtis JT, Stephan FK, Wang Z (2003) A critical role for nucleus accumbens
 587 dopamine in partner-preference formation in male prairie voles. *J Neurosci* 23 (8):3483-
 588 3490
- 589 Avlund K, Lund R, Holstein BE, Due P (2004) Social relations as determinant of onset of
 590 disability in aging. *Arch Gerontol Geriatr* 38 (1):85-99.
 591 doi:10.1016/j.archger.2003.08.003
- 592 Bales KL, Ardekani CS, Baxter A, Karaskiewicz CL, Kuske JX, Lau AR, Savidge LE, Sayler
 593 KR, Witczak LR (2021) What is a pair bond? *Horm Behav* 136:105062.
 594 doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2021.105062
- 595 Barefoot JC, Gronbaek M, Jensen G, Schnohr P, Prescott E (2005) Social network diversity and
 596 risks of ischemic heart disease and total mortality: findings from the Copenhagen City
 597 Heart Study. *Am J Epidemiol* 161 (10):960-967. doi:10.1093/aje/kwi128
- 598 Beery AK, Lopez SA, Blandino KL, Lee NS, Bourdon NS (2021) Social selectivity and social
 599 motivation in voles. *Elife* 10. doi:10.7554/eLife.72684
- 600 Berdoy M, Smith P, MacDonald DW (1995) Stability of social status in wild rats: age and the
 601 role of settled dominance. *Behaviour* 132:193-212
- 602 Blanchard-Fields F, Mienaltowski A, Seay RB (2007) Age differences in everyday problem-
 603 solving effectiveness: older adults select more effective strategies for interpersonal
 604 problems. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 62 (1):P61-64. doi:10.1093/geronb/62.1.p61
- 605 Blocker TD, Ophir AG (2016) A preference to bond? Male prairie voles form pair bonds even in
 606 the presence of multiple receptive females. *Anim Behav* 122:89-97.
 607 doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.10.007

- 608 Bordner KA, Kitchen RR, Carlyle B, George ED, Mahajan MC, Mane SM, Taylor JR, Simen
 609 AA (2011) Parallel declines in cognition, motivation, and locomotion in aging mice:
 610 association with immune gene upregulation in the medial prefrontal cortex. *Exp Gerontol*
 611 46 (8):643-659. doi:10.1016/j.exger.2011.03.003
- 612 Bosch OJ, Young LJ (2018) Oxytocin and Social Relationships: From Attachment to Bond
 613 Disruption. *Curr Top Behav Neurosci* 35:97-117. doi:10.1007/7854_2017_10
- 614 Boyer F, Jaouen F, Ibrahim EC, Gascon E (2019) Deficits in Social Behavior Precede Cognitive
 615 Decline in Middle-Aged Mice. *Front Behav Neurosci* 13:55.
 616 doi:10.3389/fnbeh.2019.00055
- 617 Brennan PA, Keverne EB (2004) Something in the air? New insights into mammalian
 618 pheromones. *Curr Biol* 14 (2):R81-89. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2003.12.052
- 619 Burkett JP, Andari E, Johnson ZV, Curry DC, de Waal FB, Young LJ (2016) Oxytocin-
 620 dependent consolation behavior in rodents. *Science* 351 (6271):375-378.
 621 doi:10.1126/science.aac4785
- 622 Carter CS, Getz LL, Gavish L, McDermott JL, Arnold P (1980) Male-related pheromones and
 623 the activation of female reproduction in the prairie vole (*Microtus ochrogaster*). *Biol*
 624 *Reprod* 23 (5):1038-1045
- 625 Charles ST, Piazza JR (2007) Memories of social interactions: age differences in emotional
 626 intensity. *Psychol Aging* 22 (2):300-309. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.22.2.300
- 627 Clark CW (1994) Antipredator behavior and the asset-protection principle. *Behav Ecol* 5 (159-
 628 170)
- 629 Crane AL, Ferrari MCO (2017) Patterns of predator neophobia: a meta-analytic review. *Proc*
 630 *Biol Sci* 284 (1861). doi:10.1098/rspb.2017.0583

- 631 De Biasi A, Wolfe M, Carmody J, Fulmer T, Auerbach J (2020) Creating an Age-Friendly Public
 632 Health System. *Innov Aging* 4 (1):igz044. doi:10.1093/geroni/igz044
- 633 DeVries AC, Johnson CL, Carter CS (1997) Familiarity and gender influence social preferences
 634 in prairie voles (*Microtus ochrogaster*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 75 (2)
- 635 Donovan M, Liu Y, Wang Z (2018) Anxiety-like behavior and neuropeptide receptor expression
 636 in male and female prairie voles: The effects of stress and social buffering. *Behav Brain*
 637 *Res* 342:70-78. doi:10.1016/j.bbr.2018.01.015
- 638 Donovan NJ, Blazer D (2020) Social Isolation and Loneliness in Older Adults: Review and
 639 Commentary of a National Academies Report. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry* 28 (12):1233-
 640 1244. doi:10.1016/j.jagp.2020.08.005
- 641 Finton CJ, Ophir AG (2020) Prairie vole offspring only prefer mothers over fathers when
 642 mothers are a unique resource, yet fathers are the primary source of variation in parental
 643 care. *Behav Processes* 171:104022. doi:10.1016/j.beproc.2019.104022
- 644 Fratiglioni L, Wang HX, Ericsson K, Maytan M, Winblad B (2000) Influence of social network
 645 on occurrence of dementia: a community-based longitudinal study. *Lancet* 355
 646 (9212):1315-1319. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(00)02113-9
- 647 Friedman A, Hueske E, Drammis SM, Toro Arana SE, Nelson ED, Carter CW, Delcasso S,
 648 Rodriguez RX, Lutwak H, DiMarco KS, Zhang Q, Rakocevic LI, Hu D, Xiong JK, Zhao
 649 J, Gibb LG, Yoshida T, Siciliano CA, Diefenbach TJ, Ramakrishnan C, Deisseroth K,
 650 Graybiel AM (2020) Striosomes Mediate Value-Based Learning Vulnerable in Age and a
 651 Huntington's Disease Model. *Cell* 183 (4):918-934 e949. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2020.09.060
- 652 Fulenwider HD, Caruso MA, Ryabinin AE (2022) Manifestations of domination: Assessments of
 653 social dominance in rodents. *Genes Brain Behav* 21 (3):e12731. doi:10.1111/gbb.12731

- 654 Getz LL, Carter CS (1980) Social organization in *Microtus ochrogaster* populations. The
 655 Biologist 62 (56e69.)
- 656 Getz LL, Hofmann JE (1986) Social organization in free-living prairie voles, *Microtus*
 657 *ochrogaster*. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 18:275-282
- 658 Gobrogge K, Wang Z (2015) Neuropeptidergic regulation of pair-bonding and stress buffering:
 659 Lessons from voles. Horm Behav 76:91-105. doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2015.08.010
- 660 Gobrogge KL, Wang ZW (2011) Genetics of aggression in voles. Adv Genet 75:121-150.
 661 doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-380858-5.00003-4
- 662 Greenwood MA, Hammock EAD (2019) Oxytocin Receptor Binding Sites in the Periphery of
 663 the Neonatal Prairie Vole. Front Neurosci 13:474. doi:10.3389/fnins.2019.00474
- 664 Grippo AJ, Gerena D, Huang J, Kumar N, Shah M, Ughreja R, Carter CS (2007a) Social
 665 isolation induces behavioral and neuroendocrine disturbances relevant to depression in
 666 female and male prairie voles. Psychoneuroendocrinol 32 (8-10):966-980.
 667 doi:10.1016/j.psyneuen.2007.07.004
- 668 Grippo AJ, Lamb DG, Carter CS, Porges SW (2007b) Cardiac regulation in the socially
 669 monogamous prairie vole. Physiol Behav 90 (2-3):386-393.
 670 doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2006.09.037
- 671 Hale LH, Tickerhoof MC, Smith AS (2021) Chronic intranasal oxytocin reverses stress-induced
 672 social avoidance in female prairie voles. Neuropharmacology 198:108770.
 673 doi:10.1016/j.neuropharm.2021.108770
- 674 Harper SJ, Batzli GO (1997) Are staged dyadic encounters useful for studying aggressive
 675 behaviour of arvicoline rodents. Canadian Journal of Zoology 75:1051-1058
- 676 Hebb DO (1946) On the nature of fear. Psychol Rev 53:259-276

- 677 Hiura LC, Kelly AM, Ophir AG (2018) Age-specific and context-specific responses of the
 678 medial extended amygdala in the developing prairie vole. *Dev Neurobiol* 78 (12):1231-
 679 1245. doi:10.1002/dneu.22648
- 680 Huxhold O, Miche M, Schuz B (2014) Benefits of having friends in older ages: differential
 681 effects of informal social activities on well-being in middle-aged and older adults. *J*
 682 *Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 69 (3):366-375. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbt029
- 683 Jacquot JJ, Solmon NG (2004) Experimental manipulation of territory occupancy: effects on
 684 immigration of female prairie voles. *J Mammal* 85:1009-1014
- 685 Johnson ZV, Walum H, Jamal YA, Xiao Y, Keebaugh AC, Inoue K, Young LJ (2016) Central
 686 oxytocin receptors mediate mating-induced partner preferences and enhance correlated
 687 activation across forebrain nuclei in male prairie voles. *Horm Behav* 79:8-17.
 688 doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2015.11.011
- 689 Kelly AM, Hiura LC, Ophir AG (2018a) Rapid nonapeptide synthesis during a critical period of
 690 development in the prairie vole: plasticity of the paraventricular nucleus of the
 691 hypothalamus. *Brain Struct Funct* 223 (6):2547-2560. doi:10.1007/s00429-018-1640-2
- 692 Kelly AM, Ong JY, Witmer RA, Ophir AG (2020) Paternal deprivation impairs social behavior
 693 putatively via epigenetic modification to lateral septum vasopressin receptor. *Sci Adv* 6
 694 (36). doi:10.1126/sciadv.abb9116
- 695 Kelly AM, Saunders AG, Ophir AG (2018b) Mechanistic substrates of a life history transition in
 696 male prairie voles: Developmental plasticity in affiliation and aggression corresponds to
 697 nonapeptide neuronal function. *Horm Behav* 99:14-24. doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2018.01.006
- 698 Kenkel W (2021) Birth signalling hormones and the developmental consequences of caesarean
 699 delivery. *J Neuroendocrinol* 33 (1):e12912. doi:10.1111/jne.12912

- 700 Kenkel WM, Gustison ML, Beery AK (2021) A Neuroscientist's Guide to the Vole. *Curr Protoc*
 701 1 (6):e175. doi:10.1002/cpz1.175
- 702 Kenkel WM, Perkeybile AM, Carter CS (2017) The neurobiological causes and effects of
 703 alloparenting. *Dev Neurobiol* 77 (2):214-232. doi:10.1002/dneu.22465
- 704 Kenkel WM, Suboc G, Carter CS (2014) Autonomic, behavioral and neuroendocrine correlates
 705 of paternal behavior in male prairie voles. *Physiol Behav* 128:252-259.
 706 doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2014.02.006
- 707 Lawrence RH, Palumbo MC, Freeman SM, Guoynes CD, Bales KL (2020) Developmental
 708 Fluoxetine Exposure Alters Behavior and Neuropeptide Receptors in the Prairie Vole.
 709 *Front Behav Neurosci* 14:584731. doi:10.3389/fnbeh.2020.584731
- 710 Lee NS, Goodwin NL, Freitas KE, Beery AK (2019) Affiliation, Aggression, and Selectivity of
 711 Peer Relationships in Meadow and Prairie Voles. *Front Behav Neurosci* 13:52.
 712 doi:10.3389/fnbeh.2019.00052
- 713 Lee W, Dowd HN, Nikain C, Dwortz MF, Yang ED, Curley JP (2021) Effect of relative social
 714 rank within a social hierarchy on neural activation in response to familiar or unfamiliar
 715 social signals. *Sci Rep* 11 (1):2864. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-82255-8
- 716 Leite-Almeida H, Almeida-Torres L, Mesquita AR, Pertovaara A, Sousa N, Cerqueira JJ,
 717 Almeida A (2009) The impact of age on emotional and cognitive behaviours triggered by
 718 experimental neuropathy in rats. *Pain* 144 (1-2):57-65. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2009.02.024
- 719 Luong G, Charles ST, Fingerman KL (2011) Better With Age: Social Relationships Across
 720 Adulthood. *J Soc Pers Relat* 28 (1):9-23. doi:10.1177/0265407510391362

- 721 Madrid JE, Parker KJ, Ophir AG (2020) Variation, plasticity, and alternative mating tactics:
 722 Revisiting what we know about the socially monogamous prairie vole. *Adv Stud Behav*
 723 52:203-242
- 724 Mateo JM, Holmes WG, Bell AM, Turner M (1994) Sexual maturation in male prairie voles:
 725 effects of the social environment. *Physiol Behav* 56 (2):299-304
- 726 McGraw LA, Young LJ (2010) The prairie vole: an emerging model organism for understanding
 727 the social brain. *Trends Neurosci* 33 (2):103-109. doi:S0166-2236(09)00198-2 [pii]
 728 10.1016/j.tins.2009.11.006
- 729 McGuire B, Getz LL, Bemis WE (2013) Social dynamics and dispersal in free-living prairie
 730 voles (*Microtus ochrogaster*). *J Mammal* 94 (1):40-49
- 731 McNeal N, Appleton KM, Johnson AK, Scotti ML, Wardwell J, Murphy R, Bishop C, Knecht A,
 732 Grippo AJ (2017) The protective effects of social bonding on behavioral and pituitary-
 733 adrenal axis reactivity to chronic mild stress in prairie voles. *Stress* 20 (2):175-182.
 734 doi:10.1080/10253890.2017.1295444
- 735 McNeal N, Scotti MA, Wardwell J, Chandler DL, Bates SL, Larocca M, Trahanas DM, Grippo
 736 AJ (2014) Disruption of social bonds induces behavioral and physiological dysregulation
 737 in male and female prairie voles. *Autonomic neuroscience : basic & clinical* 180:9-16.
 738 doi:10.1016/j.autneu.2013.10.001
- 739 Misanin JR, Blatt LA, Hinderliter CF (1985) Age dependency in neophobia: Its influence on
 740 taste-aversion learning and the flavor-preexposure effect in rats. *Anim Learn Behav*
 741 13:69-76
- 742 Modlinska K, Stryjek R, Pisula W (2015) Food neophobia in wild and laboratory rats (multi-
 743 strain comparison). *Behav Processes* 113:41-50. doi:10.1016/j.beproc.2014.12.005

- 744 Olazabal DE, Young LJ (2005) Variability in "spontaneous" maternal behavior is associated with
 745 anxiety-like behavior and affiliation in naive juvenile and adult female prairie voles
 746 (*Microtus ochrogaster*). *Dev Psychobiol* 47 (2):166-178. doi:10.1002/dev.20077
- 747 Olivari BS, French ME, McGuire LC (2020) The Public Health Road Map to Respond to the
 748 Growing Dementia Crisis. *Innov Aging* 4 (1):igz043. doi:10.1093/geroni/igz043
- 749 Prounis GS, Ophir AG (2019) The Impact of Early Postnatal and Juvenile Social Environments
 750 on the Effects of Chronic Intranasal Oxytocin in the Prairie Vole. *Front Behav Neurosci*
 751 13:206. doi:10.3389/fnbeh.2019.00206
- 752 Prounis GS, Thomas K, Ophir AG (2018) Developmental trajectories and influences of
 753 environmental complexity on oxytocin receptor and vasopressin 1A receptor expression
 754 in male and female prairie voles. *J Comp Neurol* 526 (11):1820-1842.
 755 doi:10.1002/cne.24450
- 756 Reale D, Reader SM, Sol D, McDougall PT, Dingemanse NJ (2007) Integrating animal
 757 temperament within ecology and evolution. *Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc* 82 (2):291-318.
 758 doi:10.1111/j.1469-185X.2007.00010.x
- 759 Rey NL, Sacquet J, Veyrac A, Jourdan F, Didier A (2012) Behavioral and cellular markers of
 760 olfactory aging and their response to enrichment. *Neurobiol Aging* 33 (3):626 e629-626
 761 e623. doi:10.1016/j.neurobiolaging.2011.03.026
- 762 Rogers FD, Rhemtulla M, Ferrer E, Bales KL (2018) Longitudinal trajectories and inter-parental
 763 dynamics of prairie vole biparental care. *Front Eco Evo* 6:73.
 764 doi:doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2018.00073
- 765 Royle NJ, Schuett W, Dall SRX (2010) Behavioral consistency and the resolution of sexual
 766 conflict over parental investment. *Behav Ecol* 21 (6):1125-1130

- 767 Ryabinin AE, Hostetler CM (2016) Prairie Voles as a Model to Screen Medications for the
 768 Treatment of Alcoholism and Addictions. *Int Rev Neurobiol* 126:403-421.
 769 doi:10.1016/bs.irn.2016.02.019
- 770 Rymer TL (2020) The Role of Olfactory Genes in the Expression of Rodent Paternal Care
 771 Behavior. *Genes (Basel)* 11 (3). doi:10.3390/genes11030292
- 772 Sabol AC, Solomon NG, Dantzer B (2018) How to Study Socially Monogamous Behavior in
 773 Secretive Animals? Using Social Network Analyses and Automated Tracking Systems to
 774 Study the Social Behavior of Prairie Voles. *Front Eco Evo* 6 (Article 178)
- 775 Shoji H, Takao K, Hattori S, Miyakawa T (2016) Age-related changes in behavior in C57BL/6J
 776 mice from young adulthood to middle age. *Mol Brain* 9:11. doi:10.1186/s13041-016-
 777 0191-9
- 778 Sikes RS, Animal C, Use Committee of the American Society of M (2016) 2016 Guidelines of
 779 the American Society of Mammalogists for the use of wild mammals in research and
 780 education. *J Mammal* 97 (3):663-688. doi:10.1093/jmammal/gyw078
- 781 Smith AS, Wang Z (2013) Hypothalamic Oxytocin Mediates Social Buffering of the Stress
 782 Response. *Biol Psychiatry* [Epub ahead of print]. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2013.09.017
- 783 Sorkin DH, Rook KS (2006) Dealing with negative social exchanges in later life: coping
 784 responses, goals, and effectiveness. *Psychol Aging* 21 (4):715-725. doi:10.1037/0882-
 785 7974.21.4.715
- 786 Stalling DT (1990) *Microtus ochrogaster*. *Mammalian Species* 355:1-9
- 787 Takola E, Krause ET, Muller C, Schielzeth H (2021) Novelty at second glance: a critical
 788 appraisal of the novel object paradigm based on meta-analysis. *Anim Behav* 180:123-142

Thomas JA, Birney EC (1979) Parental care and mating system of the prairie vole, *Microtus ochrograster*. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 5:171-186

Vahaba DM, Halstead ER, Donaldson ZR, Ahern TH, Beery AK (2022) Sex differences in the reward value of familiar mates in prairie voles. Genes Brain Behav 21 (3):e12790. doi:10.1111/gbb.12790

Walum H, Young LJ (2018) The neural mechanisms and circuitry of the pair bond. Nat Rev Neurosci 19 (11):643-654. doi:10.1038/s41583-018-0072-6

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Mean \pm SEM time (seconds, s) to approach a novel object for each age group. Voles between PND60-80 exhibited a greater latency to approach the object compared to voles aged PND220-240. Dots represent individual data points. * indicate statistical significance.

Figure 2. Mean \pm SEM the number of losses in the dominance test for each age group. Voles between PND140-160 lost fewer trials compared to voles aged PND300-320. Dots represent individual data points. * indicate statistical significance.

Figure 3. Mean \pm SEM time (seconds, s) spent engaging in **(A)** prosocial behavior and **(B)** aggressive behavior in a social interaction test with a novel opposite-sex conspecific (beige), novel same-sex conspecific (green), and familiar same-sex sibling (blue). Male and female voles were more prosocial and less aggressive with their siblings compared to other stimulus types. Dots represent individual data points. * indicate statistical significance.

Figure 4. Mean \pm SEM time (seconds, s) spent engaging in **(A)** prosocial behavior and **(B)** aggressive behavior in a social interaction test with a novel opposite-sex conspecific (beige), novel same-sex conspecific (green), and familiar same-sex sibling (blue). Prosocial behavior and aggression varied by the type of conspecific voles interacted with for all age groups except the eldest group, PND300-320. Dots represent individual data points. * indicate statistical significance.

Figure 5. Mean \pm SEM time (seconds, s) spent engaging in aggressive behavior in a social interaction test with a novel opposite-sex conspecific (beige), novel same-sex conspecific (green), and familiar same-sex sibling (blue) for male and female voles. Aggression differentially varied by the type of conspecific males and females interacted with. Females were more aggressive in interactions with opposite-sex conspecifics compared to males. Dots represent individual data points. * indicate statistical significance.

Tables

Table 1. Ethograms for Behavioral Assays. * denotes that the behavioral state can co-occur with other states within an assay. Otherwise, all behavioral states are mutually exclusive.

Dominance Tube Test	
Win	Subject animal remains in tube and the stimulus animal has fully exited the tube with all four paws on the ground.
Lose	Subject animal fully exits the tube with all four paws on the ground while the stimulus animal remains in the tube.
Tie	Neither animal fully exits tube within 3 minutes.
Novel Object Investigation	
Latency to approach	Time at which subject's nose is first within 1 cm of the object.
Time near object*	Subject is within one body length of the object but does not need to be oriented towards or actively investigating the object.
Time investigating object*	Subject's nose is within 1 cm of the object.
Social Approach Test	
Latency to approach	Time at which subject is first within one body length to the barrier.

Time near stimulus*	Subject is within one body length of the barrier but does not need to be oriented towards or actively investigating the subject.
Time investigating stimulus*	Subject's nose is within 1 cm of the barrier.

Resident Intruder & Social Interaction Tests	
<i>Prosocial Behavior</i>	
Allogrooming	Subject grooms the stimulus animal.
Huddling	Subject and stimulus animals are either touching flanks or laying on top of each other.
Positive investigation	Subject sniffs or investigates stimulus animal without apparent aggression.
Positive side-by-side contact	Subject and stimulus animal are passively touching sides without apparent aggression.
<i>Aggressive Behavior</i>	
Aggressive side-by-side contact	Subject and stimulus animals are touching flanks in an aggressive manner, sometimes between aggression bouts.
Biting	Subject bites the stimulus animal.
Chasing	Subject is aggressively chasing the stimulus animal and is the initiator for the entire event. Does not include non-aggressive following.
Lunging/Attacking/Rolling	Subject lunges at, swipes paws at, or rolls around with stimulus vole in aggression.
Pinning	Subject pins stimulus down.
Rearing	Subject is rearing up on hind paws in either offense or defense.
<i>Nonsocial Behavior</i>	
Autogrooming	Subject grooms itself while not in contact with the stimulus animal.

830

831

832






Figure 2









Figure 5

